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Illinois Wesleyan University (IWU) is a residential liberal arts college with a long history of offering selected professional-degree programs. Founded in 1850, IWU once awarded postgraduate degrees but those programs ceased being offered in the late 1970s and it has been a solely undergraduate institution since then. Master’s-degreed librarians have held faculty rank at IWU since the 1930s.

When IWU installed its seventeenth president in 1989, many faculty welcomed the transition to a leader who had progressed through faculty ranks. Minor Myers jr. was an active scholar who frequently published outside his discipline and a lifelong book collector. He famously characterized his collecting
interests with the comment, “Anything I can find eighteenth century—and cheap—I will buy.”2 Myers even listed his collections on his curriculum vitae:

Eighteenth century books (significant groupings in political philosophy, music, gardening, cookery), decorative arts, nineteenth century cookery. Musical instruments of the eighteenth century. College related materials, though my earlier group of 11,000 items once in the American Antiquarian Society is now part of the Illinois Wesleyan University Library.3

Placing these collections even before his scholarly publications perhaps implied the importance these pursuits held in his life. This avid collector had a profound influence on the IWU library by employing techniques from the way he amassed his own collections (i.e., making deals with used booksellers and acquiring materials in bulk without regard for condition or relationship to the curriculum). His legacy in the library is a mixture of positive contributions and negative consequences. He was an enthusiastic promoter of the library as integral to learning and an intellectual life but the materials he acquired were not suited to IWU’s needs. The way Myers was involved in the library, and the way people on campus perceived him in these activities, is now deeply ingrained into perceptions about the library among its own personnel and in some campus units.

Subjects interviewed for a project on Myers’ book-collecting interests fondly remembered that he supported students and faculty alike, contributed to an atmosphere of intellectual vibrancy, and improved the physical campus.4 One of these people, IWU alumna and Emeritus Professor of English Pamela Muirhead, succinctly summarized the characteristics that others also observed. Muirhead served as interim provost and dean of the faculty during Myers’ presidency and acknowledged that while Myers was “not a perfect person, we got a real jolt of energy and playfulness and entertainment.”5 For many, Myers exemplified the multidisciplinary love of learning that became the heart of IWU’s liberal arts ideal under his leadership.

There is no doubt that the IWU library was in better condition physically and financially after Myers’ presidency, but the manner in which he inserted himself in building the library’s collections is unorthodox and unprecedented. This case study explores how Myers’ habits as a collector conflicted with the efforts of the two university librarians who served during his tenure: Clayton Highum (1972–92) and Sue Stroyan (1992–2006). The former led the library on a path that the president saw as contrary to his vision; the latter was not entirely successful in asserting a core principle of librarianship—shaping the
library’s collections for its community—but found a way to work with the administration while cultivating support for long-range library development among her faculty colleagues.

Literature Review

A search for presidents involved in decision making with regard to academic library collection management revealed articles on presidents who established libraries and cooperated fully, or simply supported, the decisions of library administrators. Two such articles describe the origins of the university library and library school at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Presidents Andrew S. Draper (1894–1904) and Edmund J. James (1904–20) receive credit for valuing the role libraries play in higher education and in supporting the head librarians’ work.6 In 1880 Draper’s predecessor, Regent John Milton Gregory, made a more direct contribution when he purchased 644 volumes with university funds during a “month long trip east to purchase books.”7 The University of Alabama’s first president, Reverend Alva Wood, took an active part in the library’s formation when he received funding in 1831 and chose 2,000 volumes over a three-year period for their library’s holdings.8 In the latter two cases, the presidents’ actions preceded the appointment of librarians.

One article includes an account of President David L. Swain, who estab-
lished an historical society within the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill and donated his own collection to it.9 A book on the development of Stanford University’s libraries includes a chapter on President John Casper Branner, who first started housing his collections in his office for the use of his students and then sold all 10,000 of his acquired volumes to the university in 1915 to establish a geological collection that bore his name thereafter. In later years he purchased and donated additional collections and individual books to the same library.10

More typically, librarians encounter mass collection transfers through a donor regardless of that person’s status at the institution. In 1987 Princeton’s Special Collections Librarian William Joyce wrote about how private libraries progressed from limited-access research centers and into the collections of larger institutions.11 Joyce further defined how these donations developed into our current collection distinctions:

For it is in the research library serving an academic constituency that the concept of “rarity” emerges, though the concept also owes its origin
to the expansion of the antiquarian book trade. Conversely, the phrase “special collections” was generally used to designate a concentration of books, not necessarily rare, on any given subject. . . . The consequent interest of research libraries in acquiring the collection formed by bibliophiles, also led those institutions to safeguard rare items already among their holdings.12

Great publicly accessible research libraries are often built, stocked, and endowed by private collectors after careful cultivation.13 President Myers himself wrote about George S. Palmer, benefactor for Connecticut College's eponymous Palmer Library, who sold his antique furniture collection to fund the library's construction and also donated books for its special collections.14 The relationship between academic library collections and bibliophiles is undoubtedly intertwined. Lawrence C. Wroth, then-librarian of Brown University's John Carter Brown Library, published a seminal article on this topic in 1945. In “The Chief End of Book Madness” he considered the possible fates of collections built by avid collectors: they either go to libraries or to auction houses. Wroth valued both possibilities but stressed, “The question the historian of this and the last century will ask himself when he considers the libraries of the United States will not be ‘What has the book collector done for these libraries?’ but ‘What would these libraries have been without the book collector?’”15

The present article differs from those cited here in that it concerns a president and two librarians who disagreed about seeking large quantities of gifts as a sustainable approach to meeting their community's needs. No one wants to disappoint an interested donor, but librarians seem united on the perils as much as the benefits of accepting too many gifts. In an article recalling the development of Texas A&M’s gift policy, author Janice Norris identified 400 articles on the subject of “gifts and/or donations to libraries” that had been published between 1995 and 2002. Norris’ interest was in finding gift policies that involved subject specialists in decision making, but she also elaborated on problems encountered with wholesale acceptance of gifts (e.g., poor condition, suitability to the community’s needs, and personnel time used in evaluating them) and argued that “a gift book is never free.” She advised that subject librarians working with faculty were well suited to judge the suitability of book donations.16 Susan Allen, former director of the California Rare Book School, offered strategies specifically for donor cultivation in special collections but stated that “the first step” would be creating a collection
development policy. After that, any gift offered needed to be evaluated based on the policy's criteria.17

President Myers was a donor and a seasoned negotiator of deals but he acted unilaterally in pursuing his plans for the library. More important, while this president was valued as an advocate for the library overall, his actions regarding collection management aligned with strategies he used in his personal book collecting and contradicted the plans of his university librarians.

Methodology

Since 2005 I have heard anecdotes about how Myers shared his collecting interests on campus. Stories about his involvement with the university library's collections circulate and surface periodically among the staff to this day. A sabbatical leave in 2016 made it possible for me to actively begin collecting these stories and, after four months of data collection, nearly 100 people had contributed recollections of Myers through interviews and in written comments.

In addition to interviews, I explored historical records for evidence of the actions under discussion in their contemporary time. Records consulted from the University Archives at IWU include board of trustees' and faculty meeting materials, library reports, collection records, donor files, Myers' own correspondence and subject files on the library, and news sources from IWU and the surrounding community. Archivists at all four of Myers' previous institutions provided feedback on the nature of their holdings for this project: Carleton College, where Myers was an undergraduate; Princeton, where he received his MA and PhD; Connecticut College, where he served on faculty for sixteen years; and Hobart and William Smith, where he was provost for five years. The only extensive evidence of Myers' interests in academic libraries elsewhere is present in Connecticut College's records.

Myers' Characteristics

As Collector

That Myers was an earnest bibliophile is stated boldly and simply on his CV but it is most evident in the growth of his personal collection during his tenure as IWU's president. In his first month on campus, Myers told a local news reporter that he possessed “3,000 titles from the [eighteenth century].”18 Upon his death fourteen years later, his personal collection was comprised of
nearly 12,000 books and ephemera. And even though he described himself as a collector of the eighteenth century, at the end of his life he possessed books that spanned the fifteenth century to the twenty-first. Myers employed a number of strategies when purchasing books for his own collections, but it was the increasing popularity of Internet sites and, especially, eBay that made a four-fold increase possible in such a short period of time.

The story of Myers’ personal collections—their content and the ways in which they have had lasting effects on alumni and others who interacted with him—are the subject of two essays and an oral history collection.19 Myers’ energy and enthusiasm for books and other types of material culture are legendary in the IWU community of his era and, taken together with this article, these sources combine to form a portrait of this collector. Myers used his collections in a variety of ways, but his interests in book collecting as a means to preserve them are the most relevant to his actions on behalf of IWU’s library. His preservationist interests as a collector are evident in an interview he gave for Nicholas Basbanes’ book *Among the Gently Mad*. Myers cited two rules governing his book purchases: one involved purchasing something you know you want when you see it or “you just may never see it again,” and the second was to buy “books that happen to strike your fancy. . . . If you don’t buy them now, you will regret for years not having bought them when you had the chance.”20

Many collectors start out with a specific goal when looking for new materials but Myers told Basbanes that he often let serendipity guide him by acquiring “a pile of miscellaneous stuff” that he would then employ to make new connections for his existing knowledge.21 Myers collected in such quantities that many who knew him thought he was unable to control his collecting impulses and apparently he agreed. Emeritus Professor of English Robert Bray, who occasionally visited an area bookseller with Myers, recounted one conversation where Myers told him he thought his book buying was a “sickness,” even though he said it in a “bemused” or “perplexed” way.22 Minor Myers III characterized his father’s collecting as a “consumptive joy” in his life. Myers jr. could not resist a bargain and acquired without concern for condition or completeness, focusing more on what the object could contribute to his understanding of a subject.23 Most important, Myers rarely let a book go once he had acquired it. Although he was known to give books away, they were rarely from his collections and no one recalled that he sold books.24 In short, Myers’ views on preservation began and ended with acquisition. I have delved deeply into this characteristic and others in the previously mentioned related articles,
but this brief explanation of this attribute’s effect on his personal practices provides a window of understanding for his actions in the present work.

As Donor and Development Officer

Myers made decisions about library-wide acquisitions based on his own visions for collection use and against the better judgment of his library faculty and external library consultants. Indeed, aspects of President Myers’ tenure that are not widely acknowledged are the roles he played as de facto university and special collections librarian of IWU. Myers’ correspondence reveals several examples of him courting donors and brokering deals with booksellers on behalf of the library. These and other records show that he planned library exhibits and gave impromptu lectures with collections. More often than not, he sought material donations on behalf of the institution, but he did create initiatives to support collaboration among library faculty and their departmental colleagues.

Myers sometimes made purchases for the library’s collections with his own money, and he donated small subsets of his personal collections to IWU’s Special Collections throughout his tenure. When external appraisals for gifts were needed, records show that Myers sometimes paid for them. Special Collections received the largest single group of material that Myers donated: the previously mentioned serials that his CV shows he purchased at auction from the American Antiquarian Society. Other special collections donations consisted of under 200 volumes in the areas of American history, thought, and culture; British history; fine arts; an incomplete set from the Lakeside Press; twenty-nine volumes of French socialist literature; two small manuscript collections of soldiers’ letters from both World Wars; early twentieth-century theater programs; and five cubic feet of early twentieth-century sheet music. These donated collections did not have a coherent focus that is desirable in building research collections. IWU alumnus and local bookstore owner Brian Simpson recalled that Myers’ particular interest in special collections was as a means for enhancing the reputation of the institution, beyond just students’ research needs. Princeton’s William Joyce also commented on the “research and market value” of special collections in lending “an aura of institutional success,” but one of the books by Basbanes identified a broader rationale. Myers stated that his interest in library collections was “not just a matter of status, it’s a question of teaching, research and imagination . . . Serendipity is the imagination factor I am talking about. It is the material you find in the stacks when you aren’t prepared to find anything.” Surely no library
enthusiast would disagree on this point, but there must be some collective agreement on larger goals.

Myers’ involvement in the library’s circulating collection was as a broker of deals with booksellers, including a particularly large transfer of 1,300 books described collectively as “Poetry, English and American,” which was acquired from a dealer in Massachusetts in 1994.32 Throughout his correspondence files, exchanges between Myers and dealers or donors show that he solicited funds and in-kind gifts for the library’s use. Myers knew the potential these collections held for research and is quoted as saying he “[got] suggestions from the faculty,” but this study did not reveal evidence that he coordinated his outreach with either the library’s faculty or with the faculty who might develop course-related activities with such bulk acquisitions.33 At a time that overlaps with the accounts given here, Michael Buckland, professor and dean of library and information studies, University of California–Berkeley wrote a “manifesto” challenging librarians to reconsider library services in light of the electronic revolution that was taking place. Regardless of format, he stated that libraries must collect based on “the mission of the institution or population served.”34 Only one memo from Myers to his university librarian shows that he inquired about “faculty aspiration for excellence or even adequacy in a collection area” of potential bulk acquisitions.35

Myers and University Libraries

Connecticut College was Myers’ first institution and the place he served the longest during his academic career: 1968–84. Emeritus Connecticut College librarian Brian Rogers recalled Myers participating in several successful book sales of deaccessioned library material to raise funds for new acquisitions. Myers helped organize these events and Rogers saw that Myers used his experience as a collector to place values on items being donated; he was also quick to identify volumes being offered for sale that suited his interests and so made purchases that supported the library. As will be shown, while at IWU Myers took a firm stand against deaccessioning, even though his involvement in the practice of selling library discards at Connecticut College should have left a positive impression of the potential for this practice. Myers supported the Connecticut College Friends’ group in other ways as well. For a period of several years he contributed articles to the Friends’ newsletter about the significance of specific items in the library’s special collections and also served as editor of that publication.36
Once he became IWU’s president, Myers’ advocacy for library use built on his previous experiences and increased with both his personal example and through the kind of emphasis only a top administrator can bring to an issue. The culminating act of that support came with the opening of IWU’s current library in 2002—a light-filled structure that successfully integrates physical and electronic access to collections in a form that has proven it is adaptable to the needs of its community. The direction of the Illinois Wesleyan University library changed dramatically, though, even before the end of the first semester Myers was on campus.

The first indication that he would become a dominating force in the library occurred within six months of his arrival. Myers’ first bulk acquisition was a collection comprised of 500 volumes being offered at an auction in Massachusetts. In a December 19, 1989, newspaper account announcing the acquisition, Myers characterized the lot’s subject matter as twentieth-century Asian studies, a program that was not available at the university at that time. In the article he stated that he bid $300 on the lot and pointed out that the value of shipping costs, which were donated by a locally based moving company, was much higher than the price he paid. This emphasis on price and in-kind donation are examples of the reputation Myers had as a bargain hunter. One bookseller used the term *impecunious* to describe this attribute, other interview subjects corroborated it, and Myers himself affirmed it. Myers’ skills as a negotiator were formidable; moreover, this deep-seated trait from his own collecting practices served him well in this large acquisition and in his later pursuits on behalf of the university’s library.

One can imagine how a preservationist who also enjoys finding a bargain would have found the Asian studies collection too good to pass up. Interview subjects all recalled Myers’ desire to increase the quantity of volumes held and there is no doubt that bulk collections and an increased emphasis on annual book counts can be attributed to his arrival. One 1995 memo later matched a number to the goal. The plan was to increase the library’s collection from 218,000 to 450,000 volumes. However, Myers was not the kind of administrator one professional librarian was prepared to have deeply interested in the library’s activities.

*Clayton Highum, University Librarian, 1972–1992*

Clayton Highum was in charge of the library at the time Myers became president and was also quoted in the above-mentioned 1989 Asian book-collection article. There are no records that indicate Highum’s level of involvement in that
transfer, but information surrounding collection development issues at later dates indicated that Myers made these kinds of decisions without consulting library personnel. Even a few months into his presidency, Myers’ personal interests had influenced the library’s collections and foreshadowed future involvement.

Within a year of the Asian studies collection’s arrival, Myers found out about the closure of a regional public library system called the Corn Belt System. An October 5, 1990, article in The Argus reported that half of the system’s holdings, which were said to be nearly 60,000, “would be available for Wesleyan to obtain.” Notably, this article began with a statement that Myers announced the collection’s availability at a cabinet meeting. Even in this public document the article characterized this announcement as “a surprise” to those present. The need for this collection is unexplained in the article except for a comment about increasing the library’s volume count, which Highum stated should be at “350,000 to 400,000 to be much more effective.” The mention of volume counts at this early time in Myers’ tenure becomes more significant in light of his later actions, but it is also noteworthy that others did not anticipate such an acquisition at that time.

The contradiction of a large collection transfer with the library’s evident lack of ability to process it is also significant. Highum mentioned the collection’s arrival in his internal annual report for the 1990–91 academic year but no records, other than the Argus article, exist that reference his involvement in acquiring it. In this private report, most likely only submitted to the dean of the faculty, Highum’s reservations were explicit. He stated that the current level of funding could not accommodate the processing and shelf expansion for this “extraordinary acquisition.” He also requested a budget increase to $100,000, which doubled the amount requested in the previous year. The tone in this document is markedly different from previous years, where a sense of routine reporting on budgetary and staffing shortages prevails. However small Highum felt his budget was, other statements by him and data reported to others show a steady increase in volumes throughout Highum’s tenure. In 1972 when Highum began working at IWU, the volume count was 85,697. By 1989, the year Myers became president, the volume count was 167,953.

Highum had made progress with limited funding even though his 1989–90 report stated that purchases decreased due to price increases. Prior to Myers’ arrival, Highum’s annual reports complained of a shortage of funds in terms of needing to meet faculty requests rather than a wholesale effort to increase the number of books purchased. His comments show an interest in deliberate accruals grounded in the curriculum. A more public
appeal serves to illustrate this point. Two years after starting at IWU, Highum made a direct request to faculty for support in the January 7, 1974, faculty meeting. In his presentation he asked the “faculty to be more cautious and selective in book requests.” There is an added request for “faculty to be alert to various ways in which the resources of the library might be most effectively utilized . . . [including] gifts to the library, substitution of non-print materials, and more concentrated use of nearby libraries” [emphasis added].

The last comment stands in contrast to the initial part of the presentation. First, Highum asked faculty to be judicious consumers of the materials’ budget and then he implied other libraries could meet their needs.

It is striking here that Highum made this suggestion himself and so early in his tenure. Such a statement does not signal the kind of leadership one would expect from a new university librarian who would presumably be intent on connecting with his community. And yet this idea was not entirely his own. In the semester before Highum was hired, a Library Committee consisting of faculty and students noted that “it would be worth trying to develop closer contact . . . [for] interlibrary loan services” with Illinois State University’s library, just five miles away. Highum was at the forefront of library resource sharing and in fact reached an agreement for reciprocal borrowing at the neighboring university’s library two years before he suggested the faculty use resources at another library.

By the time of the January 1974 faculty meeting, he may have only wished to remind his colleagues of their options, but he had clearly taken an idea formulated prior to his tenure but informed by his own expertise and made it a reality.

The University Archives does not hold Library Committee records beyond Highum’s first year as university librarian. There are occasional reports by this group after that time in records of the faculty as a whole, but remarks attributed to Highum in subsequent faculty meeting minutes described other faculty governance work and only once mentioned the library offering services. Documentary and other evidence show that Highum had lost the confidence of the faculty by the time of Myers’ arrival in 1989. Highum’s contemporaries perceived him as out of touch with campus needs, more of a bureaucrat and not an intellectual or engaging personality. When compared to Myers, who had seemingly endless stores of energy, a curiosity about the world, a lifelong love of the printed word, and a drive to support faculty and student research regardless of costs, someone with bureaucratic tendencies would have been anathema to Myers’ vision for Illinois Wesleyan generally and the library in particular. Regardless, contemporary reports and interviews in 2016 confirmed that faculty referred their students to a nearby university’s library due to a perceived lack
of resources at IWU, not just in the spirit of cooperation as Highum suggested in 1974. Highum consistently asked for funding in his annual reports but between 1974 and 1988 there is no evidence that he took his concerns beyond these internal documents and to the faculty as a whole.

Highum died in 2002 and so his perspective is only available in written records, but his lack of respect locally should not diminish his achievements entirely. Highum actively engaged in a turning tide for the academic library world: automation and resource sharing. Since the 1970s, he had been part of library computer systems’ planning in Illinois. He was also elected to the Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries and led discussions on resource sharing within the state. In 1976 Highum announced that he had applied for a grant that would allow IWU to participate in the Ohio College Library Center (now known simply as OCLC), just one year after individual libraries became eligible for out-of-state membership. Where Highum failed was in not making sure the library was meeting campus needs.

Other contemporaries observed that even without a loss of campus support Highum’s emphasis on collaboration externally over collections internally would have put him at odds with Myers’ idea of a good library leader. We do not have correspondence between Highum and Myers, as is available with the next university librarian, so there is no evidence of Highum asserting his plans for the library beyond his internal annual reports. In a foreshadowing of the change to come, Myers commissioned an external review in 1991. The report attributed Myers’ desire in requesting this evaluation to “bringing the library to a level capable of supporting an excellent academic program.” It was clear at least to the reviewer that Highum was not meeting Myers’ expectations. Perhaps not coincidentally, the reviewer Myers reached out to for this evaluation was T. John Metz, the head librarian from Myers’ undergraduate alma mater, Carleton College.

The Metz report affirmed Myers’ belief that the library was not meeting the needs of its community with concerns ranging from staffing decisions to facility constraints. But the “first concern” Metz noted was with the collection. One practice that Metz rejected was that of accepting large quantities of gift books, especially when they would not support the curriculum. Metz further affirmed Highum’s position that electronic resources were becoming vital to academic libraries. This view was in concert with similar remarks made in a 1987 consultant’s report. The philosophical difference of emphasizing access, through collection sharing and electronic means, over ownership sealed Highum’s fate but the end of his era did not put an end to this issue.
There are no records of Myers’ response to the 1991 report, but on February 17, 1992, Highum’s resignation was announced.58 In Metz’s 2016 interview, he stated that the lack of follow-up from Myers was common to his experiences over his career as a library consultant. However, what made this review stand out in his memory twenty-five years later was the fact that a president initiated the review and that he recalled Myers visiting the Carleton library on a few occasions afterwards during alumni events. Neither the subject of the IWU library nor Metz’s report came up during those subsequent visits.59 Myers did not alter his actions in the library following the report either. In fact, his activities regarding bulk donations for IWU’s library collections increased after the arrival of a new head librarian and his involvement in managing collections deepened in other ways.

Sue Stroyan, University Librarian, 1992–2006

In an interview in May 1992 Highum’s eventual successor, Sue Stroyan (now Sue Anderson), stated that “the most urgent problem” she would address as university librarian was “the sense that students and faculty feel the library doesn’t have what they need.”60 In her 2016 interview for this project, she asserted that part of that perception came from acquisitions such as the Corn Belt Collection, which was still derisively described by faculty as “the U-Haul collection” when she started at IWU.61 Three other faculty members interviewed for this project recalled the name and the impression that the collection was not of a quality suitable for an academic library.62

Acquiring collections that were not suitable for an undergraduate institution and administering a budget that could not accommodate student and faculty needs were critical factors to address first but due to the large accession from Corn Belt, Stroyan faced a backlog that took years to resolve. To his credit, the president followed through with financial support. Records in Myers’ files show that a grant received in 1991 from a private foundation was secured in order to have the collection catalogued by a vendor.63 Even with that funding it was difficult to keep up with new donations, but Myers also increased the regular budget line for the library in the year following Stroyan’s arrival.64 His second university librarian shared news at a November 9, 1993, library staff meeting of an overall budget increase of $100,000 that specified $52,000 for acquisitions alone.65

Regardless of the budget increase, Myers’ pursuit of in-kind book donations continued and in 1995 Stroyan reported that book purchases represented only 28 percent of the previous year’s acquisitions.66 There are no other reports by
Stroyan that explicitly state the issue of gifts versus purchases, and it may be that she made this report at the high point of bulk acquisitions, but even so the number is remarkable. In contrast, an Association of Research Libraries survey in 1990 reported that while 75.6 percent of respondents reported receiving gifts and endowments, on average they represented 3.1 percent of the total funding received. Nevertheless, with Highum’s example before her, Stroyan’s actions indicate that she adopted a strategy of acceptance for this less-than-ideal impact on library operations. She engaged in direct but non-confrontational statements to Myers and one other administrator on behalf of improved library practices. At the same time, she began building community support.

“Mission Statements” for the four years prior to Stroyan’s arrival included paragraphs describing the library’s and special collections’ purposes as supporting the needs of student and faculty research interests. There is no other indication that collection policies were under development prior to the early 2000s. Stroyan’s efforts to resist bulk additions focused on the need for the library to adhere to curricular needs. Myers did acquire unique opportunities for research in special collections’ holdings, but many of these are niche collections and fail to reach a depth that would be adequate for extensive research. Furthermore, these actions took place in an era in which manuscript collections and other formats had “broadened [our] understanding of ‘special collections.’” The focus for gifts and purchases at IWU in this era was on used books, due to Myers’ talent and energy in acquiring this format, and only rarely on manuscript materials.

Myers’ advocacy on behalf of the previously mentioned bulk purchase of 1,300 volumes of American and English poetry sheds light on how his views of collection needs differed from others. Myers’ correspondence files show that he negotiated a reduced price per volume with the dealer. Myers forwarded the title list from the dealer to Stroyan, and this example reveals an additional attempt on her part to highlight the implications of adding such a collection to the main library holdings. Although Myers’ initial note accompanying the list does not survive, his rejection of her response does. Stroyan sent a memo containing a detailed analysis and a plan to apply a narrower set of selection criteria for the volumes he recommended. She also pointedly mentioned a consultation with a colleague in the English Department. In Myers’ response he exclaimed, “The whole point of this effort is to have it all and more, for it is the very scope of this group, the bottom as well as the top, which makes it interesting.” In this statement, the force of Myers’ feelings for the research potential held by such collections was explicit and correct—or
would be, under different circumstances. Without question he was committed
to inspiring intellectual curiosity, but he did not consult with departmental
faculty who could guide students in such explorations; Stroyan did.

Stroyan’s exchanges with administrators survive in a manuscript collection
Myers kept for library-related issues; that same collection contains no corre-
spondence with Highum. Stroyan wrote to her supervisor, Provost and Dean
of Faculty Janet McNew, and copied Myers about her “concerns with this [i.e.,
pursuing gifts] tactic for overall collection development.” While acknowledging
that gifts were benefiting some areas of the collection, Stroyan expressed con-
cerns for the costs of processing these books, the difficult reputation the library
had with appearing to hold a “cast-off collection,” the negative view she believed
gifts vs. purchased volumes would convey to external agencies, and the lack of
departmental faculty involvement with selecting books suited to the curricu-
lum. 

The point of attracting faculty support deserves special emphasis here.

Stroyan actively advocated for library issues within faculty governance
structures. Minutes of the general faculty meetings reveal announcements
by Stroyan about the work undertaken in the library to meet faculty needs.
These actions included changes in the physical facilities to promote faculty
use of the library; methods for delivering interlibrary loan requests, copyright
consulting, and bibliographic instruction services; and expansion of operating
hours. In the faculty meetings during Highum’s era there is only one
announcement of a library service and that was described as librarians being
“willing to come to classes to discuss research problems.”

There were two criticisms of library practices during faculty meetings in
Stroyan’s era and both involved budgets for books. In 1993 the complaint was
that books arrived too slowly and that departments had too little to spend. In
1994 a faculty member questioned when there would be an increase in the book
budget and the provost responded, “Librarians are stressing currently access to
information rather than numbers of books. Money which used to be spent on
books is now spent on access. We do not like that solution either, and we have
increased the book budget.” It is noteworthy that the provost differentiated
money for books from money for access. The context for these remarks was the
need for strategic planning but the issue of “access versus ownership” of collec-
tions is present in library literature of this era. While this issue seemed con-
tentious to administrators and faculty colleagues, the advocacy for this practice
by both university librarians was within common practices.

Myers exhibited the qualities of a seasoned bibliophile again with a five-
year book purchasing plan. Archival and internal library documentation show
that the stated purpose for this new initiative was for departmental faculty to work with their library colleagues on selecting what one faculty member described as “treasured used books” (emphasis added) to meet current and proposed curricular needs. The article that announced this initiative noted that the president was “an avid collector of used books and has been essential in bringing these funds to the community.” Stroyan figured prominently in the article, but one can still imagine the practiced hand of a collector in an effort promoted as bringing the library’s collections up to date by purchasing used books.

There are no additional records revealing Stroyan’s resistance to donations, but by 1996 plans were underway to construct a new library and so it may be that efforts directed elsewhere took precedence over further engagement with administrators on acquisitions. However, there is one other major issue in which both the president and provost asserted themselves on collection management in ways that were contrary to Stroyan’s advice and standard library practices.

The Controversy over Weeding

In reflecting on the Myers era, Anderson recalled several incidents when Myers presented projects to library staff without consulting her. Over time, she characterized these kinds of actions as Myers’ “big ideas” and understood that he did not always follow through on what others perceived as directives. One notable exception was the mandate Myers made about book withdrawals. After Myers found out that a staff member was withdrawing books and that part of the process was to mark books with a stamp that denoted official deaccessioning, he entered the processing area, took the withdrawal stamp, and reportedly berated the staff member for doing this work. Myers told a slightly different version of this story to Basbanes, and he also expressed the opinion that he did not believe any book warranted removal except “perhaps [when] it’s had its final breath of life.” Myers’ executive assistant, Carl Teichman, confirmed the incident and said that Myers placed the stamp on his desk “as a kind of trophy,” but Teichman pointedly added that appropriating a stamp did not mean that deaccessioning could not actually take place.

However overly dramatic Myers’ action appeared, a memo from Provost McNew to Stroyan showed how serious the president was. The McNew
document was in response to a memo from Stroyan titled “Policies Governing Withdrawn Books—July 1997.” McNew stated:

As we have discussed, the president and I wish to change those policies better to reflect the collection-building initiative that is intended to double our collection within the next few years. The intention of these changes is not to turn from strategies aimed at creating a quality collection to one based solely on quantity. . . . We expect the library staff to aid the faculty in making aggressive use of the increased funding of collection development, from internal and external sources, to build a collection of the highest quality and the greatest usefulness to our faculty and students.84

These initial remarks stand in contrast to the points that followed, the first of which stated, “We should use no further library staff time withdrawing books from our catalog.” Instead of withdrawal, McNew gave instructions for dealing with books that had specific condition issues and all with the end goal of keeping them in the catalog. This guidance included to “wrap and/or store” damaged books, to mark books with missing pages if “page replacement is not possible,” to note “if a book has a fungus,” in which case staff were to “do whatever is necessary (cleaning, use of sealed plastic holders, removal to a special location) to protect users and other books,” to cease withdrawing duplicates unless the “collection will not gain qualitatively,” and to keep all reference books and store only those “that have been replaced by newer editions.”85 A second point described the manner in which the catalog could be updated if items were unaccounted for during inventories. Weeding is an established professional practice that is fraught with potential controversy in any library’s community, but disputing the need for removing the kinds of damaged books described in this memo is inexplicable, notwithstanding the involvement of a collector who has no concern for the condition of the items in his own collection.86

Soon after this memo, Stroyan received support for her positions from an unanticipated source. A second library review, by then–director of libraries at Smith College Sarah Pritchard, was commissioned by the provost in 1998. Her report affirmed the kind of selectivity the library was advocating for, but during her 2016 interview she acknowledged that the strategy of an increased volume count was something she had seen elsewhere when rapid university growth was sought for reasons beyond the library itself.87 Pritchard felt her role
was to analyze the varying library visions of the president, the provost, and the library staff, and to advise in a neutral way about professional practices for moving the library forward, which might then help justify modifying some of the leadership’s strategies.88

There is one additional causal factor for these actions. Administrators, faculty, and staff who knew of Myers’ involvement in the library believed that he viewed increased volume counts as a necessary component for successful application to Phi Beta Kappa (PBK) rather than solely for collection development in service of IWU’s curriculum.89 PBK affiliation was integral to Myers’ plans for bringing IWU up from its regional status and onto a new level as a nationally recognized liberal arts college. Myers built on earlier attempts by IWU faculty, which began in 1976, and his notes identified several areas to strengthen including admitted students’ academic test scores and the library “to support [the] curriculum.”90 He also proposed emphasizing the presence of a Sigma Xi chapter and the foreign language and math requirements for students in IWU’s professional schools.91

Pritchard’s report commented on the PBK motive as well. Over the course of her review Pritchard came to believe that Myers was focused exclusively on the volume count metric, regardless of specific holdings, as a way to improve the school’s position in national rankings and educational assessments and thus increase university stature. Pritchard also felt that the library management and the faculty advisory committee perceived barriers to addressing a wider range of issues related to the quality of collections and the implications for library instruction and curricular support.92

That the library’s role in achieving desired institutional distinctions was of prime importance to Myers is without question, but the PBK criteria include much more than volume counts. Nevertheless, something was lost in how Myers conveyed his priorities to others. Pritchard’s report noted, “There is a misapprehension in some segments of the campus community that the volume count is the primary goal of national organizations and ranking reports.”93 Be that as it may, the force of Myers’ personality and the passion he exhibited for books are what everyone focused on as they recalled the steps taken during what became IWU’s successful 2001 bid for PBK affiliation.

Conclusion

Myers’ correspondence and library files reveal numerous interventions regarding acquisitions and frequently show that he emphasized the importance of gathering large collections to engage student researchers. Reading these
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exchanges gives one an appreciation for Myers’ experience as a collector who knows how to negotiate for a bargain. Even without that perspective, the letters are staggering both for their quantity and for the fact that such detailed attention was brought to bear by a university president.

As for the university librarians, Highum’s investment in collaborating among regional institutions and developing computer resources were viewed as wholly incompatible to Myers’ plan for promoting his new institution. There is no indication that Highum recognized this as a problem or identified a means to address it. Stroyan increased the emphasis on standards of professional librarianship both for collection development and in services offered by the IWU library. While she compromised on Myers’ interests in bulk additions to the library, she also brought faculty colleagues into the discussion. In the case of the poetry collection, her response to Myers cites a faculty member he knew well, Robert Bray, who provided input on the strategy she outlined. In 2016, Anderson recalled her deliberate strategy was to gain faculty supporters in order to establish a collection development policy. And when the main elected faculty governance group, the Council on University Programs and Policy, brought the collection plan to the full faculty for approval, it explicitly included a strategy for regular weeding. At the same time, Stroyan and many others in the library and across campus were deeply involved in planning for the new library building and strategic planning for library services. In designing this new facility, eventually named The Ames Library, the community’s needs were paramount. This is evident in the amount of focus groups and student and faculty surveys conducted during the planning phase.

Myers was a frequent user of the collections and the building he dreamed of for IWU in the year that followed. That Myers possessed a deeply held philosophy of libraries’ importance to researchers is noted above and was also observed by IWU alumna, benefactor, and American Library Association past-president, Barbara Ford. Her time at IWU was prior to Highum’s and she believes that improvements to the library were long overdue by the Myers era. In brief encounters with Myers, Ford observed that the way in which Myers formed an affinity for libraries was through books as artifacts, so it was natural for him to carry his view of libraries throughout his plan for strengthening the institution. If for no other reason than for being the impetus of a new library for the campus, Myers’ legacy has had “a major impact on the institution and the students that study there.” And in fact, that was also Myers’ stated objective: “my idea of a college is a collection of students and faculty gathered around a great library, and here we will have a great reading room at the center of it all to make it happen.” Myers achieved that goal and it is difficult to
find fault with the actions of a passionate supporter, but some campus personnel today view the library that Myers advocated for with mixed feelings.

The library’s construction costs were significant and, indeed, the effects of funding decisions on IWU’s overall debt are still present. Nevertheless, in the words of Robert Bray, “Who would want to come to this university without having something like The Ames Library?”100 The library revised its collection development policy in 2015 with collections weeding included again as a principle.101 In the last decade, I have participated in numerous library planning meetings in which the acquisitions of the Corn Belt and poetry collections, and other gifts, are cited as exemplars of the benefits of regular collection reviews and the need for adhering to collection development criteria. I also experienced faculty resistance first-hand when discussing a collection-weeding process with a liaison department in 2014. Librarians often anticipate such resistance, but in this case the objections coalesced around recollections of Myers’ opposition to such practices and of his dreams of amassing a library filled with more than 400,000 books.

Similar reactions may decrease over time as the faculty and staff who worked at IWU during Myers’ tenure leave campus, but the longer-lasting consequences of Myers’ acquisition decisions remain. They are present in staff time used to periodically inventory these collections, to carefully analyze current needs, to communicate with constituencies, and then to follow processes for responsible disposition.102 The examples of Highum and Stroyan show that progressive development of a library requires compromises in managing administrators’ personalities as well as collections. Librarians will succeed in serving their communities through cultivation of allies and through a slow and steady insistence on professional practices that are grounded in institutional needs.

Meg Miner began working at Illinois Wesleyan University in 2002 and joined the faculty in 2008. Miner is active in professional organizations and IWU faculty governance and serves as the library’s liaison to the History Department and to the Schools of Art, Theatre Arts and Nursing. She provides instruction and research consultation for these departments and for the holdings of IWU’s archives and special collections.

NOTES

The Sabbatical Leave Program at Illinois Wesleyan University made it possible for the author to pursue her curiosity about this president’s persistent influence on The Ames Library’s collections. The author is grateful to all of the people who shared their time and memories.
about President Myers for this project and, especially, to University Librarian Karen Schmidt who provided the travel funding needed to conduct interviews in Connecticut. Professor Emeritus Don Krummel, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, encouraged these explorations, read an early draft and offered valuable insights into Myers' place among the ranks of bookmen.
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