Category	Total resources all schools with less than 300,000 vol- umes (109 schools)	Total resources all schools with more than 300,000 vol- umes (67 schools)
14. Table 19—Retrieval use 89–90 15. Table 21—Other Information Resources (Treatises) Expenses for 89–90 16. Table 22—Total Number of FTE Staff 17. Table 23—Total Number FTE Librarians 18. Table 26—Salaries paid 89–90 19. Table 27—Fringe Benefits paid 89–90 20. Table 28—Wages paid 89–90 21. Table 29—All Salary, Wages, and Fringes paid 89–90 22. Table 30—Federal Work Study Funds, paid 89–90	1,554.9 702.7 \$34,711,962 \$7,859,309 3,833,815 \$46,405,009	418,572 \$7,934,478 1,842.5 757.1 \$41,495,025 \$9,954,560 \$4,343,365 \$55,792,945 \$2,549,231

As noted, the basic measuring tool is *size of collection*. However, when FTE students rather than size of collection is the measuring tool, the economic impact is that larger schools are driving downward the per student analysis of all schools. Table 6 and 7 reveal the following:

For libraries with less than 200,000 volumes, the economic impact of the use of libraries with 300,000 or more volumes to establish the national mean of certain categories is major. The tables reveal the following:

Category	Mean of schools with less than 200,000 vols.	Mean of schools with more than 300,000 vols.	National mean of all schools	Percent schools less than 200,000 vols. are to schools with more than 300,000 vols.	Percent schools less than 200,000 vols. are to Na- tional mean
1. Table 1, Budget 90–91 2. Table 2, Expenses 89–90	\$804,634 \$782,072	\$1,824,354 \$1,744,301	\$1,327,232 \$1,274,925	44 45	61 61
3. Table 3, Information Expenses	Ψ102,012	Ψ1,7 44,501	Ψ1,274,323		01
89–90	\$372,223	\$732,289	\$564,576	51	66
4. Table 8, Collection Size	165,333	455,320	309,480	36	53
5. Table 9, Volumes added 89-90	11,588	19,790	14,696	59	75
6. Table 10, Titles added, 89-90					
Hard	1,198	3,100	2,108	39	57
7. Table 11, Titles held Hard only	21,328	102,151	58,983	21	36
8. Table 12, Serial Subscriptions	2,367	5,600	4,114	36	58
9. Table 13, Serial Expenses	\$278,132	\$544,141	\$423,144	51	66
10. Table 14, Serial Titles	2,238	4,916	3,695	46	61
11. Table 15, Duplication-Serials	130	684 \$48,533	419 \$44.836	19	31 80
12. Table 16, Retrieval Expenses	\$33,341	\$48,533	\$41,826	69 55	69
13. Table 18, FTE Students 90 14. Table 19, Retrieval use	475 2,733	865 6,342	688 4,765	43	57
15. Table 21, Other information Ex-	2,733	0,342	4,700	43	37
penses (Treatises)	\$53,357	\$120,224	\$87,234	44	61
16. Table 22, Total Staff, FTE	12.5	27.5	19.3	45	65
17. Table 23, Total Librarians—FTE	5.7	11.3	8.3	50	69
18. Table 26, Total Salaries Paid	\$257,330	\$638,385	443,064	40	58
19. Table 27, Total Fringes Paid	\$54,623	\$155,540	\$105,408	35	52
20. Table 28, Wages Paid	\$22,006	\$66,821	\$48,386	33	55
21. Table 29, All Salary, wages		. ,	, ,		
fringes paid	\$332,017	\$858,353	\$594,174	39	56
22. Table 30, Federal Work Study					
paid	\$15,630	52,034	28,107	30	56

As noted, the basic measuring tool is size of collection. Large schools; that is, schools with a collection of more than 300,000 volumes, do have a very significant economic impact on the establishment of the national mean (as well as median) for law library statistical categories. For schools with less than 200,000 volumes, the economic impact indicates very significant problems in being able to meet the national mean of all schools.

This report provides detailed information about the establishment of the national mean and median of 176 law schools based on size of collection as the measuring tool. Thirty-four different tables have been used and twenty-two measuring characteristics based on size of collection summarize the information.

Temple University, School of Law

1719 N. Broad Street (055–00), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122, (215) 204–7861, Fax: (215) 204–1185

October 16, 1995.

Mr. John Greaney,

Chief, Computers and Finance Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, JCB Building, 555 4th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20530, FAX 202 616– 8544 Dear Mr. Greaney: I was shocked to learn that your interpretation of the proposed Consent Decree between the American Bar Association and the U.S. Department of Justice prohibits review of race and/or gender discrimination in salary and/or fringe benefits.

Both the ABA and the U.S. government have been on record for a long period of time in opposing discrimination on the basis of race and/or gender. Specifically, it is the job of the Department of Justice to fight discrimination on the basis of race and/or gender. I therefore do not understand your interpretation.

Section IV, Prohibited Conduct, of the proposed consent decree enjoins the ABA from.

"(B) collecting from or disseminating to any law school data concerning compensation paid or to be paid to deans, administrators, faculty, librarians, or other employees;