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Introduction

JOHN A. McCROSSAN

The responsibilities of state library development agencies have grown rapidly in recent years, and there is every indication that this trend will continue in the years ahead. Because of this expansion of responsibilities and because the last issue of Library Trends devoted to state library agencies was published more than twenty years ago in April 1956, the Publications Committee of Library Trends thought a new issue describing the variety of activities of state library agencies would be of great interest to the library profession.

Another reason that an issue on state library agencies seems especially appropriate at this time is that the Library Services Act, a federally funded program administered by the state agencies, was passed in 1956 and first funded not long after the 1956 issue of Library Trends appeared. Thus, this issue can provide much information on the impact which the Library Services Act (LSA) and its successor, the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), have had on state library agencies and their programs.

In addition to statewide library development, states are responsible for various other library functions, including those of general libraries which serve state government, and sometimes those of the public, legislative reference, law, and state historical libraries. This issue, however, is concerned primarily with the library development agencies as they have a great impact on libraries of all types and are therefore of much interest to a large segment of the library profession.

What are state library development agencies? Briefly, these agencies (sometimes called state library extension agencies, state library administra-

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

tive agencies, or just state library agencies) are those units of state gov-
ernment assigned by state law the responsibility for the extension and
development of public library services throughout the states and for ad-
ministration of state plans in accordance with the provisions of LSCA.
Since LSCA and, in some cases, state-financed programs authorize funds
for development of library services for other than public libraries, the state
agencies are also active in development of library services in state institu-
tions, for the blind and physically handicapped, and of cooperative library
programs involving different types of libraries. Some state library agencies
also have responsibility for school library/media programs. In other states,
those programs are under a unit of the state department of education.
Moreover, having a central role in state government, and statewide library
development as their major mission, state library agencies are in a unique
position to provide leadership to all types of libraries in an effort to extend
and improve library services.

The history of state library development agencies can be traced to
the 1890s when several New England states established what were then
called state library commissions. By 1900 a number of additional states
had established such commissions. The commissions were given responsi-
bility for development of public library services throughout the states. It
should be noted that these agencies were considerably younger than state
libraries—which began in the very early histories of the states—and
were started in order to provide library materials and services for state
legislatures and state agencies.

In their early years, the library commissions were primarily con-
cerned with extending minimal library services throughout the states. They
sent out boxes of books called "traveling libraries" to community organiza-
tions and groups in unserved areas, and provided financial and other
assistance to small communities in their efforts to establish public libraries.

Perusal of the 1956 issue of Library Trends reveals that state library
agencies had made considerable progress since their early days. In that
issue, state agency leaders were much concerned with development of
"larger units of public library service," especially multicounty and regional
libraries. In some states much progress had been made in this work, but
in many states there were few, if any, multicounty or regional libraries.
Writers in that issue were also very concerned with other forward-looking
matters, including planned development of statewide library programs,
increased state financial assistance to libraries, and development of sophis-
ticated information services for state government. They also speculated
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on the potential impact of the Library Services Act, which passed that year.

Readers of this issue will quickly discover that the state agencies have made a great deal of additional progress since 1956 and that various development activities which were then in the infancy stage are now full-grown, successful programs. For example, public library systems, almost nonexistent in many areas in 1956, are now flourishing in many states due largely to the promotional efforts of state agency personnel and to the federal and state funds provided by the state library agencies. Library services to residents of state institutions have vastly improved in recent years, and much of this improvement is due to LSCA funds, which enabled many state library agencies to hire full-time institutional library consultants and to purchase books and other library materials for the institution libraries.

As is implied by various writers in this issue, the Library Services Act and the Library Services and Construction Act have had a tremendous impact on state agencies and their services. First of all, the very existence of two state library agencies is the direct result of the federal program. Those states did not have state library agencies and established them in order to become eligible for federal funds. Many of the agencies had very small staffs, and the federal funds made it possible to hire additional consultants and other staff who were desperately needed to promote library development. As noted above, there has been much progress in development of public library systems and of library services in state institutions.

A number of other programs which were greatly assisted by LSCA are described in various articles in this issue. The first article is a general overview of the state library agencies—their organization and services, place in state government, problems and potential. Since most members of the library community are not very familiar with the state agencies, it seems especially appropriate that this issue begin with a detailed summary of the current status and trends.

The second article discusses the increasingly important role of the state agencies in coordinating planning and evaluation of all types of library services statewide. Experience shows that some agency is needed to take responsibility for bringing together library and community leaders for purposes of considering future development of library services throughout each state, and the state library agency seems to be the most logical agency to carry out this important task.

The third article is a detailed discussion of the use of federal and state
funds for library development and the potential and problems for these types of financial assistance.

In the fourth article, the writers note that library services to state government have long been overshadowed by the statewide library development function. However, as state government becomes increasingly dependent on reliable, current information, many state library agencies are now recognizing that development of sophisticated information systems for government should have high priority. This activity is typically coordinated by general state libraries rather than by the library development agencies.

The fifth article offers an overview of programs which are of increasing importance — library services to the blind and physically handicapped and to the residents of state institutions.

The sixth article discusses the role of state agencies in improvement of school library/media programs. For a number of years after federal funds were made available to the states for school library materials through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), some of the states provided not only the ESEA funds but also effective leadership in the development of school libraries. Unfortunately, in recent years state activity in this area has been reduced in a number of states.

The following article notes that continuing education is receiving increased emphasis in all professions, including librarianship, and that state library agencies play a central role in development and provision of continuing education offerings for the library profession. Many state library agencies are now calling library leaders together to plan coordinated, statewide continuing education programs for all types of librarians. This work is the direct result of an institute on planning for statewide continuing education programs which was sponsored by the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE) and attended by representatives of twenty-five state library agencies.

The article on education of state library agency personnel points out that the master’s degree in library science is an essential qualification for state library agency professional staff, but that much continuing education is needed. Mounce also notes that the need for appropriate continuing education is not now being met, and that steps must be taken to improve this situation.

Several writers have noted that one of the most serious problems for state library agencies is attracting and keeping qualified personnel, particularly because state salaries are often so low. State library consultants and other development personnel often need qualifications equal to those
of heads of large libraries, but their salaries are almost always much lower. Even chief state librarians often receive considerably less pay than the heads of large public or academic libraries.

The ninth article discusses the value of national standards for state library agencies, and the writer points out that such standards can be used to assist in improvement of the agencies in the various states.

The last article describes the role which the state agencies will play in the developing national networks. The writer feels the states should assume responsibility for development of library services throughout the states and for any multistate programs which may be desirable, and that the federal government should provide what the states cannot. He indicates that the role of the state library agency as “a coordinator, a catalyst, an initiator, and an even-handed funding agency is essential,” and that the “full-service” national network “can best be accomplished through the traditional division of responsibility between the states and the federal government as established in the Constitution.”

The state library development agencies have made great contributions to the development and improvement of library services throughout the states, but much remains to be done. The years ahead, during which national and statewide library and information networks will be developed, will be a great challenge to the library community. The state library agencies will play a central role in these activities, and they will need to provide dynamic leadership and solicit wide participation from library and community leaders in planning for library services for the future.
State Library Agency Organization and Services

JOSEPH F. SHUBERT and
JAMES W. FRY

Principles for organization of state library agencies were most recently defined by the American Library Association (ALA) in 1970 with the publication of Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. These standards (of which numbers fifty-two to sixty in the series of seventy-five are set forth in that publication) are based on an array of diverse functions which, the ALA recognizes, are organized differently from state to state.

The standards, together with a 1967 study completed by Nelson Associates for the National Advisory Committee on Libraries, provide a good overview of state library agency functions. The Book of the States, 1978-79 uses this overview in charting a profile of state library agencies which lists functions under such headings as library services to state government, statewide services development, statewide development of library resources, statewide development of information networks, and financing library programs. A 1978 survey of state library agencies being conducted by the State Library of Florida for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS) series identifies twenty-five specialized service activities and functions and will provide a statistical profile of the fifty state library agencies.

It is the library development functions which form the common interest and concern of the state library agencies surveyed for NCES. Library development functions are defined as those which foster the im-
provement and coordination of library resources and services throughout a state. These include: network and system development; administration of state and federal funding programs which foster resource-sharing, resource and service development, improved organization and operation of libraries and systems, and access to resources; statistics collection and analysis; planning and evaluation; research; dissemination of information; and consultant service.

In addition to library development, the majority of state library agencies have library operation functions such as the collection and maintenance of subject and reference resources, and direct reference and library service to state government. State library agencies with major reference libraries include: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia and Washington. Those states with major law libraries as part of comprehensive reference libraries include: California, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia (see Table 1).

The size of state library agency staffs varies considerably from state to state. The 1977 report The State Library Agencies, published by the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA), included data on staff assigned to library operations and library development functions. These data, updated in a brief survey the authors conducted in early 1978, show that the number of library operations personnel ranges from 1 to 100 persons and that the number of those in library development ranges from 1 to 30 (see Table 2).

STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES IN STATE GOVERNMENT

The ALA standards point out that the state library agency should have “clear statutory provisions which define the functions to be performed, provide authority for these activities, and ensure the legal basis for a flexible program to meet the needs of the state.” The standards are less specific in prescribing a structure within state government, pointing out that the agency “should be so placed [as to]... have the authority and status to discharge... responsibilities.” The standards recommend status as a separate agency “directly responsible through its chief administrator or its governing board to the executive and legislative branches of government” and suggest a lay governing board appointed by the governor or other elective officials. The standards also recognize that the state library agency may be part of a department of education or other state agency. In such a case, administrative simplification should not subordi-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Library services to state governments</th>
<th>Statewide library services development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information and reference services</td>
<td>Legal and legislative services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prepared by the Association for State Library Agencies.
* — Primary, † — Shared, . . — None.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Language planning</th>
<th>Development and scope of collections in libraries</th>
<th>Mobilization of resources</th>
<th>Subject and reference centers</th>
<th>Resources - other printed materials</th>
<th>Resources - multimedia</th>
<th>Little-used materials</th>
<th>Coordination of resources</th>
<th>Planning of information networks</th>
<th>Exchange of information and materials</th>
<th>Interstate cooperation</th>
<th>Administration of federal aid</th>
<th>Financing of library systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF PERSONNEL BY FUNCTION IN STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Library Operations</th>
<th>Library Development</th>
<th>Total Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>429.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nate the planning and program functions of the library agency, and it is recommended that the state library agency have the "stature and autonomy within the larger unit to achieve [its] distinctive functions and to bring libraries up to standard."8

Of the state library agencies responsible for library development, twenty-one are independent — eighteen of these function under a state library board or commission appointed by the governor, and three function as departments reporting directly to the governor; nineteen are within a department of education; and ten are within other departments or branches of government. Some state library agencies which are part of a department of education are headed by chief officers appointed by the governor, while others have statutory library boards or commissions appointed by the governor (see Table 3).

TABLE 3. THE PLACE OF THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY IN STATE GOVERNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Independent Board or Commission</th>
<th>Dept. of Education</th>
<th>Other Dept. or Unit</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>x 5 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-member Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8-member Library Commission (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Governor appoints State Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>x 8 (5G)</td>
<td>x 8 (5G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Ex Officio Board members Attached to Dept. of Education for &quot;Administrative purposes only&quot; eff. 1/1/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Community Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-member Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>x 5 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>x 5 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Independent agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Dept. of Library &amp; Archives is part of the Education &amp; Arts Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5-member Library Board of Commissioners (G) in Dept. of Culture, Recreation &amp; Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Independent Board or Commission</th>
<th>Dept. of Education</th>
<th>Other Dept. or Unit</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Education &amp; Cultural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-member Advisory Council on Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>x 9 (G)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-member Advisory Board (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>x 5 (G)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Dept. of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5-member Library Commission (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>x 6 (G)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent agency; Governor appoints State Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 member of Board of Education appointed by that Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>x 6 (5G)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7-member Advisory Council of the State Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>x 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>x 7 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>x 7 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>x 7 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-member Library Commission (G) housed for communication in Dept. of Education &amp; Cultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-member Library &amp; Archives Commission (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>x 6 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-member Library and Historical Commission (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>x 10 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>x 7 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor appoints State Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>x 9 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction Ex Offic Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>x 5 (4G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>x 5 (G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-member Library Archives and Historical Board (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>x 9 (8G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(G) — Governor appoints.
In recent years the push for simplification and reorganization of state government has reduced the number of independent state library agencies. A 1970 study by Douglas St. Angelo and others reported twelve state library agencies in departments of education. By 1978, nineteen agencies were part of an education department. During the 1970s several states have enacted or considered legislation placing state library agencies in departments broadly concerned with cultural affairs. Reorganization of state government in a number of instances has proceeded from the adoption of a new constitution (or major constitutional change) which limits the number of agencies or departments of government. In some states these reorganizations have caused state library agencies which were formerly independent agencies functioning under boards or commissions to be merged with or included in departments of education or other larger state departments. With the development of "superagencies," some recent reorganizations which have placed state library agencies within other departments have provided substantial autonomy for the state library agency, including retention of a library board or commission appointed directly by the governor.

Enactment of sunset legislation can be expected to increase the amount of paperwork and time expended in accountability exercises. However, early experience does not indicate that such laws will result in major change in state library agencies.

INTERNAL ORGANIZATION

Review of organization charts of state library agencies, as reported in The State Library Agencies, and of updated charts furnished by forty agencies indicates that four major divisions appear most frequently: (1) information services, (2) library development, (3) technical services, and (4) administrative services. Arizona, Kentucky, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia include a division for archives; Illinois and New York, a statewide computerized network service; Washington, a division for operation of its computerized Washington Library Network; and Alabama, Georgia, Iowa, Louisiana, and Nevada each include specific positions or offices for network planning in their charts.

As a means of analyzing organization patterns, the writers looked separately at 13 state library agencies with a total staff of 100 or more persons, viz., agencies in California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia and Washington. Aside from variation in size, there appears to be no significant difference between the organization of the larger state
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agencies and that of the others. Organization patterns are diverse, but generally include the same types of divisions.

A comparison of current organization charts with those which appeared in the first ASLA report\textsuperscript{12} indicates that few organizational changes in state library agencies were made in the 1973-78 period. Exceptions are New York and Washington. In the case of Washington, the current organization includes a management services position and three associate director positions (services, network and research and planning) with specific responsibility for participation in a management council. This organization chart replaces a circular chart which showed six functions (finance, research and planning, staff services, information services, statewide library development, and organization of materials) interacting with the state librarian, state government and libraries.

The New York State Library was completely reorganized in 1976. The new organization of the library into four major units (reference services, collection acquisition and processing, collection management and network services, and legislative and governmental services) replaced the traditional reader services/technical services division. The organization of reference services reflects the interdisciplinary approach of a major research library. Four specialized reference desks (law and social sciences; science, health science and technology; humanities; and manuscripts and special collections) are each staffed by a team of professional specialists. The law and medical libraries, each authorized in statute, are integrated in the reference service desks. The Library Development Office of the New York State Library, once divided into the Public Library Services Bureau and the Academic and Research Library Bureau, now has a Bureau of Regional Library Services and a Bureau of Specialist Library Services. Impetus for the change in New York State came from a review of anticipated user needs, opportunities for use of technology, a realistic appraisal of future funding projections, and new relationships made possible in a new building. Less fundamental changes in other states have resulted from the impact of technology, program retrenchment or redirection, new legislative programs or mandates, changed management approaches, or legislative or administrative direction. Overwhelmingly, response to a 1978 questionnaire on impetus for change or anticipated change indicates technology as a reason for change.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Response to a questionnaire sent to each state library agency indicates that the major forces which have caused or will cause change in many of
their organizations are overwhelmingly technological. OCLC participation and the development of statewide networks play a major role in these organizational changes. Both the increasing imperative for resource-sharing among different types of libraries and the emergence of a national network call for a stronger role of the state library in multitype library planning and involvement. These suggest staffing and operational changes in state library agencies.

Many of the libraries reported that they are utilizing OCLC, Inc. for cataloging and interlibrary loan purposes. This membership has enabled some libraries to reduce or reallocate staff, increase efficiency and expand service. It has provided access to a broader range of material and sources for interlibrary loan. Of the twelve state agency libraries that were not participants in OCLC or other computer-based systems, four indicated they plan to join in the coming year. The Washington State Library has developed its own computer-based system. There, the librarian reported that: "Computerized networking is placing a heavy responsibility on the state agency. It is forcing us to look at the way we do business on a day-to-day basis, and to give new service and support on a statewide basis."

As reported above, eight states have specialist staff assigned to some type of network development. Several other states indicated that in the future they would be adding some type of network coordinator position to their staffs in addition to specialized consultants.

Automation and network concerns may also result in more flexible use of operations and consultant staff in development work, and increased collaboration with staff specialists from regional networks or other major libraries. Ohio, for instance, supplements its Library Development Division staff expertise with personnel in the Information Resource and Services Division whenever there is a need for consultation in systems analysis, technical services costs, or specialized reference service. Increasingly, regional network staff members perform training and related work functions in the states.

Some consolidation of functions and staff usually is associated with retrenchment. Relatively few organizational changes or major staff expansions appear to have taken place in the 1973-78 period as a result of new legislation or program expansion (other than that related to technology). Developments in program budgeting, program review and accountability will probably continue to have some impact on organization and on assignment of staff in state library agencies.
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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." 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.

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.

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.
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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.

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." It also recommends that the state agency enforce minimum standards for libraries and adopt certification standards for librarians.
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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."9 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 statewide plans for all types of library services, for interlibrary cooperation, for research, and for demonstration and experimental programs." 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.\(^\text{12}\)

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.\(^\text{13}\)

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)\(^\text{14}\). 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.” 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.\(^\text{15}\)

**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
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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. 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.”

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.

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. NCLIS is now actively encouraging state library agencies to
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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-
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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
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governments in their efforts on behalf of the citizens of the State." 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.

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. Another task listed under this section was "to examine the cooperative storage concept." 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."

STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

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

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.86

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.87

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 1976.88

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)89 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.90 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.91 Two special reports done in the 1970s — one
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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 1978.40 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."

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. These recommendations are now being implemented and are part of the state plan for libraries.

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.

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. In three states — Virginia, Florida and Alabama — the state agencies have cooperated in sponsoring statewide studies of library development.

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
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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. 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.

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." 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.

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.
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Administration of State and Federal Funds for Library Development

GENEVIEVE M. CASEY

This article will attempt to trace how state library development agencies were affected by state and federal funds for libraries, and how those agencies in turn determined the pattern, volume and utilization of these funds. It will explore relationships which state and federal funding brought about between state library agencies and local and federal libraries and governments. The review will focus on the period from the passage of the Library Services Act in 1956 through 1977.

LSA/LSCA

The passage of the Library Services Act (LSA) and its successor, the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), federal legislation for the improvement and extension of public library service, has probably produced a more profound impact on state library development agencies than any other single factor. The other library legislation of the 1960s — the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (administered by a very few state libraries), the Higher Education Act and the Medical Library Assistance Act — have had much less impact on state library development agencies and thus are not discussed in this article. In all states, however, LSA/LSCA has had a profound influence on state library agencies. Because of the importance to the topic of this issue, a brief chronology of LSA/LSCA follows. It is based on data up to 1973 gathered by James Fry for an earlier issue of Library Trends, and on later data published in the
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CHRONOLOGY

1944: A group of librarians, headed by Ralph Shaw, director of the Department of Agriculture Library; Paul Howard, the first director of the ALA Washington Office; and Carl Milam, ALA Executive Secretary, conceived the idea of a bill to provide federal aid to public libraries. At that time, adequate public library service was available to less than one-half of the American people. One county in five had no public library whatever.


1956: Representative Edith Green (D., Oregon) and Senator Lister Hill, with bipartisan sponsorship of twenty-seven representatives and sixteen senators, introduced legislation which was destined to become the Library Services Act. In addition to strong support from ALA, the legislation was endorsed by twenty national organizations, including the National Education Association, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Farmers' Union, Federation of Women's Clubs, and several library associations.

In June 1956, President Eisenhower signed into law the Library Services Act, Public Law 597 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, described by Edmon Low as the father of modern library legislation.

In effect until June 30, 1961, the Library Services Act authorized annual appropriations of up to $7.5 million to be distributed to the states according to a formula based on their relative rural populations and fiscal capacity. With the objective of extending and improving public library service, the act provided that:

1. funds be channeled through a state library agency designated by each state's attorney general as responsible for fostering statewide public library service;
2. funds be used only for the establishment and/or improvement of public library service in communities of 10,000 or less;
3. funds be expended according to a state plan for public library service reached by the state library agency with the advice of a broadly representative advisory board;
4. funds be matched with state/local funds, and that these state/local appropriations not fall below the level of the previous year;
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5. Funds be used for personnel, materials, communication, travel, equipment, rental of space, but not construction.

Table 1 charts the authorization and appropriations for LSA from 1957 to 1961.

January 1960: Senate Bill 2830 to extend LSA for five more years was introduced by Senator Lister Hill and cosponsored by fifty-one senators. In justifying the need for an extension of what had been conceived as a temporary measure, Senator Hill argued: "By the end of fiscal 1961, when this program will expire... it is estimated that only half of the job will be done, that at least 40 million rural residents will still have no public library service, or inadequate service, and that 150 rural counties will still have no public library service within their borders."2

May 26, 1960: The Senate passed S. 2830 unanimously.

August 22, 1960: The House passed S. 2830 (190-29) after forty minutes of debate which centered on the question of whether the federal government had any responsibility for local public library service.

August 31, 1960: President Eisenhower signed into law the extension of the Library Services Act until June 30, 1966 (P.L. 86-679). The extension continued authorization of up to $7.5 million annually for the establishment and improvement of rural public library service.

January 29, 1963: President Kennedy sent to Congress a special education message which included a recommendation to enact "legislation to amend the Library Services Act by authorizing a 3-year program of grants for urban as well as rural libraries and for construction as well as operation." In justification for this new initiative, President Kennedy's message cited that:

The public library is also an important resource for continuing education. But 18 million people in this nation still have no access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to any local public library service and over 110 million more have only inadequate service.

Advanced age, lack of space, and lack of modern equipment characterize American public library buildings in 1963. Their rate of replacement is barely noticeable: two per cent in a decade. There are now no Carnegie funds available for libraries — nor have there been for 40 years.

The public library building is usually one of the oldest governmental structures in use in any community. In one prosperous midwestern State, for example, 30 per cent of all public library buildings were built before [the] year 1910, and 85 percent were erected before 1920. Many other States are in a similar situation.3

October 29, 1963: Senator Wayne Morse (D., Oregon) introduced S. 2265, embodying President Kennedy's recommendations.

November 26, 1963: The Senate, as its first order of business after the assassination of President Kennedy, passed S. 2265 (P.L. 88-7), a resounding bipartisan victory.

January 21, 1964: The House passed its version of S. 2265 by a vote of 254-107. Opposition in the debate centered on the dangers of federal intervention in local public libraries, and the likelihood that this "temporary" support would become permanent.

February 11, 1964: President Johnson signed into law the Library Services and Construction Act (P.L. 88-269). The principal differences between LSCA and LSA were:

1. The population limitation was removed beginning July 1, 1964. Coverage was extended to all areas of the country regardless of size.

2. A new construction title was added which authorized $20 million for FY 1964 and such sums as the Congress may determine for FY 1965 and 1966. The act provided minimum allotments of $80,000 to each state.

3. The matching grant authorization for public library services was increased from $7.5 million a year to $25 million for FY 1964 and such sums that Congress may determine for FY 1965 and 1966.

4. Construction was defined to include construction of new buildings; expansion, remodeling and alteration of existing buildings; initial equipment; and architects' fees and land acquisition costs.

5. The District of Columbia and Puerto Rico were included in the definition of a state.4
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For state libraries, LSCA had momentous effects: (1) it forced them into relationships with large city libraries and away from the exclusive concentration on rural problems which had characterized many of them, (2) it provided them with greatly increased funds and power to implement plans for public library service, and (3) it catapulted them into the enormously political and competitive world of library construction. Table 2 traces the authorization and appropriations for LSCA in 1964-66.

March 1965: Senator Lister Hill and Congressman Roman Pucinski (D., Illinois) introduced similar bills to amend and extend LSCA for four years. The new bills proposed four principal titles with the following provisions:

Title I — Public Library Services: as in the 1964 act, matching-grant funds to be used for books and other library materials, library equipment, salaries and other operating expenses.

Title II — Public Library Construction.

Title III — Interlibrary Cooperation: funds for the establishment and maintenance of local, regional, state or interstate cooperative networks of libraries.

Title IV — Specialized State Library Services: funds to assist states in providing greatly needed specialized library services to state institutions and to the physically handicapped.

In defending the bill, Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana) cited the following accomplishments of LSCA:

More than 375 bookmobiles were added to existing library resources to reach rural readers. An estimated 14 million books and other informational materials were added to library collections. In the construction phase of the Library Services and Construction Act program, 53 States or territories reported that they had approved

TABLE 2. LSCA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1964-66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Title II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>&quot;such sums as Congress may determine&quot;</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;such sums as Congress may determine&quot;</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALL 1978 149
363 local public library construction projects. . . Of the 363 projects, 233 were for the construction of new buildings; 58 were for additions to existing library buildings; and 72 were for remodeling or alteration. An estimated 23.3 million people will be served by this new construction.\(^5\)

**July 19, 1966:** President Johnson signed into law the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-511), effective through June 30, 1971. Table 3 graphs the authorizations and appropriations for each title, 1967-71.

**April 1969:** Library, education and related interests formed a coalition, the “Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Educational Programs.” The demands of the Vietnam war and inflation were beginning to jeopardize the priorities of the “Great Society.”

**January 1970:** The Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill, containing funds for LSCA for FY 1971, was vetoed by President Nixon.

**March 5, 1970:** President Nixon signed a revised appropriations bill for FY 1971, providing appropriations for LSCA of over $51 million.

**July 1970:** The Education Appropriations Bill for FY 1972, appropriating funds for LSCA, passed and was then vetoed by President Nixon.

**August 1970:** Congress overrode the president’s veto of the 1972 appropriations bill.\(^6\)

**September-December 1970:** Bills were introduced in the Senate by Senators Clairborne Pell (D., Rhode Island) and Ralph Yarborough (D., Texas), and in the House by Congressman Brademas (D., Indiana), for the extension of LSCA until June 30, 1976. The bills consolidated Title IV (services for institutionalized and handicapped persons) with Title I and identified three federal priorities: library service to the disadvantaged,

**TABLE 3. LSCA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1967-71**

(\textit{in millions of dollars})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th>Title II</th>
<th>Title III</th>
<th>Title IV-A</th>
<th>Title IV-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>“such sums as Congress may determine”</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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strengthening of state library administrative agencies, and strengthening of metropolitan libraries.7 Both bills passed unanimously.

December 30, 1970: President Nixon signed P.L. 91-600, the extension of LSCA until June 30, 1976. Table 4 charts the authorizations and appropriations for LSCA, 1972-76.

January 1972: President Nixon, in his budget for FY 1973, eliminated all funds for LSCA, along with funds for other library legislation.

August 1972: The Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill, providing funds for LSCA, passed and was vetoed by President Nixon.

October 1972: A second Labor/HEW bill providing dollars for LSCA passed and was vetoed by President Nixon. A continuing resolution permitted the administration to spend at the presidential budget figures or at the appropriation level of FY 1972; this meant zero funding for LSCA. President Nixon signed into law the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act, conceived as an alternative to categorical federal aid. The act authorized over $6 billion for each calendar year, 1972-76, to be distributed to states and municipalities on the basis of income, population, urbanization and tax revenues. Priority expenditures were for public safety, environmental protection, transportation, health, recreation services for the poor and aged, financial administration and libraries.

January 29, 1973: President Nixon’s 1974 budget again proposed to terminate federal funds for public libraries on July 1, 1973. In the words of Richard Nathan, undersecretary of HEW: “Libraries simply are not a national government responsibility. . . . This program is a good case of a federal program that should be turned back to the States and localities.”8 This position was resisted by ALA and several congressmen. Ralph Nader urged librarians to launch a campaign to educate the public and legislators about the importance of libraries to the American people.9 The Nixon administration advocated revenue-sharing as an alternative to the direct,

---

**TABLE 4. LSCA: AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS, 1972-76 (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Title II</th>
<th></th>
<th>Title III</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>$112.0</td>
<td>$46.5</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categorical aid provided by LSCA. In response to this proposal, Joseph Shubert, then State Librarian of Ohio, reflected the skepticism of the library profession:

You have two problems [with revenue-sharing]. One is that the money in some cases has already been allocated and the other is that the general attitude toward revenue sharing is [not to] make long term commitments. You can't put together systems or regional co-operative operations out of bits and pieces of revenue sharing where you have to get maybe 35 different local governments each to contribute a little money to run a $40,000 bookmobile in three rural counties. And yet not one of those three rural counties can afford to run a bookmobile program by itself.¹⁰

Shubert's reservation about federal revenue-sharing as a substitute for LSCA was borne out in an intensive study in 1976 of the effect of revenue-sharing on public libraries, sponsored by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Data gathered in this study led to the conclusion that "general revenue sharing...is not an effective substitute for...progressive development of public library services for all citizens."¹¹ In 1973-74, only 1.8 percent ($76 million) of all general revenue-sharing funds to local governments was allocated for public library capital and operating expenses, and no more than one-third to one-half of this $76 million represented new money. The remainder simply replaced local tax dollars.

March 1973: A final continuing resolution for the period January-June 1973 was signed by President Nixon, requiring the administration to spend for LSCA at the lowest of the House or Senate figures authorized in the first Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill for FY 1973. The administration continued, however, to spend only at the level of the president's budget ($30 million for LSCA Title I, compared to the $62 million authorized; zero for Title II, compared to the $15 million authorized).

May 1973: A new Title IV, "Older Readers Services," was added to LSCA, authorizing funds for a variety of services to the aging, including employment of older people in libraries. This title has never been funded.


June 30, 1973: The U.S. District Court of Oklahoma ruled on a suit brought by Oklahoma, Michigan and New Mexico that the administra-
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The administration's impounding of LSCA funds for FY 1973 was "unconstitutional and unlawful."

July 1, 1973: President Nixon signed a continuing resolution which funded LSCA through September 30, 1973 at the $58 million-level.

December 18, 1973: President Nixon signed the 1974 Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill into law. Compromising with the administration, Congress allowed the president to cut 5 percent from each program exceeding his budget request. This included LSCA.

December 19, 1973: The administration announced the release of all LSCA 1973 impounded funds. In the crisis of the 1970s, state libraries assumed a new prominence in the fight for federal as well as state funding. In every state, the impoundment of federal funds threatened to destroy library programs. The release of impounded funds six months into the fiscal year created new challenges for their wise expenditure.

August 1974: LSCA was again amended, as part of the Education Amendments of 1974, to ensure that priority be given to programs and services for persons of limited English-speaking ability.


July 1975: The Education Appropriations Bill for FY 1976 (H.R. 5901), which contained funds for LSCA, passed and was vetoed by President Ford.

September 1975: Congress overrode the president's veto and the Education Appropriations Bill became P.L. 94-94. It provided $51.7 million for LSCA.

September 1975: The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science adopted a resolution, recommending to the Congress and the president:

That the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) be revised and extended for three years on the following basis:

(a) Revise the act to ensure that federal funds not be substituted for state funds nor used as a substitute for adequate state support for the function of the state library agency. Provide a limitation on expenditures by state library agencies of 10 percent for administrative purposes.

(b) Match LSCA, Title I, funds by state appropriations only.

(c) Implement statutory time limitation on the use of LSCA funds for the state administration of LSCA, ensuring that more LSCA funds are distributed to eligible libraries.
(d) Assure an equitable distribution of LSCA, Title I, funds to strengthen urban public libraries.

(e) Structure administrative and fiscal provisions of LSCA to strengthen, stimulate, and require state and local support.

(f) Merge Title III of LSCA and the multitype Library Partnership Act providing for the establishment of a local-state-federal partnership program for the purpose of encouraging and sustaining an adequate system of libraries and for the further development of networks that extend and expand the use of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers.

(g) Revise LSCA to include provisions for forward funding to help resolve the recurring problems of uncertainty, late allocations, and other administrative problems that interfere with effective planning at the national, state, and local levels.

The resolution further recommends that the funding level for fiscal year 1977 for LSCA, Title I, be at a level not less than the FY 1976 appropriation; Title II at a minimum level of $9 million; Title III, including the Library Partnership Act, at a minimum level of $15 million; Title IV, Older American Services, at a minimum level of $2 million.12

Table 5 charts appropriations for 1977 and 1978.

February 1976: A 5-year extension of LSCA (H.R. 11233) passed the House by a vote of 378-7, but was not considered by the Senate Education Committee. LSCA operated in FY 1977 under a 1-year extension authorized through the Education Amendments of 1974. LSCA was scheduled to expire September 20, 1977.

September 8, 1977: House and Senate reached final agreement on a 5-year extension of LSCA. Table 6 charts funds authorized in the bill.

The Senate's provision for a Title V, providing discretionary grants to urban libraries, was dropped by the conferees in favor of a provision earmarking all appropriations for Title I in excess of $60 million for supporting and expanding library services of major urban resource libraries.

**TABLE 5. LSCA: APPROPRIATIONS, 1977-78 (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th>Title II</th>
<th>Title III</th>
<th>Title IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$56.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 6. FUNDING AUTHORIZED UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES
AND CONSTRUCTION ACT, 1978-82 (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th>Title II</th>
<th>Title III</th>
<th>Title IV (Older Readers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>&quot;such&quot; sums</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>&quot;such&quot; sums as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>as necessary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>sums as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


December 9, 1977: President Carter signed a continuing resolution providing LSCA funding for FY 1978. This resolution superseded the Labor/HEW Appropriations Bill, which had been delayed in a lengthy controversy over federal funding for abortion.

IMPACT OF LSA/LSCA

What have state libraries accomplished with the federal funds entrusted to them over the last twenty-two years, and what has been the impact of these federal funds upon the state library agencies themselves?

The answer to the first part of this question could fill many books. To answer it in detail would be beyond the scope of this article. In general, as Rodney Lane pointed out in Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Federal Funding of Public Libraries, "much has been accomplished to stimulate and sustain the public library as a vital community-based informational and educational institution.""13 Perhaps the most impressive result of the federal-state-local partnership has been the widespread — indeed, almost universal — establishment of public library systems and multitype library networks designed to augment and supplement local library services. These cooperatives have resulted in some level of library service to most American citizens, in improved service for many, but not in equality of access.

The movement toward regional and statewide library networks began early, under LSA, and was further stimulated after 1966 by LSCA Title III. Elizabeth Hughey, summarizing the activities undertaken by the states during the first ten years of Title III, lists the following: "(1) identification and location of library resources available in a state or region; (2) establishment or expansion of interlibrary loan and reference networks to include all types of libraries and information centers...; (3) ex-
pansion or establishment of precessing centers...; (4) coordination of the acquisition of materials among types of libraries; and (5) ... the establishment of regional area library councils" engaged in assessing needs, joint planning, and evaluation. Looking to the future, Hughey states that, “multistate regional networks are currently grappling with the as yet unanswered problems of interface and their role in what might became a 'national' network.”

Funds for construction were last appropriated in 1973, and were available for obligation through FY 1975. During its 12-year period, a total of $174.5 million of LSCA funds were allocated and matched by local funds. The result has been the erection and remodeling of over 2000 public library buildings.

Although no one could claim that public library service to the disadvantaged, the aging, the institutionalized, the handicapped, to minorities, or to persons of limited English-speaking ability are adequate, the record of achievement under LSCA is impressive. A sampling of these achievements is provided in Library Programs Worth Knowing About, a descriptive, annotated guide to exemplary programs initiated under LSCA in thirty-four states, jointly prepared by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources of the U.S. Office of Education (the federal agency which administers LSCA) and COSLA, the association of Chief Officers of State Library Agencies.

For each program described, information is included on users or target group, facilities and materials utilized, budget, staffing and training requirements, evaluation, and "replication services" available, i.e., reports, forms, audio or video materials, opportunities for site visits, etc. In general, most of the programs are aimed at groups and individuals ordinarily not reached by conventional public library services.

Six projects are focused on the aging. These range from home delivery of library materials by volunteers in Muscatine, Iowa, to oral history projects — one in Grand Rapids, Michigan, aimed at capturing the reminiscences of elders among Chippewa, Ottawa and Potawatomi Indian tribes, and another in New Mexico which recorded the rapidly disappearing rural way of life in Spanish-speaking villages.

Eleven of the projects focus on people for whom English is a second language — Asians in Oakland, California; Spanish-speaking migrant workers in New Jersey; preschool children of non-English-speaking families in Massachusetts. “Project CHIPS” (Consumer Health Information Program and Services) offered health information and referral services.
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in Spanish and English to a multiethnic population of over 2 million people in Los Angeles County.

Eight of the projects were targeted at functionally illiterate adults, many of them involving the recruiting and training of community volunteers to tutor the illiterate, thus providing a link between two divergent groups in the community—the literate, educated middle class and the undereducated poor. Commonly, these programs encouraged close cooperation between the library and other community agencies working in adult basic education.

Many of the projects demonstrated nontraditional ways to deliver library services, such as books by mail, information broadcast by radio and television, computerized information/referral centers, and innovative use of bookmobiles.

At least eleven of the projects detailed were in the area of networking and interlibrary cooperation. Among the most original of these was the development of a mathematical model of the Illinois Interlibrary Loan Network. Seven projects were aimed specifically at school/public library cooperation.

The projects highlighted in Library Programs Worth Knowing About reflect the response of state library agencies to national priorities written into LSCA—priorities of: (1) extending library services to the poor, minority groups, the illiterate, the disadvantaged—all people outside the middle-class mainstream who are traditional library users, and (2) utilizing technology to link together resources in all types of libraries. The compilation also reflects congressional and executive concern for accountability, with emphasis on clear objectives, realistic evaluation and deliberate planning to share insights and replicate programs.

Another accomplishment linked at least indirectly to LSCA, and to the planning, experiments and demonstrations it enabled, has been a wider range of state aid and grants to local public libraries. State aid to local public libraries will be discussed in a later section of this article.

On the negative side, in analyzing the effects of LSA/LSCA, it must be admitted that:

1. Equality of library opportunity has not yet been reached. In the mid-1970s, per capita expenditures for library service ranged from less than $1.00 to $15.00, against a median of $3.28. In 1976, the chief state library officers estimated that there were over 9 million Americans (4.4 percent) with no library service, 175 million (83.3 percent) with inadequate service and only 26 million (12.3 percent) with what they defined as adequate service.
2. State support of local public libraries, although it has increased in dollar amounts, has actually decreased relatively. The library's share of all state aid to local government has declined, from .33 percent in 1967 to .21 percent in 1974. Between 1972-74 state aid to libraries increased by 4.7 percent, whereas all state payments increased by 11.8 percent. Breakthroughs in the state aid programs in California and Michigan during the last few months have somewhat altered the picture at least in these two states.

3. LSA/LSCA has not achieved a balanced intergovernmental funding system between local, state and federal levels, as is generally perceived as necessary. The overwhelming portion of the cost of public library service continues to fall on local government.

Because the level of LSA/LSCA funding has never been in accord with its stated goals and objectives, and because its funding has been unstable, fluctuating widely from year to year (especially during the 1970s), LSCA has been less than totally effective in assuring adequate public library services throughout the nation, despite its truly impressive achievements.

What has been the impact of federal funds on state library agencies themselves? In the first place, state library extension/development agencies in some states, such as Arizona and Utah, were actually brought into being to enable the state to qualify for the federal funds. In every state, library development agencies have been enormously strengthened in order to meet the demands placed on them by LSA/LSCA. In fact, a 1974 report compiled by the General Accounting Office criticized state libraries for channeling too many LSCA dollars into "administration services and statewide programs" at the state level, thus unduly reducing the funds available to provide new or improved library service at the local library level, for which LSCA was intended.

LSA/LSCA strengthened state libraries, not only because it afforded them discretionary funds for administration, but also because it:

1. required planning, leading to long- and short-range programs for public library development;
2. it provided them over the years with substantial amounts of new money for the improvement of public library services, for construction of public libraries, for the development of library services for the institutionalized and for the handicapped — all of these forcing more sophisticated systems of accounting, budgeting, planning, evaluating, and technical consulting;
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3. gave leadership responsibility for statewide multitype library networks, thus causing state library development agencies to widen their scope from public libraries alone to all types of libraries within a state; and

4. caused state libraries to move from an almost exclusive concentration on small rural public libraries to consideration of the more sophisticated demands of large urban public libraries and public library systems.

There can be no doubt that the state library development agency of 1978 is a vastly more sophisticated agency, better staffed, better equipped and more respected than it was in 1956, and that much of this growth is a result of LSA/LSCA. It also cannot be questioned that a strong state library is critical to an effective local-state-federal partnership for the improvement of public library services.

One evidence of the growing maturity of state libraries since LSA was enacted is the establishment of two professional organizations: the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA), a unit of ALA founded in 1956, and COSLA (mentioned earlier), an independent organization founded in 1973 of individuals who head state agencies responsible for library development. The scope and focus of these associations reflects the growing importance of state libraries as intermediaries between the federal government and local libraries.

Within the American Library Association, ASLA has responsibility for:

- planning of programs of study and policy for the development of total library service on a statewide basis, emphasizing the coordination and interdependence of all types of libraries . . . ; establishment, evaluation and promotion of standards for state library agencies; [and] . . . the development of policies, studies, and activities relating to (a) state library legislation, (b) state grants-in-aid and appropriations, and (c) relationship of state to federal and local government.20

Multitype library cooperation has dominated the attention of ASLA since Title III (Interlibrary Cooperation) of LSCA was enacted in 1966. In December 1976, the ASLA Board of Directors adopted a position statement which asserts that ASLA is "the unit within the American Library Association best able to promote and represent the interests and activities of libraries involved in statewide coordination, interlibrary cooperation and networking."21 In 1976, ASLA was one of only three ALA divisions which increased its membership, a trend which continued in 1977. In 1977, ASLA merged with the Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division of ALA. The fact that these two divisions share a major concern
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for service to the handicapped and institutionalized can be directly attributed to responsibilities engendered by LSCA Title IV-A and IV-B in the amendments of 1966.

COSLA has as its purpose "to interact with the federal officials with whom they [the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies] work and with each other on issues of mutual concern."22

Present concerns include (1) effective statewide planning and action to ensure library services adequate to meet the needs of all communities; (2) the strengthening of state library agencies, library systems, and effective networks; (3) federal legislation and federal appropriations for library services; (4) state-federal partnership implications of the proposed National Program for Library and Information Services; (5) state library services; (6) availability of state and federal documents; (7) improved library statistics programs; (8) continuing library education programs; and (9) state-federal responsibilities for talking book service to blind and physically handicapped.23

The range of concerns of both ASLA and COSLA is evidence of the priority which state library development agencies place on legislation and long-range national planning for library development. No one who has observed the Washington scene during the last twenty-two years could deny the close ties which have existed between USOE officials responsible for administering LSA/LSCA and state library administrators, or the leadership role played by the state libraries in influencing the Congress in its generally favorable attitude toward the legislation.

STATE AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES

No picture of state library development agencies would be complete without a discussion of state aid to public libraries and, more recently, to multitype library systems.

In all states, both state and federal funds for public libraries are channeled through state libraries. Commonly, state and federal funds are jointly used in the implementation of long-range plans for statewide library development. According to Alex Ladenson, "the rationale for state aid [to public libraries] is founded on the principle that education is a primary function of state government, and since public libraries are part of the education system, it follows that the state has a direct responsibility for their financial support."24 Following this rationale, a report to the Urban Library Council on Improving State Aid to Public Libraries25 recommends that state aid to public libraries be based on a percentage of the
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state aid to local school districts. The fact that, as of January 1977, 38 percent (nineteen) of state library development agencies are now administered under state departments of education would seem to suggest the practical feasibility of this approach. It cannot be denied that, despite Ladenson's rationale, state aid to libraries in all states is miniscule (less than 2 percent of the dollars appropriated for state school aid), and that no state has chosen as yet to tie together in one formula aid to both schools and public libraries.

A survey of fifty large metropolitan libraries conducted annually since 1973 by the Montgomery County (Maryland) Department of Public Libraries revealed a range in state aid received in 1976 of from $1235 (by the New Orleans Public Library), to $3,478,000 (by the New York Public Library). Of the forty-three libraries responding to the survey, five (11 percent) received less than $100,000, four (9 percent) received over $1 million, and sixteen of the respondents (37 percent) received no state aid. Overall in the nation, state aid accounted for only 11.7 percent of the total expended by public libraries (with 80.9 percent local and 7.4 percent federal). By the mid-1970s, fifteen states had made no provision for state aid to local public libraries and library systems. However, between 1962 and 1972, the number of states granting aid to local libraries jumped from twenty-one to thirty-three. State aid to public libraries is commonly distributed in three broad patterns:

1. **State aid to cooperative library systems** — This pattern is found in New York, Illinois, California, Michigan and Ohio. State aid is viewed as an effort to equalize library service throughout a region, and throughout a state, by offering incentive to local libraries to enter into cooperatives offering improved interlibrary loan and reference service, joint acquisition and technical processing, reciprocal in-person borrowing, staff development, and other services to strengthen the local member libraries.

2. **State aid to district library centers** — Aid is given to resource libraries capable of and willing to supply resources and services to local public libraries. The pattern is used in Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Jersey.

3. **Direct state aid to local public libraries** — Assistance helps individual public libraries to achieve prescribed minimum standards, as in Maryland. Michigan continues to provide state aid to local libraries — indeed, has substantially increased the per capita grants to local libraries — while also supporting regional public library systems.
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Frequently, as in Ohio, state funds for public libraries are used to supplement federal funds in the implementation of a plan for statewide library improvement, developed by the state library as part of the requirement for LSCA.

In summary, the record of state library administration of state and federal funds between 1956 and 1977 documents that these funds have resulted in greatly strengthened state library agencies and that the maturing state libraries have contributed significantly to the amount and effectiveness of the funding programs.
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Development and Coordination of Library Services to State Government

PETER J. PAULSON, ROGER C. GREER, ROGER McDONOUGH and BARBARA MINOR

IN RECENT YEARS the size, complexity, pervasiveness and burgeoning growth of the federal government have made it a prime focus of the nation's news media, and it consequently has captured the attention of the general public. A similar expansion has occurred at the level of state government, but without as much commentary or analysis by the press. One author refers to the "surprising discovery that the largest growth sector in the 1960s and 1970s is not national defense, automobile manufacturing, or even the federal government" but is instead state and local government. When the broadened scope of responsibilities, services and agency functions are considered, the changing nature and importance of state government is even more impressive.

Like the federal government, state governments have responded to the needs of a population beset by accelerating technological, social, economic, cultural, and political change. Thus there are state agencies, commissions, committees, bureaus, councils, and departments whose responsibilities and concerns range from atomic energy to drug addiction treatment, and from medical care to the aged to the development of the arts. This expanding scope of interests has meant that the business of state government, in all its facets, requires an expanding variety of information
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sources and services. Like the rest of society in this postindustrial era, state government has become heavily information-dependent.

How have state libraries responded to the burgeoning information needs of state government? Almost every state library gives some kind of information service to other agencies of state government and, indeed, many have been doing so since the early days of the Republic. The fifth chapter of *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* makes clear the state library's responsibility to provide quality services to other agencies of state government. The ways in which state libraries fulfill this responsibility, the variety of services offered, the intensity of effort, and the degree of coordination with other agencies varies widely among the fifty states.

As early as 1966, Phillip Monypenny noted a variety of provisions to supply service to legislative, executive and judicial branches of state government, with varying degrees of coordination between law libraries, historical societies, archives, departmental libraries, and general state library agencies. Some indication of the variety of such services offered by state library agencies may be gained from the 1977 Simpson survey, where state library agencies listed the following: library services to state government, consultant services to state agency libraries, research library for state agencies, special collection for state agencies, cooperation with agency and departmental libraries, reference services to state agencies and officials, centralized purchasing for agency libraries, centralized processing for agency libraries, audiovisual production and direction for state agencies, legislative reference library, reference services to legislature, special administrative and legislative library, legislative research, computerized online bill status, state law library as part of state library, current awareness services, depository for state publications, depository for historical records, distribution of state publications, index of state publications, published checklist of state documents, records management service for state government, consultant services to state institutions, and library services to state institutions. State library collections range in size from the large and comprehensive libraries of New York, Illinois and California, to the more typical 100,000-200,000 volume collections held by many states. A few state libraries, such as Maryland's, do not maintain collections, but provide reference service by other means.

In addition to the services and collections of the state library itself, agency or departmental libraries exist in many states. Although reliable and up-to-date data on these are difficult to obtain, a U.S. Office of Education (USOE) survey conducted in late 1977 of special libraries serving state government will provide such data when compiled and published.
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It is known, however, that the number of such libraries varies from state to state (New York has nearly fifty, Texas twenty-three, New Jersey thirteen). Similarly, the collection size, budget and number and level of staffing will vary widely from state to state, from major and sizable libraries (most typically court or law libraries) to office collections with part-time or no library staff.

The literature on the activities of state library agencies during the past fifteen years has clearly dealt more with statewide library development and extension services than with other functions. A similar bias was observed by Ralph Blasingame in a survey of library studies conducted between 1965 and 1969 based on an ERIC bibliography. He reported that only seven of the eighty-nine studies listed were concerned with services to state institutions (none specifically with services to state government), while two-thirds were studies of public libraries. A reading of the literature indicates that information services to state government have not been the leading edge of "state library" program development during this period.

This emphasis on statewide library programs is not surprising in view of the passage of the Library Services Act of 1956, and the attendant influx of federal funds to support this type of development. Forced to respond to pressure from the field and anxious to seize the opportunity to effectuate long-sought improvements in statewide planning and library system development, many state libraries clearly have not given the same attention to the development of information services to state government. Regulations of the federal Library Services and Construction Act specifically prohibited use of federal funds for service to state government.

Several states, however, have commissioned studies during this period designed to improve information service to state government. Studies in South Dakota, Ohio, Indiana and New York do indicate a growing concern and offer recommendations for implementation of programs in this area. Michael Jackley, in a 1965 analysis of the functions of the South Dakota Library Commission, opted for greater centralization. His recommendations take the form of central purchasing of library materials, with those appropriate to departmental libraries being placed on permanent loan with the departmental library as a branch of the central agency. Better access to materials held by archives, history and law would be promoted by close coordination with these agencies and the central library. He suggested that those agencies of state government whose major function is research, such as the Legislative Research Council, should be housed with the state library on the Capitol grounds.
Blasingame, in a 1968 study for Ohio, advocated that the Information Resources and Services Division of the state library become a governmental service unit with three new staff positions. Each of these new staff members would work with a specific group of logically chosen state agencies in order to become knowledgeable about the concerns and problems of these groups. This would enable the state library to provide strong leadership in planning the development of information services in state agencies, and provide individual advice and assistance to those agencies with their own libraries. Duplication of effort and materials would be avoided, and maximum exploitation of existing resources insured.

Recommendations by Genevieve Casey were made in 1970 in a study for the Indiana State Library. Detailed recommendations for the coordination of services to the legislature and to state agencies include: consultant services to agencies desiring aid in cataloging and classifying materials; better circulation procedures; the provision of more sophisticated bibliographical services; centralized purchasing and processing; periodical printouts and centralized records in the state library of the holdings of agencies; some form of current awareness service, with staff members working with administrators and librarians in the agencies assessing information needs and helping to establish acquisition policies; the use of existing TWX facilities by state employees; contracting for access to the collection and services of the Indiana University Medical Library for all state employees, especially those in the fields of health and environment; and the evaluation of the state library collection in terms of state government. To provide guidance in establishing priorities for comprehensive information services, a council of persons responsible for department libraries and staff libraries in institutions would meet regularly with state library staff to discuss common problems and concerns. Work with large state agencies might be organized with small advisory councils within the agencies to work directly with the staff member from the state library responsible for that agency. Financial arrangements could take the form of either increased budget for the state library to support additional services to agencies, or an interaccounting mechanism between the library agency and departments receiving special services. The state library would require additional funds in any case, primarily for new staff to implement these activities, but also for materials and equipment.

In 1974, the New York State Library undertook a major review of information services to state government in other states. To obtain up-to-date information on existing patterns of service from the other forty-nine state library agencies, a brief but pointed questionnaire was developed.
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and distributed in autumn 1974. A summary of responses to this questionnaire is given in Table 1. Followup visits were made to Texas, North Carolina and Ohio in this study, and additional data were gathered from Washington State. These visits provided information on both innovative programs and the varying approaches to state agency services taken in each of the states.

The Texas State Library, employing a former public library consultant, has emphasized cooperative activities with other state agency libraries in Austin, resulting in the development of a lively organization called State Agency Libraries of Texas (SALT). SALT publishes a newsletter, holds regular meetings and workshops, and has developed a number of cooperative projects, including a union list of serials and a Texas state documents project.

Building on the recommendations of the Blasingame report summarized above, the Ohio State Library has expanded its services in recent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Number of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Relationships (maintain or administer other libraries)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions &amp; Technical Processing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Coordinate purchases</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Centralize cataloging</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Maintain union lists</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information &amp; Reference Service:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Current awareness</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Subject bibliographies</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) “Spot research”</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Available to state agencies</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Technical services</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Information retrieval</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Orientation &amp; indoctrination</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) On-site “in-service”</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Programs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

years through an aggressive campaign to create awareness. According to Richard Fisher, Acting Head, Information and Reference Division:

Active marketing of the information provision capabilities of the State Library of Ohio is emphasized — through "sales calls," by presentations before department groups, through orientation and familiarization classes and tours, with follow-through in the form of individualized current awareness services which provide an ordering tool to the recipient. In the last year, more than a third of the circulation to state government personnel can be traced to the stimulus provided by the direct mail current awareness program. An important positive aspect is the system for delivery to the requestor whether he is remotely sited or contiguous to the library.12

Like Texas and Ohio, the North Carolina State Library created a special unit to provide service to state agencies, entitled the "Library Services to State Agencies Branch." The program differs from Texas's and Ohio's reference-centered operations in that a considerable portion of the unit's thrust is in the area of technical services. In 1973-74, this unit provided cataloging, consultative and other support services to fourteen agency libraries, including the large Public Health Service library, the Department of Public Instruction, and newly organized libraries in the Labor and State Personnel departments. In the latter instance, the state library provided the necessary in-service training to assist the agency in starting the new library and the department provided staff, furnishings, shelving and a card catalog.13

Central to an understanding of the Washington State arrangement is the fact that the state librarian is a cabinet officer reporting directly to the governor, and the state library is responsible for all library services for state government (except law), no matter where the facility served is located. Maryan Reynolds, former Washington State Librarian, described the program in refreshing nonbureaucratic language:

Some departments want us to operate fully and where they can generate federal funds for the service we enter into a "contract".... We pay no attention to the actual dollars so generated but render the service as needed. In some instances the department prefers to have the library staff on its payroll.... All materials are purchased and processed by us so that our catalog reflects the total information resource. The staffs are given orientation here so they realize we are back-up to their limited collection. The collections are weeded fre-
Services to State Government

quently and materials returned here for final decision as to retention.

Some offices around the state have small collections but we encourage the employees to use their local public library and to call us directly. In addition to subscribing to key professional publications, we Xerox tables of contents and route them around. People write their names by the article desired and we send a Xerox copy which they can keep or throw away.

It is a very wide ranging, flexible and effective program. Special consultative services are also available to state agencies by contract and have resulted in a comprehensive bibliography on disasters in Washington State for the Department of Emergency Services, and a combined subject index for environmental impact statements for the Department of Ecology.

The New York State Library, building on an 86-year history of special services to the legislature, established a Legislative and Governmental Services unit in 1977, directed by a member of the top-level administration. This unit will promote library services to state agencies aggressively, provide special research and bibliographic support, and conduct orientation and other programs for legislative and agency staff. Publications currently issued by the unit include Legislative Trends (an annotated list of state library acquisitions on topics of interest to the legislature), Spotlight (guides to basic resources in selected subject fields), Topics on Tap (short bibliographies on topics of current interest), and comprehensive literature searches on requested subjects. Resources offered include free search services on twenty-six computerized data banks.

Despite the considerable variety of state library programs described above, certain general norms or patterns emerge which suggest the following elements as essential in developing an effective program of state library services to state agencies.

1. **Attitude.** An aggressive, outreach approach is needed, based on a commitment to service and a wide-ranging, well-defined program to meet the needs of state agencies, officials and employees.

2. **Organization.** The state library should serve as the hub or center of library activity for state government, and should create a special office or unit which will provide leadership, coordination and the necessary monitoring of the program. At the least, it should assign one or more staff members to carry out this outreach program on a continuing and preferably full-time basis. Staff should be carefully chosen for many of the same qualities which characterize successful field consultants, as...
well as for their perception of reference and bibliographic needs, and of the operation and structure of state government.

3. *Agency Involvement.* As many agencies as possible should be involved, not only in the planning of service patterns, but in their refinement and evaluation as well. Even if the cooperating agency has no library per se, it should assign someone to work with the state library coordinator.

4. *Shared Activities/Shared Financing.* Services which are beyond the capability of the individual cooperating agency should be explored carefully and implemented as practicable, including centralized ordering and processing of library materials, union lists and other methods of bibliographic control, central computerized data banks with terminal access as required, cooperative storage and materials retirement plans, etc. Shared financing on some unit cost basis, by means of contractual or other arrangements, is desirable and tends to stimulate mutual involvement, respect and commitment, and provides a basis for evaluating cost-effectiveness.

5. *Visibility, Direct Contact with Administration.* In order to gain the support of the administration and the legislature, the state library and its program of service to state government needs visibility, a voice and some degree of clout. This may be achieved organizationally, with cabinet rank for the state librarian or with strong advisory groups who can make their voices heard by the power structure. It may likewise be achieved personally, through the visibility and personal dynamics of the chief state library officer and the program specialists; and functionally, through the provision of services of demonstrable value and reliable quality. All these avenues may be necessary and should be bulwarked with an effective public relations program including publicity, orientation workshops and appropriate accountability through regular reports.

The data assembled in this article indicate that state library agencies generally accept information service to state government as a primary responsibility. Although this function does not appear to have been the "leading edge" of state library program development in recent years, there is evidence of increased interest and innovative activity in a number of states. As state government expands its interests, as legislative, judicial and executive agencies become increasingly information dependent, and as the relationship of information availability to cost-effectiveness and productivity becomes clearer, it may be expected that information service...
to state government will become an increasingly critical area of state library agency activity.
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Library Services for the Blind, Handicapped, and Institutionalized

BARRATT WILKINS and
CATHARINE COOK

In assessing the development of library services for the institutionalized and for the blind and physically handicapped as administered by state library agencies, it is important to consider several elements. These include state library organization for such services, legislation, funding, the development of standards, and networking.

Major developments in the field of services to institutionalized and to the blind and physically handicapped began with the enactment of Title IV-A and Title IV-B of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) in 1966. Under this title, state library agencies began planning for extending library service to the institutionalized in state-supported mental health, mental retardation and correctional facilities, and for further extending services to the blind and physically handicapped. Plans for implementation were developed, and in a majority of state library agencies, a special consultant was employed. From these meager beginnings, institutional library services have developed during the 1970s.

A review of the current position of institutional library services in state library agencies indicates that as of 1977, all but nine state library agencies employed an individual to coordinate institutional library services. This person, with secretarial support, has generally been the entire complement of staff. In some of the smaller states, the program is administered by a state library agency head. In others, the institutional library program has two or more consultants and is a separate section of
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the library development unit within the state library agency. The existence of a position at the state library agency level, when filled by a dedicated person, has led to numerous tangible results, particularly in focusing attention on institutional library services. Numerous seminars, workshops and programs have been successfully implemented by these consultants, and the quality of the library program has thereby been improved.

Within the American Library Association, the traditional home for institutional consultants has been the Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division (HRLSD, formerly Association of Hospital and Institutional Libraries). Numerous committees addressing the needs of the institutionalized and of the blind and physically handicapped have been formed, and much work has been accomplished in publication of standards, bibliographies and guides. In 1971, a decision was made to form an institutional library discussion group within the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA). This discussion group, limited to those individuals in state agencies having responsibilities for institutionalized services statewide or an aspect of institutionalized services, has provided a forum for exchange of ideas.

Because institutional library consultants are the focus of statewide developments in institutional library services, they have become the leaders in many of the activities of HRLSD. Because an ALA division may speak for the American Library Association in that division's area of special responsibility, the state institutional library consultants have provided considerable direction in the development of library services for the institutionalized through the association. Perhaps the most significant area in which state library agency consultants have influenced institutional services is in the development of library standards. Many of these standards have been developed in conjunction with other national associations. Some recent examples include: "Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions," completed in February 1976, and approved by the American Correctional Association (ACA) and ALA in 1977; "Standards for Library Services in Juvenile Correctional Institutions," published in 1975 by ACA and ALA; Library Service Standards for Jails, completed in 1977 and approved by ALA in 1978; Standards for Library Services in Mental Health Institutions, initiated in 1977; Standards for Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, also initiated in 1977; Standards for Library Services for the Deaf, initiated in 1978; and Standards for Library Services in Institutions for the Mentally Retarded, completed in 1978. Many of these standards will be utilized in national accreditation programs. For instance, elements of the correctional library
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standards are being utilized in the ACA Accreditation Program of Institutional Services, and the standards for the blind and physically handicapped are being developed under the aegis of the Library of Congress.

While there are a number of service delivery patterns among states for institutional services, most can be categorized as: (1) state library agencies contracting with local public libraries to provide services to the institutionalized, (2) state library agencies contracting to supplement library services with other state departments having primary responsibility for institutions, or (3) state library agencies providing direct service to institutions. It is very difficult to determine any trends in service delivery patterns since the states are so diverse. Consequently, what works in one state does not necessarily work in another. In past years, there has been some weakening of the service delivery patterns in which the state library agency contracts with local public libraries to provide institutional services. This pattern has been replaced by centralized administration and delivery of service from the state library agency itself.

It is too early to determine the effects of the changes in LSCA funding which revised the floor of minimum support from the basic $39,500 which was established in 1971 to a floor determined by expenditures for the second preceding year. Those states spending far in excess of the $39,500 may now continue with the amount expended in FY 1977 for the FY 1979 appropriation. There is a probability that these mandated higher expenditures will improve institutional library service programs. From institutional reports, however, there appears to be a trend toward lessening state support, which considerably inhibits institutional libraries.

Service patterns in institutions are changing. For example, library services in institutions for the mentally retarded are becoming less traditional. As educable residents leave the institutions, libraries must meet the needs of a more profoundly retarded population. As educable mentally retarded persons enter their communities, it becomes the responsibility of public libraries to address their library needs. To date, public libraries have been slow in assuming this responsibility.

In the field of mental health, large state hospitals are closing in favor of smaller community-based facilities. At least one state is encouraging public libraries to purchase TTYs (teletypewriters) for hearing-impaired users. Perhaps one of the most striking trends in library services for the handicapped is in the development of new equipment, such as braille cassettes, talking calculators, equipment which reads inkprint audibly, and the further development of braille reproducers.

The development of new services and the deinstitutionalization of
people formerly confined to institutions have led to the importance of networking among libraries. For instance, library service to the institutionalized is part of the total service program of system libraries in Illinois. Texas and New Jersey school districts which serve correctional facilities are linked with public libraries and their respective state library agencies. Multistate centers and subregional libraries for the blind and physically handicapped are developing connections between the Library of Congress, state library agencies and local public libraries. Although this sophisticated network for the delivery of library services to the blind and physically handicapped exists, it has not been duplicated for library services to the institutionalized.

It is expected that the growing importance of implementing the National Commission on Library and Information Science’s Goals for Action, the concomitant emphasis on equal access for all citizens, and the development of local, state and national network delivery systems will focus attention on the inclusion of institutional libraries in the national program. It is also expected that, as state library agencies implement the Goals for Action and as the library community searches for new initiatives and directions for federal funding, attention will need to be given to seeking more local and state funding for such services.
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Public education in our democracy has been aptly described by Thomas Jefferson as "the most legitimate engine of government." The responsibility for developing education policies and standards, offering consultation and research services, accrediting institutions, certifying qualified personnel, and providing other services designed to establish or improve the educational system has been, by tradition, assigned to state departments of education or public instruction. As recently as 1975, this statement appeared in the publication *Media Programs: District and School*: "The state is legally responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of education and the education agency prescribed by its legislature to provide leadership in the area of media programs."

As state libraries were founded, some were organized as components of education departments, while others were separate units. School library supervision, from its inception in Wisconsin in 1891, has been assigned sometimes to the curriculum area of education departments and sometimes to the state library agency. School library supervisors were appointed in New York in 1904, in Washington in 1909, and in Minnesota in 1911. The need for good school libraries was underscored in 1915 by Henry Johnson, professor of history at Columbia University:

> While the textbook is in the United States the chief instrument of school instruction... a conviction has developed, especially during the last twenty years, that the textbook should be supplemented by collateral reading. The need of reference books was strongly empha-
sized by the Madison Conference [1892] "Recitations alone," it was declared, "cannot possibly make up proper teaching. . . . It is absolutely necessary, from the earliest to the last grades, that there should be parallel reading of some kind."

Almost a century earlier, Horace Mann had warned: "Pupils, who, in their reading, pass by names, references, allusions, without searching, at the time, for the facts they imply, not only forego valuable information, which they may never afterwards acquire, but they contract a habit of being contented with ignorance."

State supervision of school library programs grew slowly in the 1920s and early 1930s. In the South it was encouraged and supported by the General Education Board (GEB) of the Rockefeller Foundation. Funds from this board, because of its concern for improving education for blacks and southerners, helped to provide salaries for persons in these library supervision positions. This was begun in Virginia, North Carolina and Kentucky, and was then extended to Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana and Tennessee. The GEB also assisted persons in these positions to secure additional professional training. Among those people were many whose names have since become familiar as leaders in the school library field — Mary Peacock Douglas (North Carolina), Ruth Theobald (Kentucky), Charlie Dickinson (Virginia), Nancy Jane Day (South Carolina), Willie Welch (Alabama), and Martha Parks (Tennessee). Georgia financed its own supervisor. As the grants expired, all of the states except Kentucky took over the funding of their own staffs; later, Kentucky did reestablish its funding.

Leadership was developing in other parts of the nation as well as the South, and in 1939 the State School Library Supervisors began as an informal organization. This group met annually at the same time and place as the ALA annual conference. The Canadian provincial supervisors were invited to meet with them beginning in 1956. Among the early presidents were Agnes Krarup (Oregon), Lois Place (Michigan), Martha Parks (Tennessee), Mary Peacock Douglas (North Carolina), and Mattie Ruth Moore (Texas). Their first constitution, adopted in 1961, cited the following objectives:

1. To become informed about school library programs, activities and developments in the various states.
2. To give united support to national effort for the development of school libraries.
School Library/Media Supervision

3. To share ideas and discuss worthwhile activities for a leadership role in the promotion of desirable school library programs at the state and national level.13

In 1960 a report by Mary Helen Mahar, State Department of Education Responsibilities, was published by the U.S. Office of Education. It indicates that fifteen states had delegated responsibilities for school libraries to state departments, while forty-four states provided for their regulation by state boards of education. Two states had no laws or regulations for school libraries in any agency.14 The report states that although in some states the responsibilities carried out seemed to be minimal, all state departments of education did perform some function for them.15

At present, eighteen state library agencies have been assigned responsibility for the school library/media program in their states. In the remaining states, school library supervision has become part of the curriculum area, with support services or similar divisions or bureaus within departments of public instruction or education. However, assigning responsibility for school library supervision to an agency has not meant that qualified professionals are employed. By 1959, the Mahar report indicates, only thirty-four professionals were employed as supervisors. Of these, Georgia and Virginia each employed three full-time supervisors, while Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina were each served by two people. The remaining twenty professionals were scattered among all the other states.16

In 1961 a document entitled Responsibilities of State Departments of Education for School Library Services was published by the Council of Chief State School Officers.17 This 22-page policy statement was "designed to assist state departments of education in the development of excellent services for elementary and secondary school libraries."18 It goes on to state that its guidelines were based on the premise that improvement of instruction is assumed to be a major function of state departments of education.

The statement outlines the principles for state-level administration of school library supervisory services. These include: (1) planning state programs for school librarians, (2) supervision and leadership, (3) coordination and cooperation, (4) certification of school librarians, (5) standards for school libraries, (6) statistics and research, and (7) budgeting and finance.19 This policy statement was prepared by librarians, library supervisors, commissioners and assistant commissioners of education and superintendents of instruction, as well as other educators.20 It became a
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model for policy statements or position papers for the agencies providing school library service in several states such as Pennsylvania. Now badly outdated, the document nonetheless remains as a focal point for many contemporary programs.

The advent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) with its Title II designed specifically to support school libraries provided administrative funds to state agencies in November 1965. School library supervisors were appointed for the first time in some states while staffs were increased in others. The ESEA Title II personnel in some states were not part of the school library supervisory staff. A review of the School Library Supervisors Directory published in 1966-67, 1967-68, and 1968-69 indicates offices and persons assigned this responsibility. Even with this kind of support, professional school library supervision was not assured.

As the federal funding source began to erode in the early 1970s, some states cut back or dismissed persons they had employed. The fall of 1973 saw many programs fade and others disappear. The State School Library Supervisors Association merged with the Association of Chief State School Audiovisual Officers in 1974-75. The resulting organization is designed to give more visible support to library/media programs.

In the eyes of many district- and building-level library/media persons, state supervision suggests a big stick that can be used to force reluctant administrators to provide staff, facilities, equipment and materials for school library/media programs in sufficient quantity to satisfy the wishes of the stick-wielder. Through the years, however, most state supervisors have seen their role differently. Richard Darling wrote in 1963 that he believed a large part of the supervisor's job was to convince others of the importance of good school library service. He identified cooperation with curriculum specialists within departments of education as a prime means of accomplishing that goal.

An article in the Oklahoma Librarian describes the work of the state supervisor in these words:

Title II of ESEA also provides funds for a school library coordinator and that term is frequently used interchangeably in printed material with supervisor and consultant. The position is held by Elizabeth Geis... In 1966 the Library Resources Division itself issued a paper in which it stated: "The state school library consultant shall... stimulate every school to reach or exceed state and national standards... aid in improving proficiency of librarians by... providing consultant help in selection of all materials (audiovisual as well as
the printed word), technical organization, effective utilization of library resources, planning library quarters, selecting furnishing, and equipment. ... The competence, experience, and willingness of Mrs. Geis notwithstanding, it seems a difficult, if not impossible task for a staff of one. 23

The names of many state supervisors could be substituted for that of Elizabeth Geis.

In May 1969 a 2-week institute for state media personnel, school library supervisors and audiovisual supervisors was held in Kalamazoo at Western Michigan University. Designed to assist state leaders in planning and developing strategies for implementing the 1969 standards, the institute provided speakers such as Frances Henne, Mae Graham and Henry Brickell to stimulate both thought and imagination. As small groups worked together, participants took a realistic look at the emerging changes in the role of supervision. No longer defining it as consultative or regulatory, the supervisors recognized a new identity they would have to develop. Mary Frances K. Johnson summarized this in American Libraries:

The following functions are suggested as paramount: 1. Stimulating and coordinating statewide planning involving all types of libraries, to meet the individual needs of users. ... 2. Promoting the network concept for optimum use of resources. ... 3. Providing guidance in special aspects of library service. ... 4. Interpreting library service. ... to the library profession generally. A state library agency comprehensive in its interests can do much to demonstrate the interrelatedness of all library service. 24

The group analyzed the implications that Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) would have on their work. This included the ability to assess needs, set priorities, establish objectives, test activities, evaluate and recycle resulting information, and communicate data. They recognized their need to develop skill in handling problems resulting from social changes such as student unrest, taxpayer revolts and growing teacher (including media persons) militancy. The word media was used to describe all professionals working in library and audiovisual roles. Mae Graham of Maryland spoke directly to the changing role of these supervisors when she cited the need for a revolution in school librarianship led by leaders who have "a clearly defined objective, and ... are courageous, persuasive, fearless — and ruthless," 25
When the new revision of the standards, *Media Programs: District and School*, were in final preparation, the supervisors were again in session at Western Michigan in August 1974. The first institute had welded the state leaders into a communicating, cooperating organization that resulted in the merger described earlier. At the second institute, which lasted only one week, the supervisors were joined by the presidents of the state school library and audiovisual associations to evaluate progress made since 1969. The attendees, working as teams from their respective states, defined needs for services yet to be met.

With the reduction of federal funds in the 1970s, cutbacks in state programs were inevitable. The number of state personnel was diminishing. Some became primarily "housekeepers" for their state agencies, having less and less contact with district and building persons; even assignment to federally funded programs was reduced.

David Bender recently examined the current role and function of school library/media supervisory personnel and reported his conclusions in *School Library Journal* in December 1975. Having served at the supervisory level in both Ohio and Maryland and having worked with supervisors in many other states, he observed that six basic premises seemed to form the foundation for future media program supervision on the state level. These include a team approach to media management and supervision, a thorough knowledge of the clientele to be served, and the development of a method to measure the suitability of the service provided. The remaining components include an understanding of the needs of the persons served, the maintenance of a record of the operational program area, and finally a statement of the responsibility of state education agencies for media programs.

The state departments of education provide for school library/media service in two ways, with supervisors located in one of two places. Eighteen states, including Maryland and New Jersey, place these supervisory people in state library agencies. In other states, these persons serve in curricular or support service areas as in Pennsylvania. Persons serving in each type of organization feel their organizational structure is best. When located in a state library, staff members feel that they have more visibility. They also believe that financial support is more easily available to them. A knowledgeable librarian in this structure reviews the budget, for example, and battles for funds. Interlibrary cooperation and networking are easier when office suites are shared or when opportunities are available to travel with the people responsible for those services in public or other libraries.
Arguments for placing school library/media supervisory persons in curricular agencies were summarized by John Rowell, who has served as a state consultant or supervisor in Michigan and Pennsylvania. Writing in *School Library Journal*, he observed that "school" in the title of these persons was the "generic determinant," and that their bases of operations were properly in the education complex. When queried about their roles in this kind of structure, some consultants felt they could better coordinate and demonstrate their role in curriculum planning and implementation when they were associated with curriculum specialists. Some expressed difficulty in demonstrating their role in serving a total school program from that vantage (or rather disadvantage) point. Curriculum personnel serve a specific portion of the school program. This type of limitation is almost unconsciously imposed on library/media people. On the other hand, several felt it was easier to participate in in-service workshops and continuing education programs when they were identified with curriculum personnel.

All persons interviewed cited either directly or indirectly one major factor affecting the success or failure of supervision on the state (or indeed on any level): the effectiveness of the person as a supervisor. In successful supervision for future programs, they believed the humanistic approach would be centered on a dynamic helping relationship between supervisor and supervisee, whether the latter be persons, districts or regions. This type of supervision would involve an interplay of the goals of all persons involved in a state's education program, including: parents; students; teachers; building, district and regional administrators; as well as state-level personnel. It implies that supervisors must be able to use learning theories and instructional strategies. The individual in this position must include among personal skills the ability to use data gathering techniques and to analyze resulting information. The supervisor will have to be able to act as a communications facilitator, whether the communication be oral, verbal or computerized. The ability to see education as a whole process and to recognize the manner in which components interact will be a prerequisite. Supervision, in short, has become a means to achieve a goal rather than remaining a monitoring and directing procedure.

One term well describes this new role: *change agent*. Supervisors, or as they are more frequently called, consultants or coordinators, become part of the planning process, become more accountable for their roles in program development, and have a greater effect on the final consumer of their work, the teacher and the student. The upcoming 1979 White
House Conference on Libraries and Information Services and the governors' conferences preceding it will make few, if any, direct references to the supervision of school library/media programs. However, it will be difficult to describe the state of the library and information art in the nation without including the results of their work. Recommendations for future growth will have to include them. These state persons are planning and helping to demonstrate innovative programs, seeking adequate funding, participating in networking, and generally helping to improve the school instructional program. Although some states are continuing to operate with minimal staffs, those with a real commitment to the role of library/media programs will continue to mature and adapt their relationships to their schools to meet the changing needs and demands of their clientele.
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The Role of State Library Agencies in Continuing Education

NETTIE B. TAYLOR

Continuing education for professional and support staff in all the professions has been receiving increasing emphasis in recent years. The need to update current practice through new knowledge and insight of societal conditions and client needs has had its impact in the library and information science fields. The advances in automation and technology, the proliferation of knowledge, and the growing recognition of the need to provide access to the rapid delivery of information in many formats have given priority emphasis to continuing library education as a means of responding to the changes taking place in our society. State library agencies have a continuing responsibility for a planned approach to the development of library and information services in each state. This planned approach includes the need for the continuing education of library personnel to meet changing service demands.

This article reviews the background for the continuing education role of the state library agency, the development of continuing education for libraries, the implications of these developments, current programs in progress, and trends which may indicate future change.

Historically, state library agencies have had the responsibility for statewide library development, particularly public library development. The provision of advice, assistance and consultant services has been one of the primary means employed. Included in the advisory activities were the conducting of workshops and other educational and staff development programs. State library agencies having responsibility for school library de-
velopment as units of state departments of education carried on similar programs and activities to improve school libraries.

Following the enactment of the federal Library Services Act (LSA), state library agencies moved into a new era of growth and influence. The requirement to develop state plans and the attendant emphasis on establishing libraries, creating library systems and extending library services created the need for staff development and continuing education activities as a major component in the achievement of desired objectives.

A U.S. Office of Education study of state library extension resources and services compares the data from 1955-56 prior to LSA with the resources and services of state library agencies in 1960-61. For the purposes of this article, the report of consultant activity and training programs during this period is of interest. Forty-eight states reported 16,466 field visits compared to 6544 in 1955-56; 44 states held or sponsored some 1600 training programs for over 56,000 persons from 1956 to 1961. These programs served professional (36 percent) and nonprofessional (22 percent) personnel and public library trustees (26 percent).

The responsibility of state library agencies for the planning and administration of federal funds under the Library Services Act of 1956 and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) of 1964 gave added impetus to national documents and conferences concerned with improving the capabilities of state library agencies. These reports emphasize a stronger focus on goals, purposes and long-range plans with the attendant need for highly skilled consultants and related staff development activities in the field in order to implement the statewide program.

As set forth in the Standards for Library Functions at the State Level: "the state library agency should promote and provide a program of continuing education for library personnel at all levels as well as for trustees.

It suggests that the achievement of this goal may be attained through cooperation with library schools, professional associations and sponsors of meetings and workshops.

All state library agencies view continuing education and consulting services as a major responsibility of the agency. In a recent survey, about one-half of the state library agencies considered the continuing education responsibility to be a shared responsibility and not solely the responsibility of the state library agency. In recent years national activities of major importance have contributed to an increased awareness of continuing education responsibility and to an increase in planned activities of state library agencies.

In the regional hearing conducted in 1972 by the National Commission...
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sion on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), one of the identified priorities was the availability of continuing education for the development and maintenance of competencies which are needed to deliver the library and information services required by the nation. Subsequently, NCLIS funded a study in 1973 to recommend a nationwide program of continuing education which culminated in Continuing Library and Information Science Education. This report made recommendations which eventually led to the formation of the Continuing Library Education Network Exchange (CLENE). The NCLIS report outlines the development of library continuing education and comments on the necessity for continuing lifelong learning. Based on responses from the field, an operational definition of continuing education was developed which includes the following:

1. the implication that lifelong learning is necessary to keep the individual up to date,
2. assurance that the individual carries the basic responsibility for his/her own development,
3. diversification to new areas of interest, and
4. involvement in educational activities beyond those considered necessary for entrance into the field.

In comparison with other professions, the librarians felt that continuing education should be provided for all levels of personnel, not solely professional, and that it not be limited to improved competence for the job held now or aspired to in the future.

In its plan for continuing education, the report suggests roles and responsibilities of the individual agencies and organizations in order to coordinate efforts, including those of the individual employee, the employing library, the state library agency, the library schools, and state, regional and national associations. Major responsibilities outlined for the state library agencies include coordination of continuing education programs on a statewide basis, identification of continuing education needs of the state, provision of a link between librarians in the state and national and regional plans, and the appointment of a continuing education coordinator on the state library agency staff. The other major responsibility is three-fold: the planning, implementation and evaluation of statewide continuing education programs based on identified needs.

These initial efforts to provide a suggested outline of responsibilities continued to receive attention through CLENE as a newly formed national organization. State library agencies which joined CLENE as sustaining members, as well as the state library agency directors and continuing education staff members, influenced some of the priorities of CLENE. In 1976 CLENE received a USOE, Title II-B grant to provide an “Extended Institute to Train State Library Agency Personnel to Im-
plement and/or Strengthen Statewide Systems of Continuing Education for Library/Information/Media Personnel.” The workshop phase of the institute was held November 7-13, 1976, at the Illinois State Library. Continuing education personnel from twenty-five state library agencies met to develop planning and implementation skills in continuing education. For participating states the institute spurred development of statewide coordinated planning among providers of continuing education in the state.9

During this period several regional consortia of states were formed with a primary concern for continuing education. CELS (Continuing Education for Library Staffs in the Southwest) grew out of a survey of members of six state library associations where the need for continuing education was strongly expressed. State library agencies are major financial contributors to this program. The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) had a major continuing education component funded in large part by five state library agencies. The Western Council of State Libraries has succeeded WICHE in this regional effort.

In preparation for this article, state library agencies were asked to report on activities in needs assessment, programs in continuing education, the extent of cooperation of other agencies in planning and implementing continuing education programs, recent changes and improvements in state library agency continuing education programs, and trends and new developments in continuing education. Forty responses to the questionnaire were received. State library replies indicate that all state library agencies have a responsibility for continuing education. Several have stated that the agency statutes define this responsibility but most suggest that agency planning documents cover these functions.

Cooperation with other continuing education agencies is extensive; 63 percent of the respondents work closely with state library associations, and 34 percent with library schools. State universities, higher education commissions, state departments of education, and other agencies were also listed. State staff are active participants on the continuing education committees of other agencies, and either library associations or the state library agency has formed a continuing education committee for coordinated planning and programs. The formation of continuing education planning committees representing all types of libraries is a recent development in many states. These committees are in various stages of the development of guidelines, policy statements or state plans for coordinated continuing education programs. Examples of plans underway can be found in Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and Louisiana. Oklahoma reported the formation of a state committee in 1978, Maryland in 1977. Pennsylvania is planning a
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special project in 1978 with a director and task force to develop continuing education coordination. States participating in the Western Council of State Libraries and CELS are the primary planners for the continuing education program of the regional consortia. Coordinated planning appears to be one of the more significant activities now underway.

Continuing education needs were identified by the majority through surveys and questionnaires at state, regional or local levels; consultations with local staffs and "perceived changes in the library climate," evaluation of current programs and of new national library trends and programs were also cited. The responses did not indicate the types of libraries involved in the needs assessment process. The influence of continuing education committees and recently formed task forces has not yet been felt to any great degree in the development of continuing education programs as reported.

The continuing education programs sponsored by state library agencies are directed primarily to public library staffs, although program offerings to reach a broader group were listed. All respondents listed public library directors and public library professional staff as participants; twenty-six listed nonprofessional public library staffs. However, twenty-one listed academic librarians; twelve, school librarians; twelve, multitype participants; and two listed institutional and special library staffs.

Principal topics in continuing education programs covered a wide range including copyright, networking, automation, planning, management, public relations and audiovisual materials. However, over one-third of the respondents offered basic or refresher courses to public library staffs in such areas as reference, children's services, storytelling, and young adult services. A few states mentioned law materials, oral history, censorship, and government documents. Workshops on community needs and development of special services to disadvantaged, senior citizens and other groups reflect the outreach program priorities of some states.

Wisconsin reported a continuing education program for public library and staff through the University of Wisconsin using the Education Telephone Network (ETN). Once a month for about two hours, several topics are discussed by a group or panel. Local libraries may purchase sets of materials related to the program. Topics covered in the last two years include: networks, censorship, school-public library cooperation, the independent adult learner, deaf awareness, and service to special groups. Alaska and Hawaii reported the use of video cassettes to bring continuing education programs to remote areas, and West Virginia reported that the
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capability now exists there to provide this form of continuing education programming.

Frequently, continuing education programs sponsored by the state library agency are executed by contract with a university or other educational organization. Some states (such as Ohio) do this extensively; others (such as Maryland) use this method for institutes in such areas as management.

Recent changes and improvements in the continuing education activities of state library agencies reflected the increased emphasis and direction given a planned and coordinated program. The establishment of a new position of continuing education coordinator was listed by five states (Alabama, Florida, Idaho, Maine and Oklahoma); assignment of this responsibility to an established position was listed by many states. Several states were engaged in “train the trainer” programs with the shift to local library systems of responsibility for staff development and training in their own institutions, particularly for nonprofessional staff. State programs will provide for more advanced and intensive training and attempt to ensure continuity in program offerings. At least two states—North Carolina and Maryland—provide reimbursement to public library staffs for attending out-of-state institutes.

The responsibility of the continuing education coordinator for developing and disseminating information on continuing education offerings in-state and nationally; for maintaining a master calendar; for providing continuing liaison with library schools, library associations and other educational agencies; and for assuring a program of needs identification and developing plans to meet needs were mentioned. These activities reflect to a marked degree the influence of the CLENE report and subsequent programs and activities of CLENE. It should be noted that state library agency personnel active in CLENE are frequently those most active in continuing education development in their respective states.

Several states commented that NCLIS and CLENE had provided the impetus for renewed continuing education activity at the state level; one saw CLENE as the key to noteworthy, effective state library agency work in continuing education. The continuing education programs of CLENE itself provide state library agency personnel the opportunity to gain knowledge, exchange information, and encourage the further coordinated development of continuing education activities of state library agencies.

Changes and trends seen as important and needed for further development of continuing education include the development of more non-
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traditional methods for the delivery of continuing education programs, as well as education techniques more suitable to adult learners. States expressed the need for improved needs assessment and evaluation skills and techniques.

At least one-half the states were interested in a recognition system for continuing education. This seemed to be the national trend of greatest interest. Some states are currently using the continuing education unit (CEU) in institutions of higher education for library programs. CEUs are directly related to certification in several states. South Dakota State Library provides voluntary certification for public libraries based on CEUs. Michigan and North Carolina have proposals for recertification of public librarians through approved programs in continuing education and the CEU. The "college without walls" program in New Hampshire and Vermont has prompted library staff to indicate that continuing education programs should provide some academic credit.

A nationally recognized CEU program for librarians was specifically cited by several respondents. The study recently completed by CLENE, Model Continuing Education Recognition System in Library and Information Science, was first discussed in January at a CLENE meeting and is to be further examined and discussed at a national convention sponsored by NCLIS in June 1978. State library agencies will need to give the proposal and comments from the field serious study, since it has implications for an increased state library agency role.

This article has attempted to provide a summary of the development of continuing education responsibilities in state library agencies as viewed in the literature and reported from the agencies themselves. A few other points and issues need to be raised. State library agencies have a continuing responsibility for the improvement of the quality of library services in the state. In that respect they are in a unique position to assess the impact of continuing education programs on library services in the state, and have a responsibility to do so. There is no documentation to determine whether this is being done, but the need to develop the evaluation and performance criteria for this purpose is evident. In the author's opinion this would lead to fewer programs of longer duration, involving participants in more appropriate learning situations and plans for implementation in their libraries.

Another issue is the responsibility of the individual for his own continuing education and for the pursuit of programs that satisfy individual needs and interests. State library agency programs are geared primarily
to the perceived needs of the institution and to the priorities of the state library plans and objectives. To the extent that these coincide with individual needs and interests and that participation is voluntary and encouraged, the interests of both can be served. By publicizing continuing education programs at state, regional or national levels, state library agencies are helping individuals to become aware of other opportunities. Each state library agency needs to define its own role in continuing library education in relation to those of library schools, library associations and other providers of continuing education programs.

State library agencies should continue efforts to make possible situations in which innovators and practitioners can reach each other, invent ways to be mutually instructive and supportive, define steps by which to strengthen the drive toward improved continuing education programs, and undertake cooperative endeavors that ultimately may matter greatly in the capacity of library personnel to deliver the library and information services needed in today's society.
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The Education of Library Development Personnel

MARVIN W. MOUNCE

This article does not attempt to provide a total survey of the educational characteristics of library development personnel. Such a study was included in Marie A. Long’s The State Library Consultant at Work in 1965, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to replicate that research and bring it up to date. It is rather the intention here to make some generalizations about the character of the needed education of library development personnel, part of which may be of a formal nature and part of which more appropriately should be obtained through the more informal methods of continuing education. Some of this latter body of knowledge, incidentally, may be obtained through state library agency continuing education efforts intended for the general benefit of other librarians in the state, but there is no intention of duplicating the information contained in Taylor’s article on the outwardly directed continuing education activities of the state agency.

It seems axiomatic that the education of personnel in a field should reflect the demands of the profession. In this paper observations will be made on some of the changes which have taken place in the demands made by the profession, followed by an attempt to identify some of the competencies which seem to be necessary. Discussion will conclude with observations on the general response from the total educational system to provide these competencies.

Marvin W. Mounce is a doctoral candidate, School of Library Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, and former director, Bureau of Library Development, State Library of Pennsylvania.
Changes in Library Development Work

Most important of the changes in recent years has been that from the strictly advisory, consultative role of state agencies to one which emphasizes more administration and coordination. It is difficult to find material which synthesizes a description of this continually changing role, but an article by John Humphry in *Bookmark* gives an example of a case study of the profound organizational and, implicitly, functional changes found in the New York state library agency.2 The changes are seen to have been the result not only of changes in the field of operation but also of changes in the financial administrative structure invoked by federal and state laws involving library service.

Most funds channeled to state library development agencies are not directly intended to make them more effective. Federal funds offered through the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) are designated primarily for the improvement of library service throughout the states. However, the states are charged with the task of devising plans of ever-increasing sophistication for the use of these funds in implementing whatever set of objectives is currently stated as part of the national goals. Over a period of twenty years, the Library Services Act (LSA) moved from a rurally-oriented program to one which no longer mentions priorities for rural libraries but does have special provisions to assure urban areas of receiving preferential treatment under certain conditions.5

State aid to local libraries and systems is also channeled through state library development agencies, with responsibility lying there for the development of regulations, guidelines and administration to provide the wisdom not specified in the body of the law. Furthermore, there is a reluctance in some legislatures to spend money in the state capital bureaucracy which cannot be demonstrated to have been of local benefit back in the districts.

Thus, the needs not only for numbers but also for the types of state agency personnel have continued to change through the years, and have often not received adequate attention at either the state or local levels. As little attention as possible will be given here to the quantity of work; rather, emphasis will be on the kind of work now being assigned to state agencies and the consequences of this for the personnel of state agencies.

The Monypenny study of state libraries,4 the Nelson study of state agencies8 and the ALA Standards for Library Functions at the State Level9 were all indications of quasi-official recognition of the changing roles of such agencies. One of the most fortuitously-timed pieces of library
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research — Long's study *The State Library Consultant at Work* — was completed and published at the height of the transitional stage of such development work in 1965. One can only regret that it could not have been preceded and followed in ten years by similar studies that would have illustrated the rapid change in the roles of these persons.

In addition to the Long research, there were results from a conference in the New England states which produced a list of additional needs for education for library consultants, an Allerton Park conference on the changing role of the library consultant, and a document prepared by the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA) Library Education Division (LED) Interdivisional Committee which enumerated with considerable specificity those competencies needed by development personnel and a strategy for providing them.

Since 1970, however, there seems to have been less emphasis and publication on the matter, although not necessarily a lack of action. An appreciation of the need is seen through the regional meetings of state library agency personnel from time to time, as well as in the two major efforts of the federal government to provide significant continuing education workshops — the 1971-72 seminar on planning and evaluation sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the 1976 workshop on management and administration, funded by NCLIS (although the latter was criticized in some quarters). Nevertheless, the impact of such workshops on numerous states is significant. These efforts all stand on one common admission: the state library agency's role has changed and with it the nature of work and competencies demanded of its employees.

COMPETENCIES AND NEEDS

To consider education of state agency development personnel, one must identify the role of such persons in order to state requisite competencies. Viewing development as encompassing more than the field consultant (traditionally considered to be the "development" arm of the state agency), the participation of the agency's top administration, and to varying degrees staff throughout the agency, is essential to successful development efforts. Therefore, the competencies mentioned below may be needed by persons throughout the state agency, whether involved in administration, consultant work, central collections development, development of systems of materials sharing, etc. Table 1 lists the summary statements from *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* which are most pertinent to library development activities. In addition to these
TABLE 1. PARTIAL LIST OF LIBRARY FUNCTIONS AT THE STATE LEVEL

1. The state library agency, in fulfilling its responsibilities at the state level, must ensure that library functions essential to each state are achieved.
2. The state library agency should exercise leadership and participate in the development of statewide plans involving all types of libraries at all levels within the state. It should take the initiative in marshalling qualified individuals, groups and agencies to engage in such overall planning.
3. The state library agency should review continuously both federal and state legislation affecting library service in order to ensure compatibility and to maintain a legal climate conducive to total library growth and development.
4. The state library agency should encourage and facilitate cooperative library services across state lines through interstate library compacts, contractual agreements and other established cooperative endeavors.
5. The state should gather, compile, interpret, publish, and disseminate annual statistics on all types of libraries in the state, including the state library agency. The state library agency should be a central information source concerning the libraries of the state.
6. The annual statistics gathered by the individual states should be designed to provide a common core of data among the states and for the nation.
7. The state should also publish an annual report showing state library activity as a coordinating agency.
8. It is the responsibility and obligation of the state library agency to initiate and encourage research. A position including the duties of research and planning should appear in each state agency position roster.
9. The state plan should indicate particularly the structure of coordinated library service needed to achieve national standards for all types of libraries.
10. As a standard of first priority, every locality within the state should be encouraged to participate in a coordinated library system, so that every resident has access to the total library resources of the state.
11. Some circumstances, such as very sparse population and low economic base in specific local areas, may lead the state to provide direct library service.
12. A high-priority standard of library development is that of designating or developing a pattern of centers over the state so that everyone has access to more comprehensive resources and specialized staff in addition to the resources within his locality.
13. The state library agency should make provision for reference, bibliographic and interlibrary loan service to supplement community and regional libraries.
14. The state library agency must make provision for consultants sufficient in number to stimulate all libraries to develop their full potential. It is also advisable for qualified consultative services to be provided at a regional level.
15. State library consultant service should emphasize guidance in special aspects of library service.
16. The state library agency is responsible for interpreting library service to the government and to the public, and for promoting a climate of public opinion favorable to library development.
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points, another ten standards are put forth concerning the necessity of state and federal financial aid, which presupposes the task of developing regulations for and administration of the funds.

If examined carefully, the reader can discern in the list certain common elements of responsibility demanding competencies which must be held by the staff in order to carry out such functions. Considering these functions as the ultimate goals toward which a program of education of development personnel should be directed, the following highly generalized competencies can be derived:

1. Ability to evaluate and plan in relation to public needs.
2. Ability to lead and to persuade groups and individuals to work together.
3. Ability to analyze library resources and relationships.
4. Ability to gather information, organize it and do meaningful research.
5. Ability to communicate and disseminate information effectively.
6. Understanding of government, law and the legal machinery of all different government levels.
7. Understanding of finance as it relates to the operation of libraries and the ability to administer funds.

Additional competencies not related to library development could be derived from the standards, but concern here is only with those related to development.

This deductive analysis of educational needs among such personnel departs somewhat from the method of assessing needs through the use of questionnaires addressed to persons in the field. This was done in order to find whether or not an alternative exists to the usual “shopping-list” type of questionnaire used to determine, in particular, continuing education needs.

In the study by ASLA mentioned earlier, the committee drew upon a more detailed breakdown of these needs which had been developed by Lawrence Allen and published in *Southeastern Librarian* in 1968. His method resembled an acute analytical approach to the canvass of opinions concerning educational needs contained in Long’s 1965 study. It is interesting to note that the needs extrapolated from the standards correspond rather closely with the more specific lists made by Allen and the ASLA LED Interdivisional Committee, which seem to have been based to some extent on a field survey.
CURRENT STATE OF EDUCATION IN THE FIELD

As the employment market has changed, staffs come and gone, and educational backgrounds discovered in Long's study presumably changed, the most effective way to determine the present situation with respect to the education of development personnel seemed to be to go to the source. For this purpose, letters were sent to the state agency directors and other persons who were concerned and knowledgeable, due to their present association through federal activities or through library education. (All had previously been associated with state agencies, however.)

The purpose of the letter was to solicit the opinions of these persons on the general subject of the education of library development personnel. In order to make the opportunity as open-ended as possible, the letter was general rather than being a questionnaire. To obtain some degree of comparability, however, an attachment suggested three general points for consideration:

1. the factor of formal education beyond the master's degree in library science (MLS) as being necessary or desirable for development work;
2. alternative types and methods of continuing education most needed in the field and the agency(ies) most responsible for providing such opportunities; and
3. an assessment of general conditions in the field, both as to present educational characteristics of personnel and their opportunities for professional growth.

FORMAL EDUCATION

Long had noted in 1965 that the preponderance of library consultants held the MLS degree and that the younger the librarian, the more likely he/she was to hold the master's. This seemed to be attributable to the fact that many persons still active in librarianship had received the bachelor's degree in library science in earlier years, before library education was standardized at the graduate level. Statistical certainty is impossible without repeating her research, but it would seem that education at the master's degree level in library science (or in an appropriate specialty) is now more nearly universal among development personnel, considering the degree of attrition and the improved labor market. One of the points suggested for consideration was whether postmaster's education would be an important factor in employing new personnel. Without exception, the response was that appropriate experience (in addition to the MLS) was far more important than additional education. Patricia
Klinck, State Librarian of Vermont, stated that: "Those librarians who lack solid experience have a false image of the real library world, little flexibility, and little patience with the problems of librarians in a working situation. The most successful library development personnel seem to be those who have interspersed formal education with periods of significant related work experience." David Palmer, Acting State Librarian of New Jersey, asserted that after about five years the consultant tends to become somewhat divorced from the practical aspect of library work and assumes a theoretical attitude. He suggested that sabbaticals of some sort for actual work in a library should be arranged in order for the consultant to regain a feeling of immediacy of contact.

Emphasis was also placed on the importance of desirable personal characteristics of those who will necessarily be largely concerned with working with people. Many librarians pointed out the need for empathy, alertness, curiosity, willingness for change, and an interest in pursuing new ideas.

Although appropriate experience and personal characteristics were considered to be of prime importance, additional education was also considered to be valuable. This was to be expected, but it should be emphasized that in most instances further education was explicitly recommended in a field other than library science. Areas such as public administration, finance, management, and group dynamics were suggested. There were also suggestions that a sixth-year program in library science would be useful; however, the suggestion usually accompanied statements indicating a need for some change in existing programs.

There is an appreciation, as stated before, of additional education, but emphasis was placed on the need for education appropriate to the particular assignment. (For example, the head of the Research and Evaluation Section in Hawaii holds a doctorate in educational administration as well as the MLS. Another factor influencing this particular need is the current emphasis on intertype library cooperation, which places an unusual stress on the employee involved.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Format

In the 1968 Allerton Park conference on "The Changing Role of State Library Consultants," it was noted that at that time there was a great deal of activity in allowing consultants to update themselves through attending conferences and workshops, both in-state and out-of-state. This was considered an improvement over the type of in-service training pro-
vided by department heads.\textsuperscript{22} As another step forward, the ASLA Board of Directors, at its 1976 midwinter meeting, noted continuing education as second on its adopted list of priorities.\textsuperscript{23}

Review of the commentaries received in 1977 indicates unanimous agreement that continuing education is of utmost importance in maintaining an effective development staff. With the rate of change in society and librarianship, the best of persons must work continually through reading, participation in professional organizations, and formal and informal education to stay abreast of events. One can hardly "lead" while being behind.

Respondents were asked to react to the occasionally expressed sentiment that the library schools or a particular group are at fault for not providing more opportunity, considering especially the best way to organize continuing education for participation. The overwhelming response was that the seminar and/or workshop format was the most desirable. Development personnel must observe variations in work and travel schedules which make regular attendance at prolonged courses very difficult, even when repeated travel for the sessions would not be insupportable. Elizabeth Hughey, head of the USOE State and Public Library Services Branch, commented that she had attempted many times while in North Carolina to involve personnel in continuing education other than workshops but never succeeded in getting a course short enough or demanding enough, and was therefore forced to favor the workshop format.\textsuperscript{24}

As for the nature of the seminars, the length proposed varied from an academic quarter to an unspecified, much shorter period. Obviously, it is impossible to determine a suitable length of time for such a session without analyzing the topic and the behavioral objectives to be achieved, but the limiting factor ultimately is that of adjusting the work schedule at home to allow for the participant's absence. Joseph Anderson, State Librarian of Nevada, commented on the undesirability of a series of sessions interspersed over a long period of time during which the participant returned to his work. His letter states the following: "Rather, a series of concentrated seminars on various aspects would be helpful if the background readings were accomplished ahead of time rather than being fitted in during training sessions or after the fact of the seminar. It is being away from the regular work setting that permits the learner to concentrate and produce."\textsuperscript{25}

Content

Comments received on needed subject content of seminars or other modes of continuing education correspond closely with those outlined
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earlier on the basis of competencies implied in previous publications.\textsuperscript{26} Only at first glance should this be surprising; change occurs in society and in work so quickly that updating is always needed. In addition, there is considerable turnover in staff, so that there are continually new people who need training in old subjects.

Frequently mentioned was the quality of presentation at workshops. Although it seems to be a negative contribution, a few of the specific complaints should be mentioned here. First, the level of presentation is sometimes not up to the intellectual standard expected. Moreover, the speakers sometimes have no concept of the nature of the audience they address. Third, the announcement or prospectus is sometimes misleading, which can result in participation in an irrelevant conference.

Responsibility for Continuing Education

One respondent commented:

It puzzles me that every group dealing with this on the association level (national, regional or local) seems to have a different interpretation, and none of these levels... have found a realistic mechanism for delivery. The National Commission seems to advise that continuing education be conducted as policy. The ALA gives lip service to the concept and hands it off to CLENE. The U.S. Office of Libraries and Learning Resources provides discretionary funds for specific activities for use only to elites or "chosen few," and library schools seem not to have the slightest interest in providing such experience by extension even within the states in which they are located. My perception of the latter is particularly burdensome in terms of defending librarianship as a profession because most others... provide continuing education and/or professional update activities to keep especially midcareer professionals up to date as time goes on and the state of the art expands the body of information and practices needed for changing conditions.\textsuperscript{27}

This statement illustrates the frustration of trying to obtain a clearer picture of continuing education opportunities for development personnel and others. Respondents expressing their opinions on this subject ranged generally from the view that it is each individual's own responsibility to organize his own continuing education, to the view that the employing agency has the responsibility to do so. Both are correct in their own way, of course. The assignment of responsibility for planning or initiating continuing education programs to NCLIS, CLENE and ASLA or to the li-
library schools was alternately condoned and condemned as possibilities by the various respondents. However, insofar as state agency development personnel have unique needs, it would seem desirable that some agency undertake identification and fulfillment of those needs, as suggested by the ASLA LED Interdivisional Committee on Education of State Library Personnel in 1970 (i.e., that the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education attempt to coordinate such an effort). 28

One could discuss at great length the desirability of an attempt by some agency to stimulate or initiate appropriate offerings, but Elizabeth Hughey pointed out that primary responsibility should probably not lie with any one agency; it should be a cooperative approach, with initiative from any one agency bringing them together to function. 29 Perhaps CLENE (especially with state funding 30 ) or some other agency will serve as the vehicle of facilitating such coordinated efforts.

Environment for Continuing Education

In 1967 Nelson Associates, Inc., suggested: "Appropriations might be used for sabbaticals, further education, exchanges for key state library staff or for institutes at colleges and universities to upgrade state library staff. It should be pointed out, however, that such institutes could now be funded under Title II-B of the Higher Education Act." 31

Ten years later one finds in report after report, both in response to the present inquiry and in statements made personally, that the administration of state libraries favors the allowance of time and funding for conferences, seminars and even sabbaticals (often sanctioned in theory by state policy), only then to announce that such funding is difficult or impossible to obtain. This has had a particular impact on travel to the regular ALA meetings, which is the primary opportunity for the librarian to observe trends in the profession on a national scale. Even the larger and more sophisticated states can foster the development of provincial attitudes if one does not leave their boundaries. Essentially, the current situation reflects a dichotomy in which state administrations endorse an idea (continuing education) and yet institute financial restrictions which defeat their own purposes.

SUMMARY

The employment market has altered to the extent that librarians with full educational qualifications are available to fill most development positions.
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Although the MLS is the first requisite for employment, followed by experience in the field and personal qualifications, state library agency employers also appreciate and seek employees with appropriate additional formal education. The general attitude prevails that postmaster's education should be in fields other than library science.

Continuing education in one form or another is considered of extreme importance not only by the national associations but apparently universally by state library agency directors.

Short-term programs remain the most desired format of continuing education.

Expressed needs for continuing education remain consistent with the general statements contained in the standards for library service at the state level and have apparently not varied significantly since 1970.

The conclusions reached above indicate distinct educational needs for library development personnel that are not currently satisfied and that have the peculiar constraints of requiring certain formats (as well as subjects) and an apparently cyclical need for repetition as new people come into the field or as new developments occur. Work toward a solution of the problem should therefore be undertaken in a way which will not place too great a responsibility for completion of the entire program in one place too soon. It would seem logical to begin with a joint committee of ASLA and CLENE. This committee should concern itself with the following objectives:

1. Update the 1970 report of ASLA LED Interdivisional Committee on Education of State Library Personnel, redefining the needs in the field.
2. Specify needs fully and clearly, both as to content and acceptable format.
3. Define a method of both involving ASLA, CLENE and the Association of American Library Schools in a continuing working arrangement that will facilitate the development of necessary educational opportunities where and when needed, and assuring that they will be attended by the appropriate people when offered.
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Standards for State Library Agencies

W. LYLE EBERHART

Early in 1977, upon the recommendation of its executive board, the Association of State Library Agencies (ASLA) appointed a Standards Review Committee to prepare a revision of the 1970 Standards for Library Functions at the State Level. The author was asked to chair this committee. The 1970 standards, in turn, had been preceded by 1963 standards, the first to use this title.

Shortly after the formation in 1957 of the American Association of State Libraries (AASL) as a division of the American Library Association (ALA), a Survey and Standards Committee was appointed. With the 1956 enactments of the federal Library Services Act, state library agencies were thrust into the spotlight as administrators of the state-based federal program. The Carnegie Corporation in 1960 funded a survey of state library agencies. The Survey and Standards Committee worked closely with the survey program. An ALA grant made it possible for the committee to broaden its membership and to consult with representatives of other interest groups.

Consequently, the 1963 Standards for Library Functions at the State Level covered a broad range of functions. A total of sixty-two standards was included, covering library resources, statewide library development, organization of state library services, the state and financing of local public library programs, personnel, and physical facilities for state library service. Based on the then-incomplete Carnegie-funded survey of state library agencies, the 1963 standards recognized to a degree the diversity in or-

W. Lyle Eberhart is Administrator, Division for Library Services, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Madison, and Chairperson, Standards Review Committee, ALA Association of Cooperative and Specialized Library Agencies.
ganizational patterns and functions exemplified in these agencies. The published guidelines also pointed out that in many states some functions were not being carried out at all, and that others were being pursued with no great energy. Most of the 1963 standards, however, dealt with two major functional areas: (1) the provision of library materials to library users and state government officials through a state resource library; and (2) public library development responsibilities. Admitting the diversity among the states, the standards nevertheless advocated "to the extent possible and advisable under state law and traditions" unification under one department or division.4

The Standards Review Committee, which worked from 1968 to 1970 on the first revision of standards, found much to admire — and preserve — from the first edition. The changes incorporated reflected changes in American society generally, as well as specific currents in librarianship. Title III (Interlibrary Cooperation) of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) both promoted and reflected changes emphasizing coordination of different types of libraries through networks. In its fourth chapter, "The State and Information Networks," the 1970 standards mark a change in spirit as well as specific content as compared with the first edition. "Leadership" and "coordination" appear and reappear as the central activities of state library agencies. The statement in Standard 39 that "The state library agency should exert leadership to effect exchange of information and materials through networks that open new sources and channels for the flow of information"5 was its ringing new challenge. Although the computer revolution came to American libraries much later than its early prophets expected, there is no doubt in 1978 that library automation is crucial to meeting state standards for the provision of materials and services.

Other chapters of this issue will assess how well state library agencies are now accepting that 1970 standard. To the current ASLA Standards Review Committee, its thrust is today dominant, and new standards must reflect this interest and need even more strongly. Consequently, in its first meetings the committee emphasized leadership and coordination as the very core of activities for state library agencies. It asked the ASLA president to appoint voting representatives from the American Association of School Libraries, the Association of College and Research Libraries, and the Public Library Association to the committee.

Given the diversity among the states in history and political tradition, demographics, and library and education structures, the concept of standards has many difficulties. For state library functions, perhaps the use of
the term guidelines may be more easily justified. Both the 1963 and 1970 editions of *Standards for Library Functions at the State Level* might be well described as annotated checklists of desirable functions. The revision now in process will not easily change this pattern.

Another concept difficulty concerns the advisability of dealing with areas where other library groups have adopted fairly detailed standards, e.g., standards for library services in state institutions. In earlier editions, certain public library standards were included because public library development functions were the common denominator of state library administrative agencies.

The differing evolution of state library networks creates another problem in developing state standards. State-level networking may be nearly nonexistent in some states. In others, it may be dominated by the state library agency or by the largest academic library. Finally, and probably most frequently, there may be several library networks in a state, each serving a special function or a special type of library. How, then, can a committee draft a standard, or even a guideline, which will be useful to all states?

Official ALA approval for the formation of a new division in 1978, the Association of Cooperative and Specialized Library Associations, does bring together three functional responsibilities (and presumably standards-making authority for them) : state library agencies, multitype library cooperation, and hospital and institution libraries. Perhaps this reorganization will make it easier to articulate state-level responsibilities in some specialized areas for appropriate inclusion in standards.

Whether they are called state library agency standards or standards for library functions at the state level, there will not soon be measurable quantitative standards that could be considered reasonable and appropriate. Specialists in functional areas in the states may be able in the near future to quantify standards in rather limited areas. In most cases, however, standards (or guidelines) for state library functions will continue to serve as nonquantified pointers to functional areas where state responsibilities are of key importance. Consistently and skillfully used by state library agency staffs, state library associations, networks, and planning committees in an individual state, they can bring into focus questions and concerns of great importance for the improvement of library services. Such standards must be included systematically in statewide library planning and evaluation. For a particular function, then, a national standard or guideline can become the starting point from which library planners can devise a state goal or standard.
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The success of a full-service national network of library and information services is wholly dependent on an effective resource-sharing system. If one supports the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science’s (NCLIS) statement on a national library and information service policy that information is a vital national resource and essential to well-being in a democratic society, then one must be willing to accept as policy full and unselfish cooperation. Resources must become the resources not only for primary constituencies, but for all. Acceptance of this concept and its implementation will assure provision to primary clientele of an enriched and improved service, as well as equal opportunity of access to all who desire it.

Translating ideals, goals and objectives into reality requires careful planning, delineation of responsibilities, the lessening of psychological barriers to cooperation, and a true service and funding partnership between the federal and state governments.

The NCLIS rationale for the development of a “full-service” national library and information service network is that it can best be accomplished through the traditional division of responsibility between the states and the federal government as established in the Constitution. Locally, the states should assume the responsibility for evolving rational hierarchies for the provision of service to the constituents within their borders. Each state should define the paths along which transactions within its own borders should flow for maximum utilization of its own resources. Beyond
the state level, the responsibility should be assumed by the federal government, i.e., what the states cannot provide, the federal government should. NCLIS is not opposed to regionalization or to multistate organizations, provided they serve a clear and useful function. However, it is a fact that Congress is made up of representatives from fifty individual states, each of whom is concerned primarily with serving his or her own constituency. As a result, federal funding has almost exclusively been allocated on a state-by-state basis, allowing each member of Congress to be equally placated. To change this pattern on a national scale is a task of insurmountable difficulty. It constitutes a threat to the viability of the individual members of Congress which they would probably not be willing to endure. Thus, there is no viable long-range base for regional activity except as negotiated through the individual states. This is not to deny that regional mechanisms do exist and, on occasion, have proven effective. The Regional Medical Library Network, the New England Library Information Network, the Southeastern Library Information Network, Amigos, and the Bibliographic Center for Research are examples that are familiar to all. Some services are available on a "national" basis, such as the Library of Congress's MARC services, OCLC, and the Center for Research Libraries, while others are state-based, such as the Illinois Library Information Network, the New York State Inter-Library Loan, the Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange, the Washington Library Network, the California Library Authority for Systems and Services, and the Wisconsin Library Loan System.

It is clear that a full-service national network of library and information services can only become a reality if there is careful articulation among local, state, multistate and national planning and implementation activities. The role of the state library agency as coordinator, catalyst, initiator, and even-handed funding agency is essential, extremely difficult and challenging, and requires sensitivity and political acumen of the highest quality. The responsibility cannot be "assigned"; it must be understood and assumed if it is to be effective.

The partnership at the federal/state level requires the state to accept the major share of the cost of planning, coordinating and supporting intrastate components of the network, as well as a fair share of the cost of participating in multistate planning operations. Each state must provide funding and/or matching funds for the development of resources and services, including specialized services for special constituencies and special forms of statewide network assistance. Each state library agency must solicit the widest possible participation of library, information and user
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communities in the governance and management of the multitype statewide library network if the state is to be an effective partner in a national network. State library agencies must recognize those regional agencies in their area which have an effective role to play and participate in their funding and governance, and they must make certain that their services benefit the residents of the state. Only in this way can states justify the use of state funds as well as federal funds, i.e., Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act. Regional organizations that are state-based and mainly state-funded will have a stability that will ensure their continued and effective existence.

In cooperation with federal and national agencies, state library agencies have, over a number of years, provided statewide services. For example, in cooperation with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), state library agencies have for years coordinated the collection of library statistics through the LIBGIS (Library General Information Survey) system. They have also provided training and consultant assistance to help local libraries understand the data elements on the forms, resulting in the collection of more accurate statistics. With the current demand for accountability and the development of new statistical methods which are designed to measure the effectiveness of library services, many state library agencies are providing training opportunities to learn how to use these new statistical measures.

Another area which is in support of one of NCLIS's objectives, i.e., continuing education, has also received the attention of state library agencies. Some states have participated in the development and continuing support of the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange (CLENE) program, which provides the opportunity to exchange continuing education ideas with educators and practitioners in both the library and allied professions. Responsibility of state library agencies to provide leadership for continuing education within the state is essential if progress is to be made in the appropriate use of the new technology. Training sessions for learning the use of OCLC and other data bases are often provided either by the state or through a regional organization in cooperation with the state.

One of the more difficult areas of cooperation in which state library agencies can provide assistance is in the development of cooperative collection development and effective resource-sharing. The formulation of a broad statewide policy on collection development acceptable to all of the major academic and public libraries can go a long way in avoiding needless duplication in building collections. This is not only true for periodical
literature, but for monographs and multimedia as well. This is a most difficult problem to resolve, because the institutions which participate are required to make a long-term commitment. If resource-sharing is to be truly effective, the state must not only provide help in developing agreements on collection development and bibliographic control, but most importantly, must help to provide a statewide delivery system which will assure the patron that resource-sharing really works in a timely and effective fashion. The responsibility of the state library agency to cooperate with the states in its area (through regional organizations where they exist and through state-by-state cooperation where they do not) is necessary for the development of an effective national library and information network.

In summary, the states represent a basic node in the developing full-service library and information service network. Each state must have an agency which will assume the legal responsibility for providing coordination in order to develop a user-oriented, multitype library network. Responsibility for fostering this coordination of library resources and services throughout a state has usually been assigned to a state library agency. The state library agency must make certain that its legal responsibility is broad enough to give it the authority to undertake the coordination function, as discussed in this paper and enunciated in other articles in this issue.

State library agencies must make intelligent use of their federal funds to assure not only that all of its residents receive basic library services, but that cooperation between types of libraries provides an enrichment and a level of service that is commensurate with the rhetoric. It is all too easy for those who believe in cooperation and the sharing of resources to talk about its advantages, but in the final analysis, if the individuals who work in libraries do not have an understanding of and belief in cooperation, the goal will never be achieved. Perhaps the most important contribution that can be made at the state level is to undertake a major effort to develop the attitude of service to the user — the user being the individual who walks into the library whether he/she comes from that area or institution, or from another geographic area or institution.

Equal opportunity of access, which will satisfy the individual's needs and interests, regardless of location, social or physical condition, or level of intellectual achievement, is an achievable goal; all that is needed is the commitment and the willingness to make it a reality.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 N. 2</td>
<td>State and Local History in Libraries</td>
<td>Guy Garrison</td>
<td>July 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 N. 3</td>
<td>Regional Public Library Systems</td>
<td>Clyde Walton</td>
<td>Oct. 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 N. 4</td>
<td>Library Furniture and Furnishings</td>
<td>Hattis A. Smith</td>
<td>Jan. 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 N. 5</td>
<td>Library Furniture and Furnishings</td>
<td>Frazier G. Poole</td>
<td>April 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>14 N. 1</td>
<td>Metropolitan Public Library Problems Around the World</td>
<td>H. C. Campbell</td>
<td>Jan. 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 N. 2</td>
<td>Recent College Libraries</td>
<td>Carl L. Trinkner</td>
<td>Oct. 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 N. 3</td>
<td>Library Service to Industry</td>
<td>Katherine A. Harris</td>
<td>Jan. 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>15 N. 1</td>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td>Thomas A. Shaw</td>
<td>July 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 N. 4</td>
<td>Bibliography: Current State and Future Trends, Part 2</td>
<td>Frances B. Jenkins</td>
<td>April 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>16 N. 1</td>
<td>Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging</td>
<td>Frederic J. Beveridge</td>
<td>July 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 N. 2</td>
<td>Library Uses of the New Media of Communication</td>
<td>Robert L. Talbot</td>
<td>Oct. 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 N. 3</td>
<td>Abstracting Services</td>
<td>C. Walter Stone</td>
<td>Oct. 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 N. 4</td>
<td>School Library Services and Administration at the School District Level</td>
<td>Foster E. Mohrhardt</td>
<td>Jan. 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>17 N. 1</td>
<td>Group Services in Public Libraries</td>
<td>Sara K. Stryker</td>
<td>April 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 N. 2</td>
<td>Young Adult Service in the Public Library</td>
<td>Grace T. Stevenson</td>
<td>July 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 N. 3</td>
<td>Development in National Documentation and Information Services</td>
<td>Audrey Bie</td>
<td>Oct. 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>18 N. 1</td>
<td>Trends in College Librarianship</td>
<td>Mac Graham</td>
<td>April 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 N. 2</td>
<td>University Library Buildings</td>
<td>Elizabeth W. Stone</td>
<td>July 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>19 N. 1</td>
<td>Intellectual Freedom</td>
<td>H. Vail Deul</td>
<td>July 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 N. 3</td>
<td>Book Storage</td>
<td>Everette T. Lewis</td>
<td>Jan. 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 N. 4</td>
<td>New Dimensions in Educational Technology for Multi-Media Centers</td>
<td>Philip Lewis</td>
<td>April 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>20 N. 1</td>
<td>Personnel Development and Continuing Education in Libraries</td>
<td>H. E. Stone</td>
<td>July 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 N. 2</td>
<td>Library Programs and Services to the Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Helen H. Lyman</td>
<td>Oct. 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 N. 3</td>
<td>The Influence of American Librarianship Abroad</td>
<td>Cecil R. Bird</td>
<td>Jan. 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 N. 4</td>
<td>Current Trends in Urban Main Libraries</td>
<td>Larry Earl Bone</td>
<td>April 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>21 N. 1</td>
<td>Trends in Archival and Reference Collections of Recorded Sound</td>
<td>Gordon Stevenson</td>
<td>July 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 N. 3</td>
<td>Library Services to the Aging</td>
<td>Eleanor Phinney</td>
<td>Jan. 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 N. 4</td>
<td>Systems Design and Analysis for Libraries</td>
<td>F. Wilfrid Lenehan</td>
<td>April 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>22 N. 1</td>
<td>Studies of Bibliographies</td>
<td>H. R. Simon</td>
<td>July 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 N. 2</td>
<td>Research in the Fields of Reading and Communication</td>
<td>Alice Lohrer</td>
<td>Oct. 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 N. 3</td>
<td>Evaluation of Library Services</td>
<td>Sarah Reed</td>
<td>Jan. 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 N. 4</td>
<td>Science Materials for Children and Young People</td>
<td>George S. Bonn</td>
<td>April 1974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 4 Publishing in the Third World</td>
<td>Philip G. Altbach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Smith</td>
<td>Sprg. 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 27 N. 1 Films in Public Libraries</td>
<td>John A. McCrossan</td>
<td>Sum. 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 2 State Library Development Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A complete list of back issues is available from *Trends in Library Service*, Publications Office, 249 Armory, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill. 61820.

† Also available in clothbound edition.
Library Trends

Forthcoming numbers are as follows:


Spring 1979, The Study and Collecting of Historical Children’s Books in the United States. Editor: Selma K. Richardson, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Summer 1979, Economics of Academic Libraries. Editor: Allen Kent, Director, Office of Communications Programs, University of Pittsburgh.

Fall 1979, Emerging Patterns of Community Services. Editor: Margaret E. Monroe, Professor of Library Science, University of Wisconsin–Madison.