

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs throughout the States

JOHN A. McCROSSAN

STATE LIBRARY AGENCY INVOLVEMENT in planning for improved library services statewide has a long history. As early as 1936, forty-five states and the District of Columbia had "plans or working programs for library development."¹ The plans dealt with promotion of library services throughout the states and gave strong emphasis to development of county and regional libraries, library services to residents of state institutions and strong central state library programs.²

Much earlier, in the beginning of the twentieth century, a number of states had de facto statewide library systems planned and coordinated by state library agencies. By 1900 numerous states had established state library commissions which concentrated on providing library services to unserved areas by: (1) sending out boxes of books—"traveling libraries"—to communities; (2) assisting in the establishment of small town and city public libraries and, later, county libraries; and (3) providing both financial assistance and books to libraries and training opportunities for librarians.³

It could be argued that planning and evaluation are the most important functions of state library agencies because of their potential impact on statewide library improvement. While planning has always been a major activity of the state agencies, formal evaluation is only now coming into its own as the techniques of evaluation become better understood and as the states and the federal government require greater justification of programs to determine the best uses of public money.

John A. McCrossan is former State Librarian of Vermont and is Associate Professor, Library, Media and Information Studies, University of South Florida, Tampa.

Traditionally deeply involved in planning for improvement of public library services and public library systems, the state agencies are now very actively engaged in study related to other types of library services as well. This is due to increased responsibilities brought about by actions of the states and the federal government, and especially because of the increased scope of the Library Services and Construction Act which is administered by the state library agencies.

This paper contains a discussion of the library profession's encouragement of state library agency leadership in planning and evaluation and of official authorization of these activities by state and federal law. Those sections are followed by discussion of various state agency activities which include significant elements of planning and/or evaluation. Activities discussed include: (1) consultant or advisory assistance provided on an individualized basis to local libraries and library systems by state library development staff, (2) development of programs to be carried out under the Library Services and Construction Act, (3) development of state budget requests, (4) special studies of the total statewide library program or particular aspects of that program, and (5) regular and special meetings sponsored or cosponsored by the state agency at which library development is studied.

PROFESSIONAL STATEMENTS ON THE STATE AGENCY ROLE

Through the years the library profession has produced many official documents and other statements indicating that the state library agency should assume a major leadership role in planning and coordinating library development statewide. In his influential dissertation on public library government published in 1939, Carleton Joeckel recommends a central role for state agencies in the development of regional libraries. He suggests that the state agencies should be responsible for surveys of a state to determine potential library regions. He further advocates that they should review plans for establishment of regional library organizations, take responsibility for organizing regional library councils representative of member libraries, review annual reports from the libraries, and establish enforceable standards for them.⁴

The *Post-War Standards for Public Libraries* published by ALA in 1943 indicates that each state should have an agency which is "charged with responsibility of planning and developing a state-wide system of coordinated libraries which will serve adequately the needs of all the people."⁵ It also recommends that the state agency enforce minimum standards for libraries and adopt certification standards for librarians.

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

A National Plan for Public Library Service, issued in 1948 by ALA, recommends the establishment of larger units of library service and argues that the state library agency's most important role in library development should be in "planning for state-wide coverage through efficient areas of service and coordination of existing resources."⁸

The 1956 standards for public libraries indicate a major leadership and coordinating function for state library agencies in development of statewide plans for library service, in review of state legislation, and in organization of "demonstration and experimental programs leading to the development of library systems."⁷

The *Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966* recommends that state agencies plan and coordinate library services at various levels — local, intermediate and state — and that they "assume a leadership role in, and provide necessary funding for, the development of state-wide plans for all types of library services, for interlibrary cooperation, for research, and for demonstration and experimental programs."⁸ It also recommends that the state agency should evaluate the effectiveness of libraries frequently.

The standards of the state library agencies recognize the state agency's responsibility for planning and evaluation and for involving library and community leaders in this type of activity. The 1970 standards assert that the state library agency should provide "leadership and participate in the development of statewide plans involving all types of libraries . . . [and] take the initiative in marshalling qualified individuals, groups, and agencies to engage in such overall planning."⁹

STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS REGARDING STATE AGENCY PLANNING EFFORTS

The earliest state laws regarding library development charged the state agencies with responsibility for providing library services in unserved areas, as noted above. At the present time, many states have laws which specifically indicate that the state library agency has responsibility for development and coordination of statewide systems of libraries. For example, the New Jersey statutes indicate that the state agency should "coordinate a State-wide system of libraries . . . and administer State and federal programs for the development of libraries."¹⁰ The Louisiana statutes assert that the state library agency "shall plan and work toward a coordinated system of parish and regional libraries . . . to give . . . every citizen and resident . . . free library service of the highest quality."¹¹ Wisconsin statutes

describe the state agency's role as that of planning and developing public and school library services throughout the state.¹²

Since the Library Services Act was passed in 1956, and up to the present time, state library agency planning and evaluation activities have been very strongly influenced by the federal law which requires that the funds be used to extend and improve library services and that the state library agency develop plans for, administer and evaluate the program.¹³ In the past there had been much exhortation to plan and to attempt to develop ideal library programs throughout the states, but there had been only limited success in many states because of lack of money. Beginning in fiscal 1956, however, each of the states (most for the first time) had a significant amount of money with which to begin work. This meant that a long era of hoping and dreaming had come to an end, and a new era of action had begun which has continued to the present time.

NCLIS STATEMENT

Perhaps the most significant of recent statements on the state library agency's role issued by a government agency is the one contained in the goals document published by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS). In that document it is noted that the state agencies should "provide a focal point within the state for long-range, statewide library planning and development."¹⁴ The NCLIS statement also indicates the following:

Responsibility for fostering the coordination of library resources and services throughout a state has usually been assigned to a state library agency or to another agency with the same legal authority and functions. This agency is the natural focus for statewide planning and coordination of cooperative library and information services and for coordinating statewide plans with those of the Federal Government. Such agencies should solicit the widest possible participation of library, information, and user communities.¹⁵

INDIVIDUALIZED ADVISORY ASSISTANCE

The emphasis of state library agency staff field work has changed a great deal in recent years, both in the types of libraries assisted and in the kinds of assistance given. Until the mid-1960s, almost all advisory assistance was provided to local public libraries, because local libraries had not yet been organized into systems in many states, and because the state agency mission was then typically defined as being largely limited to public

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

libraries rather than including work with other types of libraries as well. Moreover, much of the state library consultant work consisted of helping out in routine matters rather than providing real consulting or advisory assistance.

In her 1965 study of state library consultants, Marie Ann Long discovered that the consultants advised local librarians on program planning, budgeting and policy-making and also did considerable nonconsulting work for local libraries, including book selection, collection weeding, public relations, and taking inventory.¹⁶ Since library system development was gaining momentum at that time in many states, it is not surprising that Long also found that some consultants provided significant help to local officials in "starting systems."¹⁷

At the present time most states have public library systems which cover all or most of the state. State library development staff can thereby concentrate their efforts on work with systems and on special projects, leaving routine consulting to the library systems. Moreover, growth of state and federal aid for libraries has made it necessary for state development staff to spend increased time on administration of these funding programs, on helping librarians plan projects which may be funded, and in monitoring and evaluating the effects of the projects. After the District Library Centers were established in Pennsylvania in the 1960s, for example, the centers (most of which were large or medium-sized public libraries) were assigned responsibility for extension work with local libraries, work which had previously been done by state library staff. The director of the Pennsylvania State Library's Bureau of Library Development in 1972 wrote:

With the reassignment of the extension function, the role of the Bureau of Library Development involved far less direct advisory service to local libraries and placed emphasis on the administration of development programs instead. We now make "liaison" assignments [to the District Centers] rather than strictly consultant assignments.¹⁸

As the responsibilities of state library agencies have increased, the agencies have appointed specialized development staff to plan and coordinate statewide programs in particular types of library services. In 1966 three new major programs were included within the scope of LSCA: library services to the blind and physically handicapped, library services in state institutions, and cooperative library services involving different types of libraries.¹⁹ NCLIS is now actively encouraging state library agencies to

develop statewide programs of continuing education for librarians from all types of libraries, and the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE) developed an institute which trained state agency people to do this work.²⁰

A recent survey indicates that most of the state agencies have appointed a staff member to work at least part-time in each of the four special areas mentioned above, and many have full-time specialists in one or more of those areas.²¹ These specialists are active in statewide programs and also assist local libraries. For example, a state institutional library consultant will be involved in planning and coordinating a statewide program involving all the state's health care and correctional institutions. These may include regular workshops for institutional library staff, provision of supplementary collections of books to institutions, and other such services. Also, the state library specialist will often work directly in particular institutions to help in establishing or improving library services.²²

DEVELOPMENT OF LSCA PROGRAMS

Since the inception of the state-administered federal program with the passage of the Library Services Act in 1956, the state library agencies have been required to submit annual documents specifying proposed use of federal funds and matching state funds and, at the end of the fiscal year, to file final reports which include descriptions and evaluations of the programs funded. The 1970 amendments to LSCA, which became effective in FY 1972, include the requirements noted above, but in addition place strong emphasis on the development of long-range, 5-year programs and on the involvement of one advisory committee representative of all types of libraries and of the public in overall planning and evaluation of the total program in each state.²³ Previously, there had been three separate advisory councils, each of which advised on only certain parts of the total program.²⁴

Preparation of these reports has provided valuable experience in planning and evaluation for state agency staff and, more importantly, has led to many specific improvements in library services in the states. In a discussion of state agency staff expertise in this area, Joseph Shubert has noted that state staffs received a variety of planning assistance from the U.S. Office of Education (USOE), both individual advisory assistance from USOE staff and special meetings sponsored by USOE which included a significant year-long institute on statewide planning and evaluation at Ohio State University. He states that this experience, coupled with "the initiatives of the state library agencies," resulted in state agency peo-

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

ple in some states having "planning and evaluation competencies . . . [which] equal or excelled those of other program areas."²⁵

The institute mentioned above was conducted by USOE and Ohio State University in 1971-72.²⁶ The purpose of the institute was to train state librarians and their planning staff to conduct long-range planning since, in general, state agency people had previously been involved in only short-term planning. The institute, which began in October 1971, was conducted in three phases, each of which lasted approximately five days. At these sessions state agency staff intensively studied the objectives and techniques of long-range planning and evaluation and worked on drafts of long-range programs for their respective states, assisted by institute staff and by USOE library development specialists. After the final session, the state agencies participating were directed to present these drafts to the respective advisory councils for reactions and advice.²⁷

To date the institute has had tremendous impact on state library agency planning and on statewide library development since many of the techniques studied at the institute are now being used by the states in developing long-range and annual programs, as required by federal regulations.²⁸ Study of the long-range programs of a number of states showed that most of the programs contain discussion of: (1) the state's history and the characteristics of its population and economy, (2) the status of libraries of all types and of public access to libraries, (3) needs for improvement of library services, (4) criteria for determining priorities for funding of library development programs, and (5) goals, objectives and specific activities proposed to meet needs.

The practices of noting goals, objectives and specific proposed activities and of securing reaction and advice on these matters from the state advisory council have been very helpful in many states, even though the process is quite often time-consuming and sometimes frustrating. The specificity required makes it important to consider carefully a variety of options and to decide on pursuing only the most promising, since the amount of money is always limited. Also, the fact that a proposed accomplishment is noted in the long-range program (which is published and is usually widely distributed) provides a great deal of motivation to carry out the activity.

An example from the Alabama long-range program will illustrate the type of format used in the section of these programs which deals with goals, objectives and specific proposed activities. The Alabama document states that the major goal is "to assure quality library service to every individual in the state and to assist, wherever possible, state and local

governments in their efforts on behalf of the citizens of the State."²⁹ A number of subgoals are listed, each one followed by objectives and specific tasks or accomplishment indicators with target dates. One of the subgoals is entitled "Development of Library Systems." An objective under that heading is to develop state-supported multitype library systems. Several specific tasks with target dates are listed after the objective, including the following:

Publish the library systems study recommending a workable plan to include all libraries within state supported systems. Target date: 1978.

Develop resource centers based on the recommendations of the systems study and the resource study. Target date: 1978.

Develop a statewide system of reciprocal borrowing of materials and the creation of a statewide borrowing card. Target date: 1981.³⁰

Thus, the state has specific accomplishments at which it can aim and, with the arrival of the projected target date, can evaluate its progress.

While it may not be possible to prove that all this planning effort has led to improved library services in a state, it seems reasonable to assume that it has. Examination of a sample of the LSCA documents reveals that some of the states have accomplished a large proportion of the tasks projected. This is no small achievement, since some of the planning documents are very idealistic and propose vast improvements in library services.

The state of Washington's 5-year plan illustrates the type of brief evaluation statements which can be used and which clearly indicate the degree of success achieved. One section of the Washington program is labeled "Network Activity." A number of activities are briefly described on one side of the page and the action accomplished is discussed on the other side. For example, one of the projected activities was the development of legislation for the Washington State Library Network. The accomplishment statement notes that the action was accomplished and that the governor had signed the proposed legislation.³¹ Another task listed under this section was "to examine the cooperative storage concept."³² That this task is progressing satisfactorily is noted in the accomplishment statement, which indicates that a task force had studied the matter and that "a report and recommendation were prepared by an outside firm."³³

STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

In connection with development of their budget requests, state library agencies prepare extensive descriptive and evaluative material, both nar-

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

rative and statistical. While the type of material required is in many ways similar to that required by the federal government, the specifics and the format may be very different and are determined by requirements of the state's budget office. In a recent survey it was discovered that the large majority of the twenty-nine states responding develop program-type budgets.³⁴ These budgets are called by various names, including program or performance budgets; Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS); and zero-based budgeting. While differing in some respects, these various systems all require extensive justification materials, including narrative descriptions and evaluations of programs, and statistical measurements of success.

Most of the agencies responding submitted portions of their budget documents. The documents are arranged by program, each program usually containing statements of goals and objectives and narrative evaluations of past performance, as well as specific statements of activities or accomplishment indicators similar to the statements prepared for the LSCA reports. Some of the accomplishment indicators are quantitative, and others are simply statements of a task to be accomplished. Those statements which lend themselves to quantification are followed by actual quantities for past years and projections for the future. In general, the goal is to increase the quantity from year to year. Some of the quantitative measurements used in the budgets submitted are: (1) the total population served by regional library systems; (2) the number of counties without county library service; (3) the number of blind and handicapped served by regional or subregional libraries; (4) the number of meetings, seminars and other programs in which state agency staff participate; and (5) the number of grants awarded, monitored and evaluated.³⁵

SPECIAL STUDIES

The state library agencies have been involved in many special studies which outline plans for improvement of the total statewide library network or particular aspects of that network at the state or local levels. Such plans might include library services to the state's institutionalized, a statewide interlibrary loan system, or a study recommending establishment of a multicounty or regional library. In some cases state library development staff have prepared such studies; more often, however, an outside consultant is commissioned to do this type of work. In recent years the state agencies have often been short of staff due to "freezes" in hiring and uncertainty of federal funding. Also the feeling exists that an outsider does

a better job because he or she possesses more objectivity as well as expertise which may not be present on state agency staff.

California provides a good example of a state in which the state library staff did a number of significant studies which have led to the establishment of county libraries and library systems or to the establishment and improvement of the services of those systems. A number of these studies were done during the 1960s.³⁶

State library agency staff also regularly conduct special studies for development of statewide library programs provided or coordinated by the state. These may or may not be published. In the past few years, New Mexico State Library staff members have prepared reports on such topics as statewide film service, library services in state institutions and special projects in public libraries.³⁷

While this writer was State Librarian of Vermont, it became apparent that Vermont needed its own regional library for the blind and physically handicapped. This group had previously been served by a library located in another state. Therefore, several of the staff, particularly Patricia Klinck and Dorothy Allen, did extensive planning for establishing the regional library at the Vermont State Department of Libraries, receiving much valuable assistance from the Library of Congress Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. The planning included activities such as (1) meeting with representatives of groups of handicapped people, (2) studying mail service, (3) developing floor plans, and (4) devising work-flow procedures. This planning successfully culminated in the opening of the regional library in 1976.³⁸

Some special studies have had lasting impact throughout a state in that they have resulted in successful establishment and growth of statewide networks of libraries. For example, a study done by Lowell Martin in Pennsylvania in 1958 (later supplemented by a study by Kenneth Beasley)³⁹ led to the establishment of a model statewide and state-supported cooperative public library network which has grown and is currently functioning very well.

As with many studies of this type, the project was funded and coordinated by the state library, and an advisory council representative of a wide variety of library and community interests advised on proposed recommendations.⁴⁰ This network is made up of three levels of library service: independent local libraries, district center libraries which serve as centers for public libraries in their areas, and four research libraries which serve as "regional resource centers" and provide interlibrary loan materials for the network.⁴¹ Two special reports done in the 1970s — one

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

the report of a special committee and the other the work of a consultant — recommend multitype library programs for Pennsylvania.⁴²

The origins of the present statewide library network in Illinois can be traced to the work of the Illinois Library Association's Library Development Committee, which in 1962 considered plans for establishment of "larger units of library service with adequate financial support and a high level of standards of performance."⁴³ The state library agency was represented on the committee and agreed to finance the study the committee recommended. Carried out by Robert H. Rohlf, the study outlined specific plans for basic elements of the network: "equalization aid, systems of public libraries, [and] the designation of four libraries as research and reference centers."⁴⁴

This network has been very successful and relatively well funded, and is now being expanded into a multitype library network (ILLINET) to include and provide services to all types of libraries.⁴⁵ To facilitate this development the state library is now funding a special project which consists of providing each library system with an experienced consultant who will work with libraries of all types on development of special projects.⁴⁶

As a result of several years of study and planning, California is establishing a statewide resource-sharing network including all types of libraries, which should enable library users throughout the state "to take advantage of the great library resources of California."⁴⁷ In 1974 the California State Library commissioned Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company to do a study of California library systems. Submitted in June 1975, the study made recommendations regarding a statewide network for interlibrary loan and reference service.⁴⁸ A library planning institute, with participation of library leaders from all over the state, was held to evaluate the study and make recommendations for implementation. At the institute, groups were formed to work toward passage of appropriate state legislation in 1978.⁴⁹ In the meantime, progress has been made with the establishment of the California Library Authority for Systems and Services (CLASS), a public agency which is doing preliminary work for the statewide resource-sharing network.⁵⁰

In a number of states, "blue-ribbon" committees have been appointed and given responsibility for developing a long-range plan for libraries. For example, in 1973 the governor of Maryland appointed a committee representative of public and private agencies and charged them with responsibility for devising such a plan.⁵¹ The Maryland Division of Library Development and Services was made responsible for the actual preparation of the manuscript which was reviewed and approved by a variety of

groups, including the state library association, the State Advisory Council on Libraries and the State Board of Education. The Master Plan, approved by the governor in December 1974, contains a wide range of recommendations, including a strengthened statewide public library system, improved school media services and cooperative programs including all types of libraries. Recommendations of the plan will "form the basis of the programs and activities of the Maryland Division of Library Development and Services for the next five years."⁵²

Since funding for library services to the blind, handicapped and institutionalized was added to LSCA in 1966, a number of states have commissioned special studies which have assisted in the establishment, expansion and improvement of special types of library services for the handicapped and institutionalized. For example, a study of Indiana's network of library services for the handicapped recommended the provision of various services in addition to the mailing of talking books, e.g., reading guidance, reference and group activities.⁵³ These recommendations are now being implemented and are part of the state plan for libraries.⁵⁴

Florida provides a good example of a state which is currently making a great deal of progress in the establishment of county and multicounty libraries. The state is very large in area, and much of it was sparsely populated until recently. As growth has occurred, opportunities have arisen to bring public library services to areas which previously had little or none. A number of county and multicounty libraries have been established in the past few years pursuant to the recommendations of planning studies done by outside consultants commissioned by the Florida State Library.⁵⁵

State library agencies have also cooperated with interstate library groups on studies of cooperation across state lines. One of the most significant of such studies is that done by Mary Anders of the nine southeastern states. Anders surveyed conditions in all types of libraries and made recommendations for improvement and for cooperative action. The nine state library agencies in the region contributed financial assistance for the project, which also received funds from state library associations, the Southeastern Library Association and the Tennessee Valley Authority.⁵⁶ In three states — Virginia, Florida and Alabama — the state agencies have cooperated in sponsoring statewide studies of library development.⁵⁷

Finally, special mention should be made of the unique situation in Illinois which has resulted in much useful research and publication. The Illinois State Library has had a long-standing agreement with the Library Research Center of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science. The state agency makes regular grants to the research center to

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

carry out special research projects. According to State Librarian Kathryn Gesterfield, "the study of library problems is one of the important priorities of the State Plan" for the use of LSCA funds.⁵⁸ Some of the studies funded in this program include a study of public library finance, an evaluation of the public library construction program, a study of the development of library systems in Illinois, and a study of reference service.⁵⁹

MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

Much progress has been made as a result of regular and special meetings involving cooperative planning by state library agency staff and library and community leaders. Undoubtedly, the most notable example of such activity at the present time is the state conferences which precede the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science to be held in Washington, D.C. in the fall of 1979.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is coordinating the national conference and providing funds and staff assistance for the state conferences. The director of NCLIS, Alphonse Trezza, has noted that "responsibility for planning and conducting these state conferences rests with the state library agencies" and that those agencies must "involve the American Library Association chapters and other library and information service associations in their state in the planning process."⁶⁰ His discussion of the state conferences makes it clear that their major purpose is to develop a state plan for library services which is compatible with national plans. He writes:

These state conferences will call together a cross-section of interested parties from the local and state levels to focus on and define the library and information services situation, enumerate the state and Federal resources available, determine problems, and highlight successful areas. In sum, the state conferences will seek to lay out a state plan for allocation of their library and information services resources which can be used as part of a large country-wide analysis in the national conference.⁶¹

Various state library agencies regularly sponsor meetings for the administrative staffs of district or regional library systems in their states. The systems are then expected to hold meetings for local libraries. In the meetings a variety of topics of common concern is discussed, and planning for future development is inevitably one of the major topics. In Pennsylvania, heads of the district center libraries and of the regional resource center libraries are brought together by the state library three or four times a

year to discuss such matters as long-range programs for library development, plans for changes in state rules and regulations for the receipt of state aid, and development of services to meet special needs. In her study of library services in the southeastern states, Anders discovered that in six of the states, state agency personnel meet regularly with administrators of public libraries.⁶²

The Library Planning Institute in California mentioned earlier is a good example of a special meeting which has had considerable impact on library development in a state. In this case, a group of prominent librarians from all parts of the state advised on the establishment of a statewide multitype library network.⁶³

Colorado provides another good example. In that state, the state library has coordinated an extensive needs assessment of the seven multitype library systems which have recently evolved from public library systems pursuant to permissive legislation passed by the state legislature. The purpose of the needs assessment was to assist in planning for the kinds of services which the multitype systems should provide. Each of the systems selected a system planning team to carry out the needs assessment, and team members participated in a workshop on assessment techniques in Denver. As a result of this activity, the state will be able to progress with development of its network.⁶⁴ Moreover, to assist in development of the statewide network, the state library has coordinated a series of ten workshops on use of the computer in reference work; approximately 200 librarians participated.⁶⁵

Planning has long been one of the state library agency's most important functions, and evaluation is becoming more important all the time. Together, these activities may constitute the most significant activities of state library agencies because of their potentially great impact on library services throughout the states.

Social and economic conditions of the late twentieth century make it essential that some agency provide leadership in careful planning and evaluation aimed at providing the best possible library services to all of the people of a state at a reasonable cost. The state library agency seems to be the most logical organization to do so.

State library agencies have made a good beginning in this work, but much remains to be done. If those agencies can provide dynamic leadership in planning and evaluation and can effectively "solicit the widest possible participation of library, information, and user communities" as recommended by NCLIS,⁶⁶ the years ahead should see much improvement in library and information services available to all.

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs
References

1. Haygood, William C. "Library Planning in the United States," *ALA Bulletin* 30:138, March 1936.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
3. Garceau, Oliver. *The Public Library in the Political Process*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1949, pp. 40-41.
4. Joeckel, Carleton B. *The Government of the American Public Library*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. 334-37.
5. American Library Association. Committee on Post-War Planning. *Post-War Standards for Public Libraries*. Chicago, ALA, 1943, p. 39.
6. Joeckel, Carleton B., and Winslow, Amy. *A National Plan for Public Library Service*. Chicago, ALA, 1948, p. 57.
7. Public Libraries Division. Co-ordinating Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards. *Public Library Service: A Guide to Evaluation with Minimum Standards*. Chicago, ALA, 1956, p. 17.
8. Public Library Association. Standards Committee. *Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, 1966*. Chicago, ALA, 1967, p. 23.
9. American Association of State Libraries. Standards Revision Committee. *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level*. Rev. ed. Chicago, ALA, 1970, pp. 1-2.
10. Ladenson, Alex, ed. *American Library Laws*. 4th ed. Chicago, ALA, 1973, pp. 1241-42.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 839.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 1872.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.
14. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action*. Washington, D.C., NCLIS, 1975, p. 19.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
16. Long, Marie A. *The State Library Consultant at Work*. Springfield, Illinois State Library, 1965, pp. 13-20.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
18. Mounce, Marvin W. "Library Development in Pennsylvania: A Review," *PLA Bulletin* 27:242, Sept. 1972.
19. Fry, James W. "LSA and LSCA, 1956-1973: A Legislative History," *Library Trends* 24:17, July 1975.
20. Stone, Elizabeth W. "Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE)." In Nada B. Glick and Sarah L. Prakken, eds. and comps. *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 22d ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1977, p. 385.
21. "Directory of State Library Agencies and Related Organizations," *ASLA President's Newsletter* 8:5-26, Jan. 1978.
22. For a detailed description of the state agency's role, see Beasley, James F. "Service to State Institutions and the Physically Handicapped," *Illinois Libraries* 53:340-45, April-May 1971.
23. Office of the Federal Register. National Archives and Records Service. General Services Administration. *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 45, Chap. 1, § 130.19. Washington, D.C., USGPO, 1976, pp. 491-92.
24. Hughey, Elizabeth H. "Library Services and Construction Act." In Madeline Miele, ed. and comp. *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. 19th ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1974, pp. 138-39.
25. Shubert, Joseph F. "The Impact of the Federal Library Services and Construction Act," *Library Trends* 24:38, July 1975.

26. Thomson, David D., ed. *Planning and Evaluation for Statewide Library Development: New Directions*. Columbus, Ohio State University Evaluation Center, 1972, pp. ix-x.
27. Fox, June. "Library Planning and Evaluation Institute," *American Libraries* 3:501-02, May 1972.
28. Office of the Federal Register, op. cit., § 130.19-130.20.
29. Alabama Public Library Service. *The Alabama Long Range Program for Library Development 1978-1982: Building for the Future*. Montgomery, Alabama Public Library Service, 1977, p. 8.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.
31. State of Washington. Washington State Library. *Long-Range Program for the State of Washington under the Library Services and Construction Act (Public Law 96-600)* (rev. Sept. 1976). Seattle, Washington State Library, 1976, p. 14.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
33. *Ibid.*
34. McCrossan, John. "Measuring State Library Agency Accomplishments," *ASLA President's Newsletter* 7:10, Sept. 1977.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
36. Hope, Arlene. *Mill Valley Public Library: A Study with Recommendations*. Sacramento, California State Library, 1962; Wynn, Barbara L. *The Present and Future Relationship Between the Placer County Library and the Roseville Public Library; A Study with Recommendations*. Sacramento, California State Library, 1960; and Biller, Florence E. *A Proposed Napa System of Public Library Service: A Study with Recommendations*. Sacramento, California State Library, 1962.
37. Simpson, Donald B., comp. *The State Library Agencies: A Survey Project Report, 1977*. 3d ed. Chicago, ASLA, 1977, pp. 104-05.
38. Vermont Department of Libraries. *Biennial Report of the Vermont Department of Libraries; Including Statistics of Local Libraries: July 1, 1974-June 30, 1976*. Montpelier, Vermont Department of Libraries, 1976, pp. 6-7.
39. Martin, Lowell A., et al. *Library Service in Pennsylvania: Present and Proposed*. Vol. 1. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania State Library, 1958; and Beasley, Kenneth E. *A Study and Recommendations of Library Districts in Pennsylvania*. University Park, Pennsylvania State University, Institute of Public Administration, 1962.
40. Martin, op. cit., p. iii.
41. State Library of Pennsylvania. *1976-1981 Pennsylvania Library Development Plan*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1977, pp. 50-51.
42. _____. *Pennsylvania Library Master Plan Committee Report*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1974; and Meadow, Charles T., et al. *A Plan for Library Cooperation in Pennsylvania: Project No. 75-1-111*. Philadelphia, Drexel University Graduate School of Library Science, July 6, 1976.
43. Stenstrom, Ralph H. *The Emergence and Development of Public Library Systems in Illinois*. Springfield, Illinois State Library, 1968, p. 65.
44. *Ibid.*
45. "Introducing ILLINET... the Beginnings of a Statewide Network," *Illinois Libraries* 57:364-65, June 1975.
46. Simpson, op. cit., pp. 79-80.
47. "California Has CLASS," *News Notes of California Libraries*, vol. 71, no. 1, 1976, p. 45.
48. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. *California Public Library Systems: A Comprehensive Review with Guidelines for the Next Decade*. Los Angeles, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., 1975, pp. 1-3.

Planning and Evaluation of Library Programs

49. California State Library. *Long Range Program, Library Services and Construction Act, California State Library, Fiscal 1978-82*. Sacramento, California State Library, 1977, p. 4.
50. "California Has CLASS," op. cit., pp. 45-46.
51. Maryland State Department of Education. Division of Library Development and Services. *1976-1980 Master Plan for the Development of Library Services in the State of Maryland*. Baltimore, Maryland State Department of Education, 1974, pp. 1-3.
52. _____. *Report 1974*. Baltimore, Maryland Department of Education, 1974, pp. 2-3.
53. McCrossan, John A. *Library Services for Indiana's Handicapped (Report No. 8)*. Bloomington, Indiana Library Studies, 1970, pp. 38-39, 50.
54. Indiana State Library. *Five Year Program for Library Service*. Indianapolis, Indiana State Library, Aug. 1976, pp. 13-14.
55. Grigg, Virginia. Personal communication, Nov. 22, 1977.
56. Anders, Mary E. *Libraries and Library Services in the Southeast: A Report of the Southeastern States Cooperative Library Survey, 1972-1974*. University, University of Alabama Press, 1976, p. iv.
57. Ibid., p. 30.
58. Gesterfield, Kathryn. "Challenge and Hope," *Illinois Libraries* 53:319, April-May 1971.
59. Ibid.
60. Trezza, Alphonse F. "White House Conference on Library and Information Services." In Glick and Prakken, op. cit., p. 29.
61. Ibid.
62. Anders, op. cit., p. 28.
63. California State Library, op. cit.
64. Katz, Ruth. *Colorado Regional Library Service Systems: Needs Assessment Project; Statewide Report No. 1*. Denver, Colorado State Library, Nov. 1976, pp. 1-3.
65. Simpson, op. cit., p. 32.
66. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, op. cit., p. 62.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank