

U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES
AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Thursday, February 17, 2000

Los Angeles Times Building

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Good afternoon. Very quickly I will give you a little bit of an update on some of the things that I have been doing in my role as acting chairperson.

I did meet with the Center for Research Libraries when they had their meeting in Atlanta at Eberjane Woods, and I was one of the speakers, and we talked about issues dealing with the cost of scientific publications and electronic formats and a number of other issues.

My talk is up, I think now, on the Web page, if anybody wants my words of questionable wisdom. But I thoroughly enjoyed meeting and talking with the people there.

I also attended the meeting in December on the Digital Divide. I did have the opportunity to chair the Commission's first meeting on the issues around NTIS. A number of the commissioners, including myself, attended mid-winter. This really doesn't have anything directly to do with the Commission, but I did teach a class in library administration at the University of Nevada.

It was a distance education class. My farthest students lived 300 miles from the library, and actually in the middle of a snowstorm I drove to Tonopah, Nevada to do an on-site session and had a great time, but I'll have to tell you, I'm not sure if I'll ever do it again in the middle of a snowstorm in winter.

So I welcome everyone, and with that I will -- thank you, Bob.

Before we go on to the executive director's report there are two household items. When you speak, please be sure to introduce yourself so that the gentleman who is taping the minutes will know who said what. If you don't remember to introduce yourself, I will interrupt.

With that, I'm going to ask everyone to introduce themselves, and we'll start with Winston Tabb.

COMMISSIONER TABB: I'm Winston Tabb, representing the Library of Congress.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: I'm Rebecca Bingham.

MS. WHITELEATHER: Barbara Whiteleather, staff.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Abe Abramson.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Jack Hightower.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Jose-Marie Griffiths

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: Beverly Sheppard, acting director of the Institute of the Museum of Library Services.

MR. HORTON: Woody Horton, consultant to the Commission.

MS. VLACH: Rosalie Vlach, staff.

MS. BINGHAM: Beth Bingham, consultant.

MS. RUSSELL: Judy Russell with the Commission staff.

MR. WILLARD: Bob Willard, executive director.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Emily Sheketoff, the American Library Association.

MS. BOLT: Nancy Bolt. I'm here representing the chief officers of the State Library Agencies.

MS. RODGER: Joey Rodger with the Urban Libraries Council.

MS. SCHUKETT: Sandy Schukett. I'm here today representing the White House Conference on Library and Information Services Task Force.

MR. NEAL: Peyton Neal, the Software and Information Industry Association.

MS. TALEN: I'm Carol Talen, substituting for Carolyn Staley, the National Institute for Literacy.

MS. MOLOD: I am Ann Molod.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: And by telephone, we have Joan Challinor, who is with us in spirit, if not in body, thanks to AT&T.

Joan, you're there?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Yep, I'm here.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Great.

Okay. Bob, would you like to take over?

MR. WILLARD: Sometimes in prior commission meetings we have so much to do, and one of the first things we cut or shrink is the executive director's report. So there was a

little malice of forethought when I put it sort of toward the beginning of the session because I think the Commission and its staff have been doing just wonderful things, and it really is appropriate to spend some time talking with you about some of those.

I'm going to discuss six different areas. I'll start with personnel because we've got some interesting changes.

First of all, we've lost two people, and we have replaced them. We've got a new receptionist and a new administrative officer. I am especially pleased that our administrative officer we hired from the National Institute of Literacy, and she was completely trained on all the same systems that we use. We're both supported by the Department of Education, so she definitely hit the ground running.

We also have a brand new position. Rosalie Vlach has introduced herself. Let me tell you just a little bit more about her.

First of all, her job is to help us in the area of communications, both public communications and also congressional communications. She has a background that includes working in education as a primary school teacher. She worked with the Dunn & Bradstreet Corporation for a while in Washington, relations work with a special focus on libraries, and then she worked for the District of Columbia government.

Of course, another personnel activity that keeps me a little busy is working with the Office of White House personnel, trying to identify additional individuals to go through that tortuous path that all of you commissioners have already gone through in terms of getting nominated, confirmed and appointed to the Commission.

In the area of appropriations, as you know, we've started out the year living on a continuing resolution. Well, actually I think about 250 different -- 9 continuing resolutions.

The appropriation finally that we are under was signed by the president on November 30th. Well, maybe it's November 29th, but it's the last Monday in November. I remember it because I was able to fenagle an invitation to the signing. Actually we'll talk about it more, but that was an opportunity to -- eyeball -- talk to president about the White House Conference, and I'll say more about that in a bit.

Judy just did an amazing amount of work on getting the 2001 submission ready to go, and then in the last minute it seemed like it was a round the clock effort to get it into the White House.

We, again, as is our continuing hope -- we've asked for more than we have now. The president's budget went to the Hill with an amount of \$1.5 million. We're at \$1.3 million, so that still is a 15 percent increase. But as you know, the long-range plan that we're dealing with and the objectives that we think are important for the Commission to be

working on will cost more than \$1.5 million, so we are still hopeful that that message will be understood by the members of the Appropriations Committee.

In the area of publications, we have, as you know, continuing interest in the "Kids on the Internet" brochure. We still have a fairly good supply of that, but we are going back to the printers shortly because we want to get many copies of that out into the hands of state libraries. The hearing report is, I'd say, 99.8 percent ready. It is getting some final tuning and will be off to the printers shortly.

Quickly, behind it -- and especially because it follows the same format and what we've learned in terms of using desktop publication and moving this publication, where we can give material directly to the GPO, and they don't have to do anything further with it except print it; we're doing the same thing with the disability hearing, so that should be out shortly.

The annual report traditionally misses its deadline of January 31st. We were very late last year. We will not be very late this year. Much of the text is already written. It is basically Rosalie's baptism by fire and initiation ceremony, and it's a great way also for her to learn what the Commission is all about. I'm not going to make any predictions, but both Rosalie and Judy know that that's a question I ask them almost everyday, and we will have that out shortly.

In general, projects is what we will be talking about through this meeting, so I'm not going to talk a lot about them in this presentation, but I think they need to be highlighted.

I believe you have in your book a report on the statistics activity Denise has put together. I've said this many times, but it continues to be just a delight to have someone with her background and experience and also reputation in the field and acceptance in the field. She really brings a strength in that area to us.

Sister Libraries. We will have a report on the agenda. It continues to be one of the most visible projects we have going, and I want to thank Beth for all her good efforts on it. With Rosalie on board now, we have a permanent staffer who is going to be handling much of the administrative aspects of that which are really Washington based which she and Beth will be the team that makes Sister Libraries continue on.

The GPO study is something we've talked about for many years, but it really is sort of supplanted at the moment. We will get back to it. But we really were presented with an event in government that brought to bear all of the issues that the GPO project was concerned about -- meeting the needs of the people for information from government. Specifically, it was a proposal to close down NTIS.

I won't say much more about that, but we will have it on the agenda. I've said at one of the two meetings that we've had so far, that when you look back on the history of the Commission the involvement in NTIS was probably one of the things that will be a landmark in our history.

The White House Conference. As you recall, at the last commission meeting, we passed a resolution asking that a formal communication be made to the president, asking that before he leaves that he convene a conference.

As I say, because I was at the signing, I was able to actually talk to him about that, and specifically what I said -- and it was one of those purposefully designed, attention-getting sentence -- I said, I've just been listening to a speech you gave 20 years ago when you addressed the first White House Conference, and we hope that before you leave the White House, you hold one of your own. And he immediately said, "Oh, you've got a speech? I'd like to hear it."

When you think about it, from just his personal development -- in fact, our former chairman of the Commission says without exception -- it definitely was his first time to come to Washington and deliver a national address.

So we used, therefore, the fact that we had an audio tape. We sent a fairly extensive package over to him that included the letter from Jeanne asking for the White House Conference, a letter from me sort of personalizing it because I had been at that first White House Conference. We also had a transcript of the speech and a couple of photographs that we had found. I think we passed them out at the last meeting. The intriguing thing was that those photographs were reconstituted from contact sheets. Nowhere in our archives did anyone think that a picture of Governor Bill Clinton was worth making an 8 x 10 of, but we did find the contact sheets, and although the negatives have gone on to who knows where, we were able to reconstitute those.

We received a letter from the president saying that he had assigned it to a staffer. He also gave a very positive statement about his commitment to libraries and also his recognition of the work the Commission has done, but we are in negotiations with the staffer now, and there are some concerns that the timing -- that there's such a narrow pipeline for everything that has to get done by the White House before the administration is over, that they're not positive it can be done, so we're working with them to see what can be done.

We also have spent some effort in strategic planning. Members of the Executive Committee met both in New Orleans and then also again in conjunction with ALA's mid-winter in San Antonio. You have the working documents. Martha will probably be saying a little bit more about that when she reports on the Executive Committee.

In International activities -- in addition to Sister Libraries, we also are continuing our involvement with UNESCO. Thanks to Woody's wordsmanship, a congratulatory letter was sent to the new secretary general of UNESCO when he was elected. We got a good response back saying that he was committed to the information program, and subsequently, correspondence from the director of the Communications and Information Program. We will have more formal contact with them very shortly.

In terms of meetings, there's nothing important about attending a meeting, but it's got to be done. You've got to show the flag. Sometimes you can make a contribution at it, but

we've been at a number of places -- these are basically places I've been, but in many cases I was also joined by other commissioners like the Digital Divide Conference. I'm on a committee with the law librarians that's dealing with authentication and preservation of legal information. It's an assignment that grew out of my prior life in legal publishing, but it's one that I thought made sense to continue to have some involvement with because it pertains so closely to what we're doing in terms of the GPO issues.

Winston and I were both at a meeting focused on IFLA 2001 over at the ARL offices not too long ago.

The Public Printer has convened a group of senior people around the government who are concerned with the long-term preservation of information, especially as it is in electronic form, and I've been representing the Commission with that.

I also had a meeting with the deputy director of the National Archives and Record Administration, and it was followed up by Woody in sort of an individual role, not as a consultant for the Commission. But nonetheless, it's certainly an nexus for what he does for us and what he did with the Archives in terms of the Archives' concern over these preservation and long-time access issues.

I met with the deputy administrator, and then Woody went to an all-day meeting on brainstorming those issues with the senior management of NARA.

Of course, ALA, mid-winter.

It was one of those fortunate things where I was able to attend part of the meeting of the National Association of Secretaries of State, one of the strangest assignments in government because in some cases the secretary of state is the state librarian. It's certainly in Illinois. But it was good to be able to maintain those connections that I had developed earlier.

And of course, I don't want to leave off this meeting because one of the things I want you to be sensitive to is that there is a lot of preparation that goes into this meeting. It isn't just something that happens. Everybody gets involved in it, and we don't want to lose sight.

Presentations. I'll let you know a couple of places. I was able to give a commencement address at the Library School of the University of Maryland.

I spoke at the meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General. They had a workshop on how the Internet was changing their mission, and I talked to them a little bit about our Kids in the Internet initiative.

I talked about library research at ALISE. I had a wonderful presentation at COSLA where I talked about what the Commission was doing and learned how they feel about one our initiatives, specifically, the White House Conference.

Just yesterday, I was invited -- sort of in a personal capacity, but it was nonetheless a very professionally satisfying opportunity to talk about librarianship or libraries in the 21st century. This is a well funded small college in Nevada that is basically building a brand new campus. They're putting all new buildings up, and they're bringing in people to talk to them about what the function of a library is in the future.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Where is it physically located?

MR. WILLARD: On the next-door lot to the Hyatt Hotel in Lake Tahoe.

And just for future reference, I will be going to London as guest of the United Kingdom's Library and Information Commission. They are doing a two-day conference on the development of national information policy which they are really involved in in Great Britain, and they have invited me to speak on the American experience in national information policy. Joan is also attending that as chairman of our International Committee.

We are working very hard, and Woody has already assured me that we will end up with appointments also on that trip to continue the liaison activities with UNESCO.

Thank you. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: On that last point, I couldn't help noticing recently that that analogous institution, the UK Information and Library Science people got a direct grant from Microsoft Foundation, Gates' foundation, with the job of distributing money for the kinds of programs they've been doing in the United States and Canada through the states.

Do we know more about that or is that part of a plan?

MR. WILLARD: Essentially, what you said. They're a much more operational entity than we are.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Okay. But the grant was made directly to that commission there.

MR. WILLARD: Right. Now remember, that commission disappears on April 1st and is replaced by a newly and able thing called the Museum, Libraries and Archives Council.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any other questions for Bob?

Joan, do you have any questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: No, not a thing.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Do you want to repeat that so everyone can hear?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: No, I have no questions.

MR. WILLARD: Okay. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: The next item is under Tab B, and we're going to be looking at the meeting calendar for the rest of this year, and then we will go to the proposed dates for meetings in FY 2000 and 2001, so please turn to Tab B to the calendar.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: My book doesn't include it.

MS. WHITELEATHER: The yellow page separates the two things.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. I noticed on the calendar the Music Library Association is going to be meeting in Louisville, Rebecca.

MS. BINGHAM: Good.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Do you think you will be around? You might want to pop in?

MS. BINGHAM: I know of no reason why not.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Good. Make a note there, Rebecca.

On the proposed closure and transfer of NTIS, I will be coming into Washington to chair that particular meeting. And unfortunately, Joan Challinor -- if I remember correctly, Joan, you said that you will not be in Washington.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I'll be there. I'll be there until 2:00 in the afternoon.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Great, thank you.

You want to go down to March.

Joan, are you going to be able to attend the Digital Library Conference on the 15th and 17th of March.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I will be in Europe.

MR. WILLARD: She'll be in Europe.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: That's right, you'll be in Europe with Bob.

COMMISSIONER TABB: Is this meeting in Washington or in Columbia, Missouri?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: This meeting is in Washington.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I am planning on coming into Washington for that meeting also because both Joan and Bob will be in Europe, so that takes care of that.

In March, the FSCS training workshop in San Antonio, Texas. Commissioner Abramson, will you be attending that?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Good.

The Public Library Association's conference. I will be attending that.

Commissioner Tabb will be there, and let's see, Beth Bingham and Rosalie will also be attending for the Sister Libraries.

We're in April.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Do we want to plug in there that for those whom it might be convenient, they would attend the awards ceremony for one of our commission members, Mr. Anderson? I think that's the 28th of March.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Commissioner Anderson is receiving a rather prestigious award in Washington, D.C. on the -- is it the 28th of March?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I believe it is the 28th, yeah. It's during PLA and the workshop.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: The date is Tuesday, the 28th, in the evening.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I can attend that one probably down the road.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. So far we know that Commissioner Griffiths and Commissioner Challinor will be attending the awards ceremony.

Mr. Willard, will you be there also?

MR. WILLARD: No, that's the Friends of the Law, Library of Congress.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. And I won't be because I will be at PLA.

In April, please mark your calendars for April 10th. That will be the presentation of the first National Library Services Awards in Washington, D.C.

Bev, would you like to say something about that at this point?

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I would simply like to comment that the process of announcing and soliciting nominations for this award produced more than 70 nominations. Reading them collectively, what emerges is an incredible portrait of excellence in the library community. The decision process is not quite final yet, but what emerged from this are some extraordinary libraries of all kinds who are doing exemplary service.

By hosting this award ceremony in Washington, we have the opportunity to bring attention to the role that libraries play in supporting their communities, and I think it will be a very remarkable program highlighting some incredible institutions.

We have talked further about ways to continue the process of bringing public information about the nomination process and what we have seen. So this first step is one that I think is going to yield some very, very good information and kind of public information in support of libraries.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: May I speak?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: By all means, Joan.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I'd like to say as having been homebound for quite a while, all the enclosed NCLIS commissioners were the ones that read the finalists and suggested which ones were the best to Beverly. And having read them twice, they are exactly what Beverly said. They are extraordinary, and I think all the commissioners will join with me in saying that these libraries are doing work for the United States that nobody else is doing. They are reaching out to every kind of person, very kind of immigrant, every kind of disabled person; it's an extraordinary story. And I just wish everybody had the opportunity to read these as the NCLIS commissioners did.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: Thank you, Joan.

My reaction when I read all of these -- and I want to sort of talk about literacy and the digital divide because it became very obvious in going through these applications and nominations that libraries are playing a much larger role in addressing the issues of information literacy, literacy in general and the digital divide that anybody realizes until we started to read these.

I think that's food for thought, to begin to really make our local governments, as well as perhaps the national government, understand that we're already doing things at the local level that inside the Beltway they're talking about starting to do. It's very frustrating to

me that we're not telling our story to the broader audience, and that's something I think we need to think very seriously about.

We have tentatively scheduled a hearing on scholarly publishing.

Commissioner Griffiths, do you want to talk about that?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I will be giving a report a little bit later, but I think that it's unlikely we'll be scheduling a hearing in April and will probably postpone it until the fall.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: At some time in April we will be having a regular commission meeting then, which we will hold in conjunction with the awards.

Commissioner Hightower, will you be planning on attending the Texas Library Association meeting?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I can.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Great. And then, of course, we come to Passover at Easter.

Commissioner Abramson, will you be attending Montana?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes.

One of the things that's almost too obvious to mention is that on the 24th is the 200th anniversary of the Library of Congress, and we might want to indicate that.

I've been invited to do some work with the Department of Commerce which might put me there at that time, so I might be able to celebrate at no cost to our budget.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER TABB: I was going to ask if this could be put on the calendar. We're still finalizing the details of the day, but all of the Commission members will be invited to join us for that day.

It will begin at 7:00 in the morning with an appearance on the Today Show with Jim Billington. At 9:30 to 10:30, we will be unveiling the coin which will be commemorating the Library of Congress, the first bimetallic coin in the history of the United States. That will be followed by the unveiling of the postage stamp also celebrating the Library of Congress and America's libraries.

So we have chosen this part of the program to be the focus not only for the Library of Congress but for the library community of the United States, all. So we would like all the Commission members to be able to come.

From 12:00 to 2:00, will be the national birthday party which is a big celebration in the front of the Jefferson Building, a big party. We're hoping to have about 10,000 people, closing the streets around -- people like Colin Powell, Carol Burnett, Pete Seiger, Quincy Jones, Micky Hart and others have already agreed to come and perform, So it will be quite a celebration which we, again, want to think of as a national party for libraries.

Then the evening will end between 6:30 and 9:00 with the opening of the major exhibit on Thomas Jefferson, again, to which all the Commission members will be invited. We hope to have those invitations in the mail by next week.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Will Clay Jenkinson as Thomas Jefferson be there?

COMMISSIONER TABB: Yet to be decided.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Do you want me to say something to Clay?

COMMISSIONER TABB: Yes. We'll follow up.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. We're coming into May, and I've gone blank of when in May, but I have received an invitation to attend the First Lady's luncheon at the White House. I think it's on May 16th. I'm not sure.

My calendar sitting to my right has reminded me it's just before ARL. So I will come into Washington for the luncheon, and then I will stay for ARL.

Going back to the 1st of May, I will be coming into Washington for Legislative Day.

Commissioner Challinor, will you be around in Washington for Legislative Day?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: And that is?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: May 1st.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Will there be any other commissioners coming in to attend?

Do let the office know.

Unless there is something else in May that strikes us, we'll go on over to -- excuse me.

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I would like to mention is also in Baltimore at the same time as the ARL meeting is the American Association of Museums meeting, and I have proposed and had accepted there, a double session on May 17th from 2:00 to 4:45, which

will be, Examining Museums and Libraries on Parallel Tracks. That's the title, but it's looking at the commitment of museums and libraries to enhancing community life.

We will be inviting one of the award winners as part of the panel that will be interviewed as Part 1, looking at the process of making the decisions for outreach, the challenges for staff, the commitment to outreach, so that it will be kind of insightful, setting sort of the values and processes.

The second part of that session, we are inviting library leaders and museum leaders from Baltimore in conjunction with some of the educational and civic leaders to have a facilitated discussion about how museums and libraries -- the potential for working even more effectively within a wide sort of civic arena to enhance community life.

I would like to offer the invitation for at least one person here, but all those that could attend, I'm sure I could make arrangements that you could be there for that session. I think it could be very good.

May 17th, 2:00 to 4:45. I believe it's the Baltimore Convention Center, but I will have more information about specific location when the program is printed.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Madam Chairman, before we get off that page, back up. On the 26th through 28th of March, LFSC has a training workshop in San Antonio. You mentioned that to Abe. Abe said he was going to go.

Is there any reason why I should be there?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Not necessarily.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Fine. That's a trip to San Antonio you don't have to make. I wanted to be sure. I'm going to be very busy that evening. I've got to entertain the fellow from Montana, I understand.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: As a reminder, Commissioner Abramson does chair a committee on statistics, which is the reason that he will be attending.

COMMISSIONER TABB: I'd like to say something in addition about the ALA meeting, following up on what Beverly said.

I have been asked to plan and chair the meeting at the ARL Association on the 18th of National Librarians from Australia, Germany and Finland. So I would think it would be appropriate, certainly, for Joan to plan to attend, if she could, because we'll be talking about national library activities, particularly with regard to cooperation and the digital.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: In case you couldn't hear, Joan Challinor will be attending that also.

In June, we have the Special Libraries Association, the Lubbock Literary Institute and the Canadian Library Association. I'm unaware sure if anyone from the Commission will be attending at this time. We will be going to SLA. Bob will be attending for the Commission at the Special Libraries Association. Then, of course, in July we have two things. We have the American Library Association's annual conference in Chicago, and then the American Association of Law Libraries, which Bob and Jack will attend for us, later in July.

MR. WILLARD: I should also mention -- and I think Beth and Rosalie will be highlighting this -- that Sister Cities will be meeting in June also, and we will be having an exhibit there, pending budget.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: So you want to make a note on your calendar about Sister Libraries in June. It's a Sister Cities conference in Denver.

And because Denver is a fairly short plane ride from Reno -- what I refer to as the flying cigar or rubberband airline -- it's one of those small airplanes -- I may possibly go in at least for a day.

In August, I will be attending with Commissioner Challinor and Mr. Willard the IFLA Conference. Rosalie and Beth will be going.

Just Beth? Okay. Beth, that means I get to help you put up and take down the exhibit. I'm a mean one with a hammer.

We will be in Israel at I think probably the hottest time of the year. And Reforma will be meeting in Tucson, Arizona. At this point in time, I may go to Reforma because, again, it's a very short plane ride and a relatively inexpensive plane ride from Reno to Tucson where the weather will be 115 in the shade.

Before I go into September, does anyone have any comments they want to make?

Commissioner Abramson?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Edmonton, Canada is a short ride for me, so for any reason we should want to be represented or get invited in Canada, including Sister Libraries, I would love to handle that if that comes up. And if there's anything that spills over, I would also like to be on the wait list for IFLA.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We will take that under consideration after I take a long, hard look at our budget.

Jack?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes, I'd be happy to be on the waiting list behind Abramson.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: No comment.

Okay. We are into Labor Day in September. I don't if anyone has plans to attend any of the Library Association meetings?

We did discuss the probability of the joint board's meeting in early to mid-September, although at this point we didn't assign dates for it.

What I don't see here is the Mountain Plains Annual Conference meeting. Or am I missing it somewhere? They usually some time in the fall. Oh, I see, yeah.

We had thought about the possibility of having one of our commission meetings in conjunction with Mountain Plains, which I think would be a very good idea. Again, we'll be looking at that.

The Nevada Library Association. Amazingly enough, it's going to be in Reno, Nevada, so I suspect that I will be attending. In fact, I've already been invited to be there. So as it's literally around the corner from my house, there's not much of a problem.

Are there any other issues?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I would be happy to attend the Michigan Library Association.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Okay. We'll take a long, hard look at some of the other things in October, and, again, part of that will depend on how well our budget goes. And then, of course, the rest of the year there's the Ohio Library Council Meeting, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

That pretty well takes care of our meeting calendar. What about proposed dates?

MR. WILLARD: I'm sorry, we don't have strong-hand for you to consider. The only thing that we have on the calendar now -- I mean, it isn't even physically here, but I will communicate it to you now, is that we do plan, instead of having hearings in April, we will have a full commission meeting in conjunction with the library awards presentation. It will likely be the 11th, so you'll arrive in time to the reception for the awards, and then we'll meet the 11th and probably make it a one-day meeting.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay.

MR. WILLARD: Martha will be bringing that up later, but the focus of the meeting will be on the strategic plan.

The other invitation that we have -- it's not formally an invitation, but there are so many groups that are coming together in conjunction with the Mountain Plains meeting in October. In addition to the State Library Association, also WCHLIST will be meeting in conjunction. So it has been suggested that the Commission consider having a meeting at that time in Nebraska.

At this time, I think it would be appropriate to ask for suggestion from members of the Commission, keeping in mind that our general philosophy is we'd like to have some meetings in Washington, some meetings outside and usually in conjunction with either an interesting program -- for example, the Reading Benign Literacy initiative here in Los Angeles or a meeting as we've done with ACRL last April in Michigan.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Commissioner Abramson?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Because of the growth and their span and scope and level of services, at some point I think it would be interesting for us to have a meeting where we could visit on site with OCLC.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We'll make a note of that. Thank you.

One of the locations I really would like for a meeting of the Commission would be in Cincinnati because that's sort of the heartland of the United States, and they have some very interesting programs, and that might be a perfect location for one of our meetings in the next year.

I would hope we would address some of the issues around the status of the school libraries in the United States. School libraries are begging for support, and I think that from the point of view, again, of addressing literacy issues and information literacy issues and digital divide issues, the role of the school library is extremely important.

So I would like to put on the table the idea that one of our meetings will be held in Cincinnati. We've already received an invitation from the director of the Cincinnati and Hamilton County Public Library to hold a meeting there, and it is close to OCLC, so we could do a number of things together.

So make a note of that, and we will continue to think about that.

Jack?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Yes?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Do you want to talk a little bit about Austin and the LBJ Library?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I'm always a little reluctant to talk about Texas, but I will overcome it.

I think some time at the future -- I don't know, I've looked at this calendar as we've gone through. There's no date that really looks like it might fit, but certainly we can make almost anything fit.

I think at some time though in the foreseeable future we ought to schedule a meeting in Texas at the LBJ Library.

Austin has some fantastic libraries to visit. The LBJ Library, of course, is great. The University of Texas has the Ransom collections. We also have a fantastic law library there. As far as entertainment is concerned, I think we can as well by you as San Antonio did, even have some good TexMex food.

Austin is an interesting place. Austin is advertising itself as the live music capital of the United States. As opposed to Nashville and its recorded music, it's live music. There are just a lot of activities always going on, and we'd try to schedule a time where we could work and play too if you wanted to.

But think about that. I would not like to have you after the 15th of July and until after the 15th of September, but any other time in the year would just be great.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Mr. Willard.

MR. WILLARD: One of the things that was evident from my report I hope is that we're doing a lot. I can tell you also on our to-do list -- but below the line that's getting attention now, and it has to be moved up, I think -- is the fact that the Commission is coming up on its 30th birthday in July of this year.

I think we can follow the same model we followed on our 25th. We used the period between the date the president signed the legislation establishing us and then the date the first meeting was held, which was about a year later, as a period during which we would want to have official commemorative activities.

I say that in conjunction with Austin because the Commission came out of a proposal of a presidential commission -- a temporary presidential commission -- appointed by LBJ. All the records of that commission reside in the LBJ Library, so it would make sense to have something at the LBJ Library and honor his involvement in supporting what eventually became the National Commission on Libraries.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Also, one of the people that did a good job on King was Senator Yarborough from Texas. The Senate sponsor was Senator Ralph Yarborough. So there are a lot of things we can point to around there.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you. I think this sort of segues very neatly into the next item on the agenda, and we are right on time.

I'll do a mea culpa for you.

MR. WILLARD: I want to say a little bit more about it.

I got a mea culpa that you do not have minutes. It is my intention that the minutes of this agency and meetings of the Commission be much briefer and be backed up by a full transcript, which is what we did for the first time at the last meeting.

I can probably say we do have the transcript. I cannot so probably say I haven't got the summary done yet, but we will suspend it and hopefully get your approval at the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: And actually, I have seen the complete transcript and read through it.

One moment. This will be Joan Challinor.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I think we need some sort of a Robert's Rules of order to pass down the minutes of the meeting -- the last meeting -- and to put them off officially --

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Actually, you're correct. And I would entertain a motion that we go ahead and table the minutes to the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I so move.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I second.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I second.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: It has been moved by Commissioner Challinor, seconded jointly by Commissioners Griffiths and Abramson, so we will table the minutes to our next meeting.

Thank you, Joan, for reminding me of that.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: My one last rule of order a year.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Perhaps because of that I should look upon you as the parliamentarian who keeps me in order.

We are still on time, and we're down to the NCLIS action plan.

I'd like you to change the language. We're really seeing this as a strategic plan, and if you turn to Tab C, you will see pretty much from the Power Point presentation the

framework, and our meeting in April, we're really going to finalize this and set our goals for the next few years.

So I want you to look at this very carefully, please. The Executive Committee met in San Antonio. We spent a whole day pulling all of this together, and in April we will go ahead and finalize our strategic plan.

Are there any comments at this time that you want to make about the plan? Hopefully, most of you have looked at it before you came or we could rearrange the agenda and come back to me, perhaps for a few minutes tomorrow after you've had a chance to go over this.

What is the pleasure of the Commission? Well, don't everyone speak at once.

In that case, I would suggest you look at it, read it and send your comments directly to Mr. Willard.

Okay. We are now moving to Tab D, and Beth Bingham, are you ready to make your report, please?

MS. BINGHAM: Thank you.

As Bob mentioned, Rosalie is the new project director for Sister Libraries, and I'm going to look forward to working with her.

Let me tell you about a few of the things that have been happening with the project.

In the span of a year, we've created a traveling exhibit, exhibited at one national and two international conferences -- Sister Cities International is our second one -- designed and printed brochures; placed information on the web page with links to the designated library sites; had articles in the Australian Library Journal, Sister Cities International newsletters, and the 3M Corporation International Tadler magazine.

We hosted two recognition events at the American Library Association meeting in New Orleans and San Antonio. We've imparted ongoing publicity efforts with all of our sister libraries which have been selected, presented recognition plaques to 50 sites. We've matched 47 libraries, created and maintained an international database of nearly 600 libraries that have expressed an interest in the project. And we've worked with 10 embassies and a dozen library associations, made some site visits and talked with hundreds of librarians. We now have 98 libraries in 36 states and the District of Columbia that have been selected and designated.

The office has assisted with this matching process, and I think that this has been the most frustrating and time-consuming thing that we've done. People start, they get going, and something happens, and it all falls apart. It's like the domino effect. So then we go back to square one.

Even libraries that were in relationships with Sister Cities have had problems connecting and finding out who to work with and what exactly needs to be done. So we spend a lot of time on the telephone, an inordinate amount of time on e-mail communication, and basically we just do what needs to be done.

We had another successful tea in San Antonio. We had a number of the commissioners attending. Martha made remarks and read a letter from the First Lady. Abe and Jack Hightower were there, Beverly and Winston were also there.

A special guest was Dan Carter and his wife, who was a former commissioner, which was very nice for people to see. Connie Carbo, former executive director of the Commission was there, and also our special friend. Ann Molod, who has just been a wonderful reporter of our Sister Library program.

We also had Barbara Ford from the past president of the American Library Association, who perhaps keyed on Joan's passion for global touch to get the Commission and Sister Libraries going.

We gathered information periodically from the libraries and have tried to share this, and I think that this is where the teas have been most beneficial. The librarians who are working in active relationships like talking to one another and finding out what is working and what is not, so that the newly designated sites can work with the other ones, and this is a real value.

Down the road, Rosalie and I have already been talking about hopefully seeing what we can do to get a list server, more written communication among our sites.

Judy Russell and I attended the Sisters Libraries Committee meeting in San Antonio. Joan was not able to come. Basically, Judy and I spent the most of the time of the two-hour meeting talking about what we were doing because it seems like we're doing an awful lot in this particular arena. So we were being looked at as pretty much the model of what to do to get a twinning relationship going. So that was kind of an interesting situation.

Judy announced that at the conclusion of the project that the Commission will probably be publishing information, a report about what has happened. The database is continually being updated and change. We have different contacts. We have people communicating practically everyday wanting information about the projects, so we refer them to the web page. But some people need to be more spoon-fed than that, and we actually mail things out if they need that.

Our booth. We don't necessarily need a hammer, Martha. It's a little easier than that. You just need to be tall, and that's real frustrating.

All our materials were sent to the school library meeting in Birmingham, and I wasn't able to attend. But members of the Birmingham Public Library helped stamp the booth and had a lot of the traffic. Rebecca was at the booth, and she was on call, and she was the hostess with the mostest at the booth.

It's flashy. It looks very, very nice. I passed out pictures at the November meeting so you could see exactly what it is. So hopefully, as you're traveling around to some of these conferences, you will be able to see it, especially if you're going to PLA. That's when Rosalie is going to debut as the booth person because I'll be attending for my library.

Sister Cities International right now is trying to determine when we best fit into their agenda to present our plaques because that's when we did them last year to the cities. They've changed their format, so we'll be working with Denita Holland from Sister Cities to come up with a win-win situation so that we can get high level visibility for the communities and for the mayors to get their plaques.

Because if you'll remember, we not only give a plaque to the designated library, we give a plaque to the city in which the library is located -- and from both ends, internationally as well as in the United States -- to get more visibility with the project for the cities.

Woody and I have been communicating back and forth talking about a way to perhaps get information and pull something together to work with the UNESCO Associated Library Network, and this is another venue for exploration.

There are a lot of questions that need to be examined, and they will be posed to the International Committee to come up with perhaps a little bit different focus for the rest of the year to see what we do with the libraries that we have going on and where to from here.

I've enjoyed being part of this project. As I say, it's been a worldwind of activities since last January, and I'm looking forward to working with Rosalie on the future developments of the project.

I think my limitations as a consultant have been that I have been so focused on this particular project that at time I've kind of lost sight of the totality of service that the Commission provides, so I apologize if there's been any problem with that.

But bottom line, I think that Sister Libraries have provided an opportunity for visibility for the Commission in the library community in a different slant. This is a people project, not an institutional project, and that is something that is a little bit different from the types of projects that have been done in the past.

If you have any questions about the project, I'd be happy to answer anything or Rosalie. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Joan, would you like to make some comments?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I think you have had to have worked on the inside of this to know how much work there is. It doesn't sound like an awful lot, but I can tell you that Beth has really put out 100 percent for this project, and I think she deserves all our thanks for what she has done. This has carried our name and our program to places we never would have gotten before. She has done a superb job on this, and I'm sure that she and Rosalie and in the future will be tying it up and putting it to bed and getting these things out, and keeping it going because, as Beth said, some of these libraries start and they stop, and they start and they stop. But I want to pay tribute to Beth and what she has done.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you. Are there any other comments?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: If it hadn't been done so well, it wouldn't be worth the time to comment on it. But it's much more difficult in my experience to have a small, semi-formal gathering go well than a large one. The arrangements for the reception that was held in San Antonio were excellent. And, in fact, we were able to expose the program to a lot of influential people who could carry it on. I think it was just seamless. There must have been some things that went wrong, but it t was perfect, we had the right people there, and they were treated well, and everything about it was outstanding.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: The long loud silences are --

MS. BINGHAM: Martha, I forgot something. Today at lunch, Nancy Bolt, who is one of our newly designated libraries from the Colorado Library Association, the Colorado State Library, brought up an interesting component, and Joan I want you to be thinking about this.

She's working with the Bulgarian Library Association. They've identified six sites to match with Colorado sites. They were reading the information that we had sent them about the project, and we're fascinated that Hillary Clinton is our honorary chair, and they've decided that they want to see what they can do about working with the first lady of Bulgaria to see what we can do.

So this is something we're going to be thinking about. As I say, things are like topsy. They tend to grow where that snowball just keeps going down the hill, but there are all types of things that are coming from this. But this was today's add-on to the agenda.

So we will be addressing, Nancy. I don't want you to think that we're losing sight of that, but we have put it on our to-do list to talk about.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Great.

Joan, I think you wanted to say something.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I did.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Oh, you've already said it? Okay.

Woody Horton.

MR. HORTON: I wasn't directly involved, but I think the notion of Sister Library schools has also been discussed at the ALISE meeting.

Is this time to mention what has happened? All I know about it is, that thanks to the help of Tony Carbo, who, as most of you know, is the dean of the Library School of Pittsburgh.

The feasibility of establishing some sort of a sister library school program is also being explored now with ALISE, so we'll try and keep up with what happens there.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: You might want to talk to the Simmons Graduate School of Library and Information Science. They already are partnering with the Library School at Wuhan University in Wuhan, China, where actually I visited a number of years ago. It was really quite fascinating.

So I think this is great. Things do tend to grow nicely.

Any other comments in terms of the Sister Library Program?

Okay. Then we will go to the Library Statistics Program, Mr. Willard.

MR. WILLARD: Thank you.

I really don't have much to add to what's in the book, but I'm delighted that it is in the book. We've got two landmark activities, one being the signing of the memorandum of understanding with the Department of Education for partially funding what we do in statistics.

I say partially funding because, as you may recall from an outgrowth from the report done by Howard Harris, the Commission has taken a much bigger role using its own resources and applying to the Program of Statistics focused on libraries. I will just echo what I said earlier about the great role that Denise is playing in leading that effort.

I believe the amount of money we're getting from NCES is larger -- 225 -- this year. It was how much last year? About 190?

MS. RUSSELL: It was less because we only had Denise part of the year.

MR. WILLARD: But the other important thing is to realize that we are continuing on our Internet connectivity survey. It started in 1994. And I still like to boast about the fact

that when Congress was designing the E-Rate Program, one of the compelling facts that they used in their debate was the number that was developed out of our survey that talked about only 21 percent of the libraries in the country being connected to the Internet.

This new survey will take place in the Year 2000, and I'm predicting probably break the 90 percent barrier in terms of Internet connectivity, and also in terms of public access. I think last time it was the '97 survey where it was 83 percent connected and about 70 to 75 percent offering public access.

We will have some additional questions. Obviously, what we asked before in terms of filtering was useful in the debate on that subject. Based on our own hearing on library services for the disability, we will try to design some questions in the survey that focus on providing Internet connectivity for people with disabilities, and we'll see that information elicited by this questionnaire.

Keep in mind that we also try very hard to make this as simple a survey instrument as possible to respond to. It's almost like a postcard. There's some discussion about using the Internet itself to get some of the responses. Of course, if you're measuring Internet connectivity and use the Internet, you get 100 percent connectivity, so we've got to also make sure we measure those that aren't connected.

So that's where we are with the survey. Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I do have one comment because interestingly enough I've been involved right now in Nevada in terms of establishing standards for school library services. And thanks to the beginning of some of the statistical work that has been done, Denise has provided me with some rather interesting statistics in terms of what we don't have in my own state, and it's going to be extremely helpful.

Abe, do you have any comments? You've attended a number of meetings.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Unusually, no.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Mr. Abramson said, unusually, no.

Okay. We are now down to Commissioner Griffiths on the working group and journal pricing.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: Thank you.

At the last meeting, I took away the to-do to write a letter to Carolyn Snyder and the Big 12 Plus Librarians to invite them to prepare a strong-hand paper describing principles for journal pricing.

It didn't happen as quickly as I wanted, but it did finally happened, and Carolyn Snyder responded. The Big 12 Plus Librarians have accepted that task. They were hoping they

might -- but they thought it might not happen -- prepare a detailed outline by this meeting, but I'm pretty sure that we will have a document from them which we'll be able to discuss at the April meeting.

The other thing that's happening independent of the Commission is that the University of Michigan towards the end of April -- I believe it's April 23rd and 24th -- is hosting an invitational meeting on the economics of their electronic journals where a number of the key players, internationally, will be coming together. So I'm hoping that those two things occurring in April will give us the impetus to start planning a hearing.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Will there be minutes or proceedings from this meeting at the University of Michigan?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I'm sure there will be, and I will be attending. I would welcome, if anybody else is interested in attending, I can probably arrange it.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We'll take that under consideration.

Ancillary to what Commissioner Griffiths just discussed, in March there will be a meeting with Beverly Lynch, who is the interim director of the Center of Research Libraries, and what came out of the meeting that was held in Atlanta was looking at some changes in the mission of the Center for Research Libraries.

She is very interested in exploring the viability of the Center for Research Libraries literally becoming an electronic depository for electronic journals. So she will be meeting with us in Washington to begin exploratory talks which will be concurrent with the meeting that's going on at the University of Michigan. It's on the same day. So we're beginning to I think move ahead very nicely in that direction.

Yes?

COMMISSIONER TABB: In following up on this, the recent report that was published on the digital dilemma also has a specific recommendation in it that there ought to be a task force put together to look at this question about legal deposit of electronic materials, particularly electronic journals. There was a specific recommendation in that report that this ought to be or might be convened by the Library of Congress.

The register of copyrights, Mary Beth Peters and I, have agreed to co-chair this. We'll be meeting in Washington at the Library of Congress on March 15th with the chair of the Committee for the National Research Council that prepared that report, along with Cliff Lynch and probably Karen Hunter to begin talking about how we might begin to actually work on that particular recommendation coming out of that report. So this needs to be folded into the mix as well.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Do you want to get in touch with Bev Lynch? Good.

Commissioner Abramson?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I've made it an hour and 15 minutes. I can't make it another hour and a half. Our break is scheduled for an hour and a half from now.

MR. WILLARD: It occurs to me that when I was giving the Executive Director's report I sort of telescoped everything that I should say at this point.

Recapping, the idea of a conference is definitely being considered in the White House now. The president himself knows that it is something we want to do. It is in a staffer's hands.

I have always felt that if we had gone any other way -- that is, if we had sent just a formal letter to the White House without finding a way to get it to the president's attention, it would have stopped at a staffer's office, and may or may not have ever gotten to his attention. But I think the fact that it has received presidential attention means, if it's going to happen at all, it will.

I think it is appropriate to let you know specifically that we did get some criticism of it, and Nancy is here to augment during the time of having comments from the observers.

But I think it's fair to say that the state librarians raised some very legitimate questions about the timing of such a conference and whether or not it would provide the opportunity for communicating to policymakers what the concerns of the library community are.

One of the problems with dealing with a White House Conference is it's a problem that a model exists, and people then use that word to always convey that model. I would say that it is unanimous -- or as close to that as I can measure -- that nobody wants to see the '79 or '91 conference's model repeated. Rather, it is our desire that when you have an individual sitting in the White House who started his national career, in a sense, talking about libraries, that he shouldn't leave without talking about them again. And it is less an occasion for bringing a lot of people together to write resolutions as the past occasions were; and instead it is, essentially, a public relations or public celebration function that we're hoping they will convene.

We also said in the letter that we anticipate the use of technologies that didn't exist in a viable way for the earlier ones so that people around the nation can participate without the travel costs and without the commitment of time in the past, and it ends up being not more than a day and a half devoted specifically to libraries in a celebratory way.

So that's where we are. Joan is our liaison on White House Conference issues. She has been in direct contact with the individual in the White House, who happens to be the person we've dealt with before on the Millennium Project, and as soon as I get back to

Washington and Joan and I can get together, we are going to strategize how we make the case and convince people in the White House that this is a minimal burdened and a maximum benefit for us.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Joan Challinor, do you want to make any comments at this time?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: No. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

With that, I will suggest that we take --

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Martha?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Yes?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: During the break, would you take Bob's cell phone and give me a call?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Will do.

Any other comments by the commissioners at this time?

I would suggest then we take a 15-minute break. When we come back we'll talk about NTIS, the United Nations, and then we will be hearing comments from all of our liaisons. So be back here at 2:45, please.

(Recess at 2:30 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We are back in session, and the next issue we're going to discuss is the future of the National Technical Information Service. The discussion will be done by Bob Willard and Woody Horton, but we are pleased to welcome Jonathon Orszac from the Department of Commerce. He was also with us this afternoon, and we are delighted that you were able to come.

With that, I'll turn this over to Mr. Willard.

MR. WILLARD: Let me back space just one second. I didn't bring copies of the letter for everybody, but I do want to pass around the letter that we got from the White House on the White House Conference. Specifically, the sentences where the president says, "I am deeply committed to supporting our nation's libraries, and believe they are among our most important and cherished institutions." He also says about the Commission, "I appreciate the work you do everyday to ensure that they continue to be a vital, educational, social and cultural resource." So I'll pass that document around.

As I said in my earlier comments, when people look back at the history of the Commission for this era, what we are doing with NTIS will be a very noteworthy element because it brings together so much of why congress created the Commission to begin with -- to have somebody who can act as an independent view, an honest broker, dealing with public policy issues as they affect information.

It really came out of left field. We weren't prepared for it, but in the middle of August we saw that notice as a press release from the Department of Commerce. We moved quickly and established contact with both the House and Senate staffers and also with the secretary. Jeanne had a letter into the secretary almost instantly, suggesting that the Commission should be involved in helping to deal with these issues.

I also can't say enough about how fortunate we were to have on our staff through a consulting relationship, Woody Horton, whose depth, bureaucratic touch is just wonderful.

One of these days, I've got to find a librarian who can help me find it again because I've known it for about 30 years. I cannot remember where I've read it, but I've used it more times than I can think of.

It's about an old time photographer back around the turn of the century who's using one of these big portrait cameras that has the film that you slide in and out, and you get under the hood and you look through there.

He was taking a picture of an industrialist, and he put the person in the chair and turned his head just a certain way and said, lean this way. Then he went back, got under the hood, looked through the lens and saw a very uncomfortable person and felt that wasn't the picture.

So he just got out and said, "Sir, why don't you stand up, relax a minute, and sit down again." The man did it, sat down, took exactly the same position but now looked comfortable.

I've always used that as an example for the importance to let people arrive at the position that think they should be at, but through a process where they're very much involved.

Woody is just a master of that. He's on the phone all the time. He's making sure that nothing happens in the dark, we don't hide anything from anybody, everybody is involved in every process every step of the way. So we are extremely fortunate that he was already working for us on the GPO study and was able to apply his full energies to this project.

In addition, we also were very fortunate that another wonderful person, Sara Kadlec, a librarian and information scientist who has been involved in many different jobs, including at the EPA -- in fact, I think she was the first information resource manager librarian at the EPA, and then she was called back later. Also, I think she was a librarian

at the White House in her career. She was available, and she has been a key player in this process.

So with that, I think it would be foolish for me to say anything more because Woody's here. So I'm going to turn it over to him.

MR. HORTON: Thank you for your kind remarks, Bob.

Well, you've taken the first half of my thunder away, so I don't have to repeat the press release and those things.

Shortly after the press release, Judy and I met with key staff people on the Hill, and we also went up and talked to John at the Department of Commerce, and we sensed that, indeed, this was the kind of the issue that would not settle very easily, and it would probably be very helpful to use the phrase, "honest broker," if the Commission did play that kind of a role in trying to bring together as many stakeholders as we could so that we could air their views and get it out on the public record, so to speak.

That in turn led to two meetings which have taken place. The first one on January 19th, which Martha chaired, the second one on February 4th, which Joan chaired -- both of which did a superb job -- which did allow upwards of 75 people representing many, many different stakeholders to tell us how they felt about what the Secretary of Commerce was proposing.

We have one more final open public meeting which is scheduled for February 29th, and at that meeting we hope to bring in the remainder of the most important stakeholder groups who for one reason or another were unable to attend the first two meetings.

Meanwhile, a couple of weeks ago, after listening carefully to the tapes and looking at the minutes for the first meetings, we drafted a position paper which has been qualified to be called an emerging consensus position paper.

I've been asked what is an emerging consensus. Well, an emerging consensus is one which is not yet a consensus. When it has emerged it will be fully hatched, but we're not yet at that point because we have to go through the process of this third meeting and hear from the remainder of the stakeholders.

That paper has been prepared primarily with the help of a very limited number of friends of the court, as we call them, who are those who have been the most directly concerned with this issue. We were fortunate, I think, to have at those meetings two of the four former NTIS directors, Mel Day and Peter Urbach who have been helping us with this position paper.

The position paper was given to you, labeled clearly graphed, and we have a new one in this morning that was just distributed to you with yet a little more tinkering with the words but no significant change to the main points.

Later, Martha, I guess we would need to ask you if you want the commissioners to take more time to look at this and act tomorrow or whether you want to act today. I'll leave that up to you.

My hope was that the Commission could focus on that draft position paper and make any suggestions for revisions or changes that you feel are appropriate to us. We will make those changes, and then my suggestion to Bob and Judy was going to be that we removed the word "draft" from the title and say something like, approved by NCLIS for public review and comment, and the post it to the Web and send it to all the stakeholders who have been participating in the meeting, so, as Bob says, we keep this as open and democratic as we possibly can.

We would continue, while that's going on, at the staff level to study the main so-called short-term alternatives which are still on the table. Namely, to keep NTIS in the Department of Commerce, to transfer it to the Library of Congress, to transfer it to the Government Printing Office or to transfer it to the National Archives and Records Administration.

There are three other alternatives, but every one of those other three are alternatives which we feel are going to require considerably more time for the principals involved to focus on all the challenges associated with doing it.

One of those is to create a new national science, engineering and technology library. Obviously, that's not the sort of thing you do overnight. It's going to take time. It means creating a new structure. There's a key question about where is it going to be house and so forth and so on.

Then there are some interesting little sideplays going on. The main advocate of that at the moment is the Department of Energy, but every time we write science, engineering and technology, they change it to science, energy and technology. So that's the sort of thing that needs to be aired.

Then another alternative has to do with creating a new independent service bureau, kind of an organization, which can consolidate the different programs in the federal government concerned with public information dissemination. The third alternative would be to privatize some elements of the NTIS operations.

So we have both short-term -- more feasible, more practical -- and longer term that would require much more study.

From the very first time Jonathon appeared at our meeting on the 19th, I was very impressed with the openness with which he exposed his ideas and his willingness to contribute to the broader goal of the meeting which was to get all the views on the table without taking anything personally; and he had every reason to become upset because the arrows were flying at him from many different directions. But he stood very tall, and

there were several times when Martha leaned over and said, "We've got to stop this attack." But we didn't need to because Jonathon handled himself very adroitly and adeptly.

We have him here today because we asked him if he would like to first-hand give us his views and to enlighten us perhaps on some things that we have not stated as correctly in his views as we should in the paper.

So with that, Jonathon. Jonathon, by the way, is director of policy in the Department of Commerce.

MR. ORSZAC: Thank you, Woody.

I actually want to keep my remarks short and just answer any questions that you may have.

NTIS, as stated in this emerging consensus -- and I think getting Commerce Department to be part of that consensus may be a difficult task, but you never know, we may be able to move you all to our position by the end of this -- is that the business model of NTIS is fundamentally flawed. It is a model that just does not work. It cannot be self-sufficient, period.

The core clearinghouse which I think this group is most interested in, and we are too, is truly a national treasure. It has millions and millions of science and technology documents dating 50 years in one place. This is a very important collection, and the question is, how do we maintain access to that information, et cetera, in a way that is fiscally responsible but also meets the sort of goals ensuring that the public has access to it.

Just to give you some idea of the situation facing NTIS. I believe it's five years in a row that the clearinghouse has lost money. Last year, we were in a situation that they were in danger of being deficient. That means that they would actually end the year bankrupt, and given the Anti-Deficiency Act that Congress passed, somebody at the Commerce Department would go to jail. I can name a few people I wouldn't mind, but that's okay.

So obviously, it raised important issues -- bells -- for us, and so we started looking into both the short-term issue and the long-term issues. In terms, of the short-term issue, we took a number of steps to reduce costs, consolidating rents, moving personnel from NTIS to other parts of the Department where possible, et cetera.

Fortunately, NTIS ended the year and still had a surplus. They have about \$1.7 million on hand and are running at approximately a rate this year of making a profit of half a million plus.

The problem is, if NTIS loses their biggest contract which is with the IRS -- they get 25 percent of their revenue from the IRS -- they will be in danger this year of going

deficient. So it obviously is still a very touch and go situation. We're following it closely month to month. So that's in terms of the short-term issue.

In terms of the long-term issue, we started looking and said, this is not an area that the Secretary of Commerce in sort of today's economy is focusing his attention. His attention is focused on e-commerce, it's focused on globalization, and this year it's focused very much on the decennial census.

By the way, I'll get a pitch in for the Department there. The census forms will be mailed out next month, and I expect everybody in this room to mail them back. The goal is to get a response rate of 61 percent, so it's assumed that we want 65 percent, so the more people that send them back, the better.

So we started looking at how do we address this in the long-term, and we have three goals. First, how do you maintain public access to this information, how do you something that's fiscally responsible, and lastly, how do you minimize any impact on the employees of NTIS?

We put together our best proposal and went up to the Hill to explain it to them. Before, we had talked to the Library of Congress, which in retrospect may have been a mistake, and we've been criticized for it. Then again, if we had talked to the Library of Congress first, we probably would have been criticized for that too, so we were in a catch-22 there.

But our proposal was to shut down the parts of NTIS that were not part of the core clearinghouse, to transfer the core clearinghouse function to the Library of Congress.

We chose the Library of Congress, based on the information that we had at the time, for three reasons over GPO. It wasn't like we thought GPO couldn't do a good job. It was more, first, the library already had a significant science and technology collection; second, they've had a service that they provided information to the public, unlike the National Archives; and third, in 1989, the Library of Congress asked the Department for NTIS, and so we were just getting back to them 10 years later.

It's important to understand the model we created -- a new document, say produced by the Commerce Department -- the first copy would go up on the Web. We believe that the Internet is an important means, but should not be the only means by which information is accessible to the public. So a document would go up on the website, and it would be maintained there for at least three years.

Second, the document would be sent to the clearinghouse which would now be housed at the Library of Congress. Third, a document would end up in the Federal Depository Library so there would be points of access throughout America where people could go and see this document.

One problem, as many of you know, is that agencies are not supplying the information to this core clearinghouse, and we've appreciated very much the work and the discussions

we've had in these various forums. We believe that the best approach would be to have the chief information officers at each agency report annually to Congress on that agency's compliance with this law. Shining a light on the problem may be the best thing that we can do. I know in our department, if we were about to send up a report to the Hill saying we weren't complying with this piece of legislation, our secretary and deputy secretary wouldn't let us get away with it. Other departments? Who knows, but at least from experience in our department, we would not be in the good graces of our bosses.

I think the hard work that NCLIS has done in putting together these recommendations is this consensus. It certainly is a consensus or something that's pretty close to a consensus document here.

The one thing I just want to emphasize -- because it does put sort of off the decision of where should this clearinghouse be -- is to think about who's the best place to oversee an information, dissemination organization? Is it a department whose main goal is to promote trade to help technology flourish or would it be better served to be at an information dissemination organization? In our analysis, we believe it will be better at a place that has more knowledge on this than we do, but of course, reasonable people and friends can always disagree.

I just want to re-emphasize from somebody who sees first-hand what the secretary's schedule is day in and day out, the issues that you all have and are focused on are not issues that he spends his time on, and I don't think any secretary in our lifetimes is going to be focused on them.

So it seems to me that it would be better served, whether it's the public printer, whether it's the Library of Congress or whether it's an independent organization or some hybrid thereof, that they focus day in and day out on the issues that you have, and that would probably be best served for NTIS to be within an organization like that.

Any questions that you have, I'd be more than happy to try to answer them.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Commissioner Abramson?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: It's not like you didn't try to generate income. I was getting postcards for a couple of years about offers to do Power Point presentations for me and posters and all kinds of other things, and, in fact, that raised the flag for me, and I had an intention not too far in the past to go out to Springfield and visit, to find out what was going on out there.

It seems to me that the quick fix, to buy the kind of time that the Commission seems to feel is necessary, would be to just put a line in the bill that says it doesn't has to pay for itself for X months or the next two budget periods. Of course, the money has to come from somewhere. But unless they do that, somebody may be in violation of the deficiency bill.

Is that something that would solve most of the problem that you have or you still have to devote energy and focus to it?

MR. ORSZAC: Obviously, sort of the genesis of this issue was the fiscal, so it would to some extent address that issue. Getting an appropriation would address that problem, but it doesn't address two fundamental issues.

One, they clearly have been trying to generate income, and I think they've moved from their core mission and started generating income in areas that aren't quite appropriate per se for the government to be entering into, competing almost directly with the private sector in some places.

Yet, sometimes you have to question whether it's appropriate for one government agency to profit significantly off another government agency, which is what NTIS is doing in servicing the IRS' web page.

Getting back to the core question, obviously, it would address the fiscal issue, but I don't think it would address this larger issue of, is NTIS and the information community better served by having it at a place where information is sort of their focus?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I was going to say that I've seen this kind of dilution of service happen a number of times, and people are required to recover all their costs. In fact, it might be better for NTIS to really focus on its core mission, rather than try and find innovative ways to generate revenues that are distracting and detracting from the core mission.

The question of where it should be located, it seems to me, would have to be asked after some kind of changing of the business rules because it could quite easily continue to function independently and perform its core mission very, very well as a stand-a-lone; and it may, in fact, perturb other organizations and their core missions. So I think that really does need a fairly lengthy examination.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Martha, this is Joan. May I have a question?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Joan Challinor.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Bob, the piece that you handed out, does it reflect the emendations and everything that Fran Buckley sent us?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: It does.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: The answer is, yes, it does.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I align myself with what Jose just said.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you. That was Joan Challinor.

Are there any other comments from the commissioners? Don't everyone speak at once.

Commissioner Hightower.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Let me direct this to Winston now. Sometimes someone hands off a baby when that when they receive it doesn't necessarily want it.

I've heard for the first time that 10 years ago the Library of Congress offered or expressed a willingness to have it or desire to have it, but is this something that the Library of Congress feels could fit into their program with some minor adjustments?

COMMISSIONER TABB: When Dr. Billington wrote to the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Mossbacher, he was writing really to a friend, beginning a possibility of a dialogue which never was consummated. But I think we should put that aside and really look to where we are now.

Martha had asked if I wanted to speak about this, and I think I have to be as careful as I can about speaking as a commissioner as opposed to a representative of the Library of Congress.

If I would speak as a commissioner, I would say I really support what Jose was saying. I think what I see for the information community at large as needing is a chance to really think about how this kind of information should be handled in the longer term, how this kind of material relates to other kind of government documents. And whether at the end of this if we can take our time, not forever, but sufficient time to really think more holistically about the way in which users will be better served by the management of government information.

The Library Congress does have a position about this, but I would prefer really to make those statements as I was permitted to do at the meeting that we had earlier in February where I could speak with that other hat on.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Is there perhaps a danger if it came to the Library of Congress that it would also be along with it that mandate that it had to pay its own expenses?

COMMISSIONER TABB: I think one of the key elements in the emerging consensus is that the public-good functions must be publicly funded wherever they are. And I think that's really a great step forward so that it really doesn't get to be so much the turf question of whether this is done at Commerce or at Library of Congress or at GPO but opens it up to talk again more about the principles upon which a final decision ought to be made which is that there are certain aspects of the work now being done by NTIS that really ought to be paid for by the taxpayer. Not everything. I'm not saying that, and I don't think anyone else is either, but that really is the nut of the problem; that NTIS was

asked not by the current administration, but historically, to try to as a cost recovery operation something which ought never to have been put into that purview.

MR. ORSZAC: If I can just add one thing. We concur. This clearly is not an area that can survive without public funding, and it deserves public funding.

To just sort of discuss a number of the options that have been on the table, we're not sort of set in the way that the Library of Congress was the place that it was suppose to be, that was just our best -- I don't want to say guess, but our best option in front of us.

One option that was sort of put on the table at some point was the hybrid approach. One concern that the library has is that they don't have the ability to disseminate the information. If they had a larger

increase in the number of people calling up for the information, that would overload their systems. But GPO does have that kind of capability. So one idea that the Commission would be well served to think about would be sort of a hybrid approach, of the collection going to the Library of Congress but the actual dissemination function being done at GPO.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: May I say something, Martha?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Commissioner Challinor?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: I would like to say how much I appreciate the work that Woody has done, and I associate myself with everything that Bob has said because having had to share this, I had to get up to speed, and he answered an awful lot of dumb questions.

And I appreciate all the work he has done. You have to be there -- I'm speaking to the other commissioners now -- to know what a great job Woody has really done.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you, Commissioner Challinor.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any other comments from the commissioners?

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: I understand you're having another meeting. Two more meetings.

MR. ORSZAC: One.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: One more meeting. And then after that the revised draft will become the draft, and that will be submitted to who?

MR. ORSZAC: Actually, there will be one edition. On March 9th, the House Science and Technology Committee is having a hearing on the Technology Administration's Reauthorization Bill. The Technology Administration oversees NTI, so we've been informed that NTIS will be a main focus of that hearing. So given that that's after the last meeting, that may be an opportune forum.

MR. HORTON: NCLIS suggested a timetable to both the House and Senate science committees, and we said that we hope to have our final report into the president and the Congress by mid-March. So that is the timetable that we're operating under. They concurred in that timetable. And the new ingredient which John has just added gives us yet another opportunity perhaps to testify and participate in that hearing.

So at some point this position paper would be transformed -- its contents would be transformed into a letter to the president and the committees of Congress that have jurisdiction over the matter.

COMMISSIONER HIGHTOWER: Are you saying, Woody, that this would be coming from NCLIS?

MR. HORTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: So if it's going to be coming from NCLIS, do you anticipate, Bob, having a telephone conference with all the commissioners to sign off finally after you've sent it to us. You can call and say, shall we sign this and send it to the president? Is that your plan?

MR. WILLARD: I don't want to commit to a telephone conference, but certainly it will be communication. It may be faxed, and it will ask for a fax back indicating that you read it. Yes, but absolutely, before it goes out it will be finally blessed by the entire Commission.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Isn't it true that we will be sending it both to the president and to the Congress?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Never have I know our charge to be so specific. This is one case where we really speak to both sides.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you, Commissioner Challinor.

Then it's my understanding that this revised draft, which hopefully by unanimous consent, we will send out for broad distribution to all of the stakeholders that have been involved in the first two meetings, plus the next meeting. And then when it comes back with the input and what not, we will revise it again, and we will hold hopefully to the

timetable, and also we'll discuss in the future testifying at the meeting on the 9th of March.

MR. HORTON: We also handed out to you today a second paper that lists the so-called criteria for assessments. While we're conducting these public meetings at the staff level in NCLIS, we are working with different groups to try and analyze each of the alternatives against this set of criteria, with user groups primarily.

MR. : What is the title of the document?

MR. HORTON: I don't have it in front of me. This is called the Revised and Retitled General Principles for Public Information, now titled Guidelines for NCLIS Consideration of Alternatives Relating to the NTIS Closure and Transfer.

One of the ideas that we're talking about is perhaps convening a panel of major user groups and asking them to evaluate the alternatives against this list of criteria. So there is that staff level of work that is going on in the background and will be cranked into the final outputs.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Do you have any additional comments, Jonathon?

MR. ORSZAC: I think I should just second or third or fourth or however many times people have said what a great job Woody's done and everybody else in NCLIS in terms of bringing all the folks together on this issue. It's obviously a difficult issue, and there have been a lot of different positions, but you all have done a terrific job, and we thank you. I'm happy that you all are having this out in L.A. and not back in D.C.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Are there any additional comments from the commissioners? Then I feel that we can say that there was unanimous consent that the revised draft, February 15, 2000, that we approve by consent going out to the stakeholders and asking for their input in return for public comment. Not final, but additional comment.

Commissioner Abramson?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: As I read this -- the pagination on the bottom is 4 -- I kind of like the -- obviously from what I said before -- the first full paragraph on page 4, which is 5 of 7 on the fax, "If Congress provides appropriated funds."

If I were to be charged with emphasis in rewriting this, I would rewrite and emphasize that as a short-term fix that keeps everybody's head above water why we look at a longer fix.

MR. HORTON: I agree with that recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I don't know if I mean I'd italicize it or make it the banner or sidebar, but --

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. Then we will go ahead and disseminate this particular revised draft, dated February 15, 2000, to all of the interested parties that have been at the first two meetings, plus those that will be at the third meeting and I guess anyone else who wants to comment. Okay?

While we go on to our next item, I will remind people that there are soft drinks at the back of the room.

(Housekeeping announcements)

Jonathon, thank you, again, for taking the time to come. We appreciate the input.

MR. ORSZAC: Thank you for having me.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: The next item then will be the United Nations, UNESCO, and Mr. Willard, you're on.

MR. WILLARD: The Commission had an amendment of its law in the early '90s, where, among other things, it authorized -- and the floor debate actually encouraged strongly -- that the national Commission be sensitive and be involved in international library and information service activities.

We have done this to a moderate degree, and giving the limitations on budget, that's probably appropriate. We probably can't do too much than we're doing.

But we are really the primary representative within the federal government who is concerned with library and information policy on an international stage. Now that isn't to say that other organizations aren't involved -- clearly, the Library of Congress plays a great role in terms of international leadership -- but it would be a mistake for the Commission to ignore this area completely, and so we haven't.

One of the groups that we've always stayed in touch with, but recently have improved the communication with, as I indicated earlier, was UNESCO.

Last September -- and I reported this at our November meeting -- at the specific request and at the funding of the Department of State, I visited with the Library and Information Policy staff people at UNESCO in Paris.

As you may know, the United States is not a member of UNESCO. We dropped out in the mid '80s because of principally policy disagreements and also concern about the administrative efficiencies of the organization. We also in recent years have been

delinquent in paying our dues to the overarching international organization of which UNESCO is part, and that's the United Nations.

Things are changing greatly though. In the material that was handed out in preparation for this meeting, you will see the report of the President of the United States on our involvement in the United Nations, and that's a lengthy report of which we've only provided you a few pages -- it's a table of contents -- and that's specifically dealing with UNESCO. But you can see that the official attitude of the government is different now.

Also, the arrearage in dues to the United Nations has been appropriated by the Congress, and we are in the process of paying those dues off. I think there is some gating factor, some things have to be done, but the money is authorized and the negotiations are in process now.

Why don't I ask if Woody wants to add anything before we move forward.

MR. HORTON: Just a couple of things.

In the last conversation that we had with the Department of State on the question of the U.S. rejoining UNESCO, the one thing that stands out in my memory is that we were told that the biggest single issue holding things up now is the question of agreement on reducing the U.S. prorated share from 25 to 21 percent, I think, or 22 percent. I think it's 25 to 21 or 22. That's the biggest single hurdle that's yet to be overcome. But as Bob points out in principle, both the Congress and the president are moving in that direction.

We have floated the draft in front of you as a draft to the State Department, and they have strongly endorsed this wording. We deal with the Bureau of International Affairs which is our point of contact on this.

So even though the American Library Association's first resolution on this I think was passed in 1989 endorsing the U.S. rejoining the UNESCO, the State Department feels it's very timely that this Commission pass such a resolution now to sort of reinforce their 11th hour attempts with the Congress to reach a final agreement.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Joan, do you have any comments you would like to make at this time?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Yes. I am looking forward to going to Paris, and I hope we can meet with UNESCO.

I think what we have done is a very fine balance between doing something but not getting so involved that it takes up more time than we have in the office. I think we have to be careful that we don't overload the office. I think this is a really fine balancing act that we've kept doing now; that we get involved, but not so much that it's going to overload the office. I think that's very important.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you. That was Commissioner Challinor.

Commissioner Abramson.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Yes. My only concern was the paragraph in the proposed resolution -- the draft of which is in front of us -- and if that's been vetted by the State Department for the purposes of at least discussion, I would move that we vote to make such a resolution.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Has this been vetted by the State Department?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: The answer to that is yes.

Commissioner Griffiths?

COMMISSIONER GRIFFITHS: I was going to second it. Did he make a motion?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I made a motion.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. It's been moved and seconded that this be approved. Any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER TABB: I have just a question.

The last "whereas" talks about the fact that the State Department has supported more direct working relationships and so.

This is a slightly odd situation because it was, in fact, the U.S. terminated the major exchange program. That was not technically the State Department, I guess, but I'm curious as to whether this implies that the State Department is interested in resuming the ALA Book Fellows Program, for example.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Mr. Horton?

MR. HORTON: Yes, I was aware of that. And in my last conversations with Mr. Wanner in the International Affairs Bureau, he said in his words that he felt sure that the State Department would consider when they see this re-entering that issue again. So I would suggest we raise it as a part of our transmittal letter when we send it over to them.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Mr. Willard?

MR. WILLARD: As I recall, the Fellows Program was actually through USIA, and USIA is now part of the State Department.

I didn't mention it, but Martha and I have been in initial conversations with the USIA about strengthening the relationship between the Commission and USIA, now the public diplomacy part of the Department of State. Their request was wait until the dust settles a little on the incorporation of that agency within the Department of State; but that dust is settling now, so we should be back in contact, and I think there's a nice knitting together of both the UNESCO resolution and further involvement with the public diplomacy function.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: If I could reiterate my point. I think we have to be careful that we don't go too fast so that the staff -- I mean, we don't have a large budget -- so that the staff is not overloaded. I think there's a danger here, because I think it's waiting to happen, and we have to be careful how involved we get.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you, Commissioner Challinor.

When I came back from meeting in Vienna and -- Estonia -- we met with Mary Boothe and Ron Ungaru.

Weren't you at that meeting too?

MR. : I missed it.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: That's right.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: And again, they are very interested in seeing more being done in this area. And actually, I think once this is passed, then it's time for us to go back to Mary Booth and set up another meeting.

Are there any additional comments? All those in favor?

(Ayes)

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Opposed? Unanimous. Thank you.

The next item, I believe is the budget.

Judy Russell, if you would kindly walk us through this.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to be very brief with this. This is in more or less the format that we've been using for the last year or so to present information to you. There are a couple of minor changes in the way the format is designed.

You notice at the top our FY 2000 appropriation. Because of the recision, where they took the across-the-board from all agencies when they passed the budget, we actually have \$1,295,06 for our appropriations. So not \$1.3 million, although we keep saying \$1.3 million.

The first column is what we actually requested. One of the difficulties, of course, is that we're forecasting a budget several years before it's actually passed, and we start implementing it.

The first column shows how we expected the split to be among salaries and travel and other things at the time that we sent our proposal into OMB and ultimately to the Hill. Then more recently, at the beginning of the fiscal year, we sort of juggled based on what we know about actual staff salaries and things like that, and as always, our use of consultants in lieu of staff in some cases. So the FY 2000 allocated is the way that we actually told the Department of Education we anticipated allocating the money.

We do have the flexibility to move some of this around and reprogram it as we need to, but this is sort of a starting point for how we expect to spend money this year.

There are a couple of things that are probably noteworthy here. We had originally projected adding two staff positions if we got the \$1.3. One of them is Rosalie, who is sitting at the table, so we obviously accomplished that. The other was a so-called Information Policy Fellow, sort of using the model of having Denise as a professional staff person for statistics, and in effect, Woody is filling that role. So that money was moved out of salaries into consulting services, which is why we tend to bring those consulting services dollars up and associate them. Although they're not, from OMB's point of view, payroll expenses, from our point of view they are staff expenses, and it helps to kind of keep that in perspective.

This year in setting up our consulting fees, we allocated \$70,000 for the statistical surveys. That is not all going to the -- Vertoh -- study that you saw the press release on, but it is funding other activities that Denise will be pursuing as the director of Statistics and Surveys as well. And so, that is part of consulting services over and above Woody, Barbara, Beth -- that type of staff report.

We do have a new MOU with the Department of Education for our administrative support services, and we know at this point what we believe the amount is going to be. We've signed it, but we're waiting for them to do their final vetting of it and return it to us.

So where you see government services, and you see the \$40,500, because we are already into the second quarter of the year, we, in effect, already owe them this \$32,765 because they frontload a lot of those expenditures. But until the MOU sign, no money will be transferred. But I thought it was important that you see it there and realize that that is a expenditure, that, in effect, they've been providing service to us, waiting for the MOU to be signed, much like we're providing services to the NCES waiting for their MOU to be signed. We don't all just sort of stop service and try to float for 6 months or so while paperwork flows to catch up, or 10 months sometimes, God forbid, yes.

So that's why you see zero expenditure there. As soon as the MOU is signed, we'll immediately write them a check for the \$32,000, and then we'll pay quarterly thereafter.

Bob did mention that down in the other funds we have an MOU with NCES for \$225,000. It was \$154,000 last year, so this is a significant increase. They may increase it even a little more later in the year. They have some additional things they're thinking about having us take on. That partnership has continued to strengthen, and Denise has been a major asset in that. They're very, very pleased with the work the Commission is doing, and therefore, really bringing more responsibility to us in that regard.

Woody is preparing for us a submission to the State Department for the money that they generally transfer to us in support of the UNESCO-like information activities.

We're expecting, although we haven't finalized where we're going to put -- we will ask for \$150,000. We may even ask for a little more than that. It's not clear at this point how much we will get. So this number is still very much kind of a placeholder that will then be filled in once our proposal goes through and once we get some push back from the about how much they will actually have to give us.

The gift account we brought forward. It's about \$8,000. We had informed OMB that we anticipated that we might have as much as \$60,000 in anticipation of fundraising for the Sister Libraries. In fact, the fundraising for the awards ceremony, if it flows through our account rather than the through the IMLS account, will also potentially increase that.

This is, of course, the kind of money that we have to have, particularly to be able to fund activities involving any kind of food service, since other than for the meal allowances we cannot use government funds. So it is really important that we do keep a cash flow in that gift account.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Also for the 30th anniversary.

MS. RUSSELL: The 30th anniversary is another piece that we'll probably flow through there. So we may actually see more activity in the gift account that is planned here, but at this point what you're seeing reflected is the carry over from last year.

Most of that carry over is actually allocated to Sister Libraries because it was given specifically for that purpose, but there is a small amount of money that is still totally at the Commission's discretion, part of the funds which we can use for guests at meetings and similar things.

I'll be happy to answer questions if there are any other pieces of the budget that you specifically have questions or when you get back home and look at it and have a question.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Do we pay our rent semi-annually? What happened here on the rent account?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, the rent's another one where we have just actually completed the purchase orders to pay for our rent. We didn't actually get money released to us until the last week of December. Because of all the continuing resolutions, we didn't actually get this year's money, then we didn't even get the last few continuing resolution pieces of money released.

Then in mid-January when Seran Dozzo came on board, we started going back and doing a lot of our -- the beginning of the year, purchase orders where we normally buy a block of Federal Express service, and we do a block of rent purchase orders and those kinds of things.

We normally do a quarterly purchase order, and then they deduct automatically from the Department of Ed. GSA actually does what they call an OPAC transaction. It's a direct electronic transfer where they take the money from us automatically, but we write a purchase order to cover it.

We have anticipated a little higher rent later in the year, because as we talked about at the last meeting, we're trying to annex some additional space in the suite next-door to us. It's been vacant for the better part of three years.

We'll give up some of the space in our current suite and pick up some space in the suite next-door which will give us a little bit more space, certainly a better conference room and reception area among other things.

MR. WILLARD: The ability to hold commission meetings within our own office which will save us a little money in terms of hotel space.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: My concern was just the worst kind of looking at numbers. I understand the advance purchase order, but we have 75 percent of the year left as of this reporting date, January 31st, and 57 percent of the line item rent available.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, the purchase orders are done for a full quarter, even though the transfer only occurs monthly. So, in effect, the \$63,978 is a half year.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Oh, okay.

MS. RUSSELL: And we allowed for more that because when we take on the extra space, our rent will go up, and we don't yet have a firm number on how much that will be. At the moment, we've actually lapsed 4 out of the 12 months, but the purchase order covers 6 out 12 because we do them in quarterly increments.

Are there any other questions? Obviously, you can always call and ask if you have more.

MR. WILLARD: One of the things that Judy mentioned that we paid for is administrative support from the Department of Education.

You would think that that would facilitate getting reports like this very simply. I assure you, it does not. We would not have reports like this unless Judy spent countless hours at her computer working with spreadsheets, taking sketchy reports that we get from the Department of Education and making them into more useful management reports.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: One last comment, and I've made a similar comment before.

When we present a budget based on five commissioners waving their salary, I would rather have us budget under the assumption that all of the commissioners would use some salary. And I realize it always ends up fitting within the 10, but I think the budget document should speak for themselves. In terms of looking ahead at any moment, any commissioner who presently waives salary can decide not to waive it, and I think we shouldn't want to be in a position to be surprised by that.

So even if we don't change the numbers, I'd rather have us put, in terms of the ones that we could be responsible for -- not the Library of Congress and not IMLS -- but I'd rather have our budget reflect the best case.

MS. RUSSELL: In fact, it does. The FY 2000 request that goes in presume 14 commissioners with the same average number of salary days, but once we came back to actually looking at how we expected to spend money this year, and we had worked out the travel plans and those kinds of things and allocated with the existing number of confirmed commissioners, this reflects the reality of what we think will happen in this fiscal year.

That's one reason, when you fill out your forms, as you should before you leave at the end of this meeting and give to me, please -- where people mark the first salary days, we do keep track, and we do do a report, and we do project ahead what it would have cost.

So when we had a commissioner like Frank Lucchino, who was barred as a state government or county government employee from taking salary, we counted the days that he participated so that we knew how much we would have had to cover because it is very important. When we go to see an appropriation, we don't know two years ahead who's going to be on the Commission and whether they'll be taking salary or not.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, I'm also familiar, on other government boards, including at least two federal boards, where it's become a tradition that they waive, and it's made it impossible for certain people to put themselves forth to serve them.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you, Commissioner Abramson.

I also would like to point out that because there was some concern voiced at mid-winter, if you'd go back and look at our rent and utilities, that the increase that we got in our

budget this year did not go to new, fancy quarters for the Commission, it went directly to staff that are responsible for programs.

Are there any other comments on the budget?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I've been responsible for budgets like this, and I know how much work it is, and I know how you have to keep more than two sets of books to really understand what's going on. And this is the kind of presentation that's very helpful to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Commission Abramson, we do not keep two sets of books.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Well, we don't file two sets, but you have to keep at least two sets of books.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We have spreadsheets that allow us to track.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: All of our sets of books are available for public inspection.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you, Commissioner Abramson.

It is with a great deal of pleasure now that I invite our liaisons to please give us their input, their comments, their questions. And we are delighted that we do have liaisons that now attend our commission meetings.

Our first one will be Emily Sheketoff from the Washington office of the American Library Association.

Welcome, Emily.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Well, thank you very much. I'm sorry I missed the first meeting while I was an employee of the American Library Association, and I will hope to attend all of your future meetings. I will do my best. ALA and the Commission have had a great working relationships, and we do hope to continue that.

There are many issues that are coming up for all of us. We are working very closely on NTIS. It's an issue that we're both very concerned about. Also, the National Forum on Libraries and whatever format it should take, we're interested in that as well. And I hope that there is a lot of dialogue between our organizations as these things come to pass, because I think on all sides, we have a lot of experience in this and strongly held opinions, and I think it's helpful to dialogue with those opinions.

On issues that are coming up that I notice haven't been discussed, there is great concern this year as ESEA is being reauthorized. The school libraries are in deplorable shape in

many communities, and this is due to the fact that they have not been getting resources over the past few years.

There's been some media attention to some of the most critical libraries which have either had to be closed or restricted because books on the shelves have been printed since 1965, the physical building is deplorable, they don't have and the electrical wiring that can support the new technology that's so important.

I hope that the Commission will be supportive as we try and address these issues and try and get decisionmakers to focus on this. We all accept that a good education is critical for our nation's youth, and we know that a school that has a good school library with a qualified school library media specialist really enhances a child's education. And it doesn't matter what type of community that child comes from or the education or ethnic background of those children; that if they have this facility, it will really help them.

As we really push either for Senator Reed or Congressman Owens' bill to be included ESEA reauthorization, I hope that everybody in the library community will be supportive and really talk to those people who can make that happen. It's very important because this is something that is really critical, and now is the time when we have to do something about it.

I just want to reiterate the fact that we would like to keep going in partnership and we would like to keep a close dialogue going on the issues that confront us. Every week it's something new, so I don't want to be restricted. But I hope that we do continue this dialogue, and if you've got any questions for me, I'm available.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Emily, first of all, I'd like to point out that this is your first meeting with us. We are delighted.

What is the status at this point of the reauthorization of ESEA? Where is it?

MS. SHEKETOFF: The House has held a hearing on this. A library representative did testify, a librarian from Delaware who came down, and emphasized the critical need of school libraries in this overall education authorization.

We are actively working with the Department of Education and the congressional committees. There has not been a recognition by the Clinton administration to this desperate need, so we are putting our eggs now in the congressional basket and trying to work that way.

We don't know. There's a very compressed time limit this year. There's only going to be 55 legislative days to the end of this session because of some presidential activity.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: That's a very astute way of putting it.

MS. SHEKETOFF: And it's a big election year for the Congress as well. So all these guys care about is getting out of town as quickly as possible.

So there is a very compressed window, and there won't be the extensive hearings on appropriations that there has been in the past. There's a real effort to get these bills reported out in the summer so that they're not either held up or you don't have the never-ending, continuing resolution because they all feel that that would be a very bad way to run for re-election in the fall.

So the pressure is on now, and I think decisions will probably be made in the next two months. So anything that anybody can do to help between now and then is very appreciated.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any additional questions for Emily from the Commission? Comments?

Thank you.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I'll be at dinner tonight, so if there are things you want to tell me privately --

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Nancy Bolt who is here representing COSLA, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies.

Nancy, welcome.

MS. BOLT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to talk to you about three things that involves COSLA, and I must admit I weaved a little bit of what's happening in Colorado, where I'm the state librarian, into it.

I want to give you a draft of COSLA's legislative agenda. Unfortunately, I was printing this on a bubble jet printer when I was on vacation, and the cartridge ran out, so I have nine copies. So I'll let Barbara pass them out and ask you indulgence to share them.

I just want to highlight a few issues that's COSLA's particularly interested in terms of legislation.

The first is, of course, the LSTA reauthorization, and we hope to help bring together a group of people, as happened last time, to deal with the various issues which would include ALA, NCLIS, ASCLA, PLA -- who are part of ALA -- ULC, of course, to look at what the issues are as we go forward with reauthorization.

Another LSTA issue of which we are extremely concerned is the growing tendency of Congress to earmark LSTA funds for pet projects.

The COSLA members have taken a vow that none of us will approach our Congress people and ask for a set aside for our state. We believe so strongly that that is inappropriate use, that if they took that money and divided it up according to the way the money should be allocated, every state would benefit instead of just a few pet projects. So you'll probably hear our increasing anger on that topic, but I've been told it's politics, there's nothing you can do about it; don't waste your breath, but we're still very concerned.

We appreciate the lead that NCLIS has taken in NTIS. We're very supportive that the NTIS functions continue. We hope to have someone at the February 9th meeting who can speak to COSLA'S concerns.

In terms of E-Rate, again, this is something that COSLA has taken a big lead in. We have coordinators in every state. We are doing everything we can to make sure that the E-Rate program continues and are working with ALA's Office of Information Technology Policy to evaluate E-Rate's impact on libraries.

That's a very complex and fascinating topic which I will not take the time to go into now, but if you're interested in this -- because it involves all the different strands.

When somebody goes into a library and gets on the Internet and gets a piece of information, whose funding was responsible for it? E-Rate who pays the phone bill, LSTA who started the connectivity, Gates who gave it the computer? Well, I'm launching into my speech, and I'll stop. But if you're interested in pursuing this conversation, I would be very happy to do that.

In terms of school library media, I absolutely agree with Emily. This is critical. COSLA very strongly supports ESEA funding. And I must add a Colorado point.

Keith Lance, who is our director of our library research service at the state library, has now completed three studies -- four, if you count the one he did in 1992 -- that show statistically the impact of school libraries on student achievement. It's not just, we believe it to be true; we now believe we can prove it to be true.

His most recent information is showing somewhere between on the average of a 15 to 20-point increase in student achievement scores where there is a well staffed and well stocked library. And this says, "Regardless of geographic location, school investment, education level of the parents, poverty rate, ethnicity," anything.

So if you do have your school media program, Martha, in Cincinnati, I would suggest that you might think of Keith as one presenter on statistic rates and how that works. He calls it Proof of Power. It's a nice presentation he does on the results of the three studies that he's done.

In terms of other federal issues, one of our thrusts is to get libraries as eligible applicants for a lot of things that we're not eligible for now.

If you look at some of the education funding, it's targeted to schools. And it says that, "Other kinds of agencies can be recipients of funds if you go to the school district." Well, that's not good enough because most school districts say, we'd be glad to have you partner with us if you pay your own way. What can you contribute. Not, we'll give you money. So we're very concerned that libraries be eligible applicants on more of these community beneficial programs.

So this is a draft. We're actually meeting next weekend in Washington, D.C. to finalize our legislative agenda, but I'm sure what we'll do is tinker with the words. I don't believe any issues will come off of this.

I do want to say a word about the White House Conference that Bob alluded to. I must say that COSLA's not particularly supportive of the effort as it's currently designed. And I think some of the reasons -- and I shared these in the letter to Bob on COSLA's point of view.

I think part of it depends -- I heard you talking about this earlier, Bob -- about what the purpose of it is. If the purpose of it is to celebrate President Clinton's eight years and the good work he's done for libraries, that's a very different kind of event.

If we begin to involve people from each state and convocations of people technologically, then it begins to look like trying to put together an action agenda for the future that relates to libraries. If that is in fact the purpose, December of 2000 doesn't feel like a good time to do it.

It's the last month of this president. Whomever the next president is, there's no guarantee that he will support the agenda that comes out of it. It's a time when Congress is not in session. So for a number of practical reasons, COSLA is I think hopeful that you might reconsider a national forum for libraries that occurs at a later point in time when we can get the support of a new Congress and a new president, that that might be more effective.

So I think it really comes down to what you see as the goal of it, and then what's the best way to achieve that goal. Certainly, thanking President Clinton is a good goal, but we're not sure that involving a nation-wide effort is the best way of using resources to do that.

The third issues. Just real quickly I'll mention this.

We've started our own Sisters library project in Colorado which we call Partner Libraries, but we've been recognized as a sister library, so we're really pleased to do that. We have six Bulgarian libraries and we're looking for partners for them.

We're going to be visiting Bulgaria in June. We hope to present plaques to the partners. At least five of the libraries we hope to be able to visit, and we're also sponsoring a conference on Access to Government Information to which Bulgarian mayors and librarians and city officials will be invited, and we're really excited about that.

Also, our Emporia Library School is working with Sophia College to put together posters to present in our Access to Government Information Conference. So we have a library school to library school thing as well. So we're real excited about our Bulgarian efforts.

What questions do you have?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any questions or comments?

Commissioner Abramson?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I think I may know part of the answer, but what kind of child care programs would you want libraries to be eligible to receive grants for?

MS. BOLT: Whenever there is a program that provides money, for example, reading readiness programs, that any kind of reading activity, anything that deals with education of long kids -- public libraries, particularly, are places where this occurs. Every bit of research done shows that when kids participate in the summer reading program, their reading levels are maintained during the summer, and if they don't, their reading levels slip.

So why shouldn't public libraries be eligible for programs that -- it's not strictly child care, but it's the educational component of some child care program. Right now, typically those go to school districts who aren't even in session in the summer, so those are the kinds of programs we'll be interested in supporting.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any other questions?

It so happens that I have a question.

MS. BOLT: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: In the reauthorization of ESEA -- because it's moving very quickly -- have you tried to bring together any kind of a task force that can work on issues the same as we did for LSTA?

MS. BOLT: Actually, we're participating in ALA. The ALA Legislation Committee has an ESEA task force, and I represent COSLA on that task force. We participated early on in some critique of the proposed legislation, and now we've been circulating -- actually, ALA's been circulating requests to write your Congress person and advocate that they vote yes on it.

So COSLA has not formed a separate kind of committee; we're doing this one through ALA.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: This is a question for both Nancy and Emily.

When will you impanel the task force to begin to look at reauthorization of ESEA?

MS. BOLT: Well, COSLA's going to talk about this next weekend, and we're feeling some urgency to begin bringing people together. I know that Barbara Will, who's the current president of ASCLA, is also very interested in it, and she was a big player years ago. California sort of went its own way last time, and so we're hoping that we can bring the whole library community together and hold that consensus through the reauthorization hearings.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Well, NCLIS -- if I remember correctly, Jeanne Simon and I were the representatives from NCLIS to the task force, and we would be delighted to serve again on the task force. I feel very strongly about it, and the sooner, the better.

MS. BOLT: Well, we feel the same thing, and we've done a preliminary list of organizations to invite, and NCLIS is, of course, on that list.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you. We appreciate it.

Joey Rodger. Joey, welcome. This is your first meeting as the president of the Urban Libraries Council, and we're delighted to have you.

MS. RODGER: Thank you so much. It's a real honor to be here.

Because it's my first meeting, I wanted to do a couple words of explanation.

The Urban Libraries Council understands itself more as an R&D organization than as a policy organization. The reason our board has decided to do that is because almost all of our members are also active in the American Library Association. We felt that it was not a good use of our resources to simply be an echo to an ALA position in terms of federal policy or federal legislation, nor was it helpful to be divisive. So if we had a difference of opinion, that that should be ironed out under the ALA tent rather than have ULC create a separate presence in Washington. So to that end, there are very few of the things that are on federal legislative agendas for which ULC would have comments and concerns.

As I have told some people, we'll sign almost anything if you need us, but we're not going to spend a lot of organizational time and attention on it. The exception for that probably will be the reauthorization of LSTA. Our executive board will have a retreat in early June. At that point, we'll decide what level of effort they wish to put into that agenda.

I think we do see our role as in many ways complimentary to many of the interesting concerns of the Commission. For instance, I've had very good conversations with Denise around the statistics issue. The piece that we're doing that may inform the broad picture we're beginning to get of libraries in the Internet is a study that we're working with Dr. George D'Delia. In fact, the grant went to -- Suney -- Buffalo -- a study of the Internet use and library use funded by the Institute for Museum and Library Services.

It's a 3,000-person household telephone survey. If you imagine a matrix of people who have Internet access and people who don't and people who have access to libraries and people who don't -- or people who use libraries and people who don't -- what we're going to be doing, based on telephone interviews, is filling in the boxes.

For those people who have Internet access and library access, when do they use each one? What are the decision rules? For those who have Internet access and don't use libraries, did they ever? Are these people we're losing or are these people we never had? For people who use the library and don't have Internet access, are they actually using it in the library?

That is our rhetoric. We want to ask 3,000 households and see if it's true.

For people who don't have Internet access and don't use libraries, where do they get information? What's in that package?

We believe the results of that are terribly important for understanding the future of public libraries at a time when many elected people are coming to us and saying, why should we build buildings because we're not going to need the library in the future.

We need to understand from a human being standpoint when people use libraries and when people use the Internet and to know more about that. We will have that study finished by the end of August and probably publishable early in the fall, and I'll be happy to keep you up to date on it. I think it's a really important piece of work for public libraries in understanding their future.

Our political emphasis at ULC is local, it's on cities. To that end, we are having a first-ever conference for us in December, co-hosted by the Chicago Public Library, but particularly co-hosted by Mayor Richard Daley, for mayors, library directors and library trustees. The theme of the conference is Partners for Successful Cities. The subtitle is Community Development: Downtown Development, Neighborhood Development.

This is not a conference in which we are being advocates for libraries with mayors. If they wanted to hear that song, they could hear that home. This is a conference for bringing together mayors and thoughtful city leaders, who are library directors and often trustees, to understand the public library as an asset in community development and to extend our understanding.

In addition to Mayor Daley and Mary Dempsey, we'll be having a moderated panel of other mayors. We'll be having some experts in urban development who will extend all of our sense.

We're coming to that table as players rather than as advocates. It's a new role for us, and it's one that I think is really important, particularly at the local level.

We have a programmatic commitment to life-long learning, and the particular form that is taking is a collaboration around programming for public television. We're working with film makers to do outreach programs so we can have community conversations around broadcast media. We deeply believe that we share communities' learning agendas with museums, public television and public radio, and so again, in an R&D mode we're trying to make some progress there.

Finally, we care a great deal about youth. This is the place we may come back to you and ask for some help.

We have a major project in nine cities throughout the country funded by Wallace -- it's now called simply The Wallace funds -- to reinvent public library service to high-risk kids -- language I don't even like -- based on an asset model of what gifts these kids have to give to communities.

Part of that we're hoping for is to create a stream of funding -- perhaps a federal stream -- for youth employment in libraries. It's part of our long-term recruitment strategy, but it's also kind of an informal goal that we hope more kids will work in libraries than work at McDonalds because we believe it can be a deeply, rewarding lifetime experience for them as an employment opportunity. So we're trying to think through how to create those jobs so they're more than shelving books and how perhaps to get a federal funding stream that begets some new funding to do that. As well as how to help librarians who don't like teenagers become dynamic, effective supervisors of adolescent workforces.

Thank you very much for the time, and I'm happy to answer questions.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Commissioner Abramson.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I think at one time I had some understanding, but for some of us that don't fully understand the distinctions, ULC is not a division of ALA?

MS. RODGER: Boy, is that correct.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Okay. And you were the first conduit for some of the Gates money at one point in time?

MS. RODGER: We temporarily ran the technical support for the Gates project when it was Libraries Online.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Everybody's not eligible to join ULC. All libraries are not.

Can you explain what that eligibility is?

MS. RODGER: Our current eligibility, according to our by-laws, is any public library serving a community of 50,000 or more in a standard metropolitan statistical area. The

reason it goes down to such a small number is because the configuration of public libraries, as you know, around the country is, what would be a branch in one state is part of a large system in another, and our focus really is urban issues.

So that's one qualification and willing to pay the dues, which are indexed to operating budgets; \$3,000, \$5,000, \$7,000 and \$12,000.

We also have a small number of corporate members who participate fully because we deeply believe that the thriving of public libraries is a function of leadership shown by high-level administrators in libraries, trustees and those companies that serve us. We cannot provide library services with tools we don't have, and they're in charge of the tools. That's why they're at the table.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Joey, the conference in December in Chicago, are you also going to have people from economic development authorities?

MS. RODGER: We are not at this point including them. We may think that through. Suddenly, there are a lot of other people who would like to say the libraries and X, in addition to the mayors.

For our first outing, probably the mayors may be enough, but we're having another meeting with the folks in Chicago next week and may flush that out.

Actually, the mayors is an interesting issue because someone said, how do you manage all those egos? And we've said we call the U.S. Conference of Mayors and ask them how they do, who gets VIPed, who gets limousined, who gets this and who gets that. There's a lot of meeting planning in that one that's new for us, and we need to do it skillfully, or our people will pay when they get home. They'll get benefits if it goes well and penalties if it doesn't.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: It sounds like an absolutely fascinating conference, and certainly the information from this conference may be grist for the mill when we talk about the reauthorization of LSGA because there will be a lot of substantive, I think, information.

Would it be possible for the Commission at least to sit in as an observer?

MS. RODGER: I think I could probably arrange that.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I think in terms of our beginning to evaluate policy issues, this type of information is extremely important.

MS. RODGER: I think we can do that.

The other thing that is my goal -- once we get the Saturday morning session with the panel of mayors and Mayor Daley and all firmed up, which should be by the middle of

next week -- is to then call C-Span and say, it's a Saturday in December, nothing's going on. Bring your cameras.

We want to give the mayors that exposure, but we also want to give a conversation between mayors and library people that kind of exposure. Whether we'll be able to do that or not, I don't know, but that's part of the dream.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

MS. RODGER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any other comments from the commissioners?

Joan, do you have anything you wish to add?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: No. I'm listening with all four ears.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Sandy Schukett, we are delighted to have you here, and you are representing --

MS. SCHUKETT: WHCLIST.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: You're with WHCLIST. Because I think of you as a school librarian an ASSL.

MS. SCHUKETT: Well, actually, if I may, just take a minute to discuss ESEA issues, and thank the two previous speakers for their wonderful support. I'm going to let you know that in another hat I'm the chair of the Legislative Committee of the American Association of School Librarians and have become the chief nag for my colleagues nation-wide over two or three different list serves. I think that although everyone's support is essential to get either one of these two bills into the ESEA reauthorization, I also that school library people themselves really need to begin taking a very strong and proactive role in advocating for their issues, and we're working on that. So I just wanted to add that little piece in.

I thank you for having me be here today. The real reason I'm here is as a representative for Carmine Trotta and Sara Jane Kadlec, the co-chairs of WCHLIST. I'm also the secretary of WCHLIST, and since I live here in L.A. and in real life am a middle school librarian at a large middle school not far from here, it was quite convenient for me to attend this meeting.

I have a couple of things that I am sorry there are not copies, but we will get it into the record. I have a letter from Carmine Trotta to the Commission, where he's thanking the Commission for their support for a national forum on libraries with a resolution at your November 4th meeting.

I guess the issue of whether or not it's in December 2000, we understand that given the fact that this is an election year, given the fact that the president perhaps has some other things he wants to accomplish before his term is over, that possibly this may not be good timing.

In this letter, he mentions the fact that at previous White House conferences, they might have been called by one president, but yet convened during the realm of another, and that certainly would be acceptable.

In addition, he mentions the idea of subsequent national forums as part of a pre-conference or post-conference related to ALA maybe on an bi-annual basis as another possible idea.

I think the basic thing that WCHLIST feels related to this issue is to kind of utilize the strengths of the previous two White House conferences, a lot of which was grassroots strength. This would be something that I think would be very beneficial on a national level for all types of libraries. And whatever the ultimate format becomes, I think it's the involvement of the grassroots people that really creates advocacy. The question as to what the purpose of this conference would be, I think is something that has to be very clearly defined by the three organizations.

I have also a resolution from ALA that was passed during mid-winter which basically says, "Therefore, be it resolved that the president of the American Library Association inform NCLIS and WHCLIST that ALA supports the concept of a national forum."

That's basically all that I have to say on that. Carmine Trotta says that he is available to meet with members of the Commission. At any time that you might need that to happen, he can drive down in a short time, and he would be available to meet with you. And if there are any questions, I will try to answer them.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Questions or comments from the commissioners?

Joan Challinor, do you have any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: No, I think Bob covered this before. That's about it.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you very much.

Okay. Peyton Neal.

MR. NEAL: Since the old IIA ended its existence on December 31, '98, there has been a new organization formed, the Software and Information Industry Association, which emerged on January 1, 1999.

Consequently, there are some old companies that are not part of the new association and some new companies from the software realm that are beginning to take bigger interest in some of the issues that the Commission has been supporting. The process of transition is destined, I think, to continue to take another year or so until people are comfortable with the Commission and what it's doing.

I would say, looking back to the Kansas City meeting where the first issues were discussed openly by the Commission on journal pricing, I would take from the remarks of Commissioners Tabb and Griffiths, appropriate people in the private sector have connected where they need to connect, and their expertise is certainly, I hope, going a long way towards making those projects work.

Secondly, kudos to the Commission for continuing to have on its agenda Phase 3 of the GPO project. I've talked informally with Bob and Woody, and I would hope that after the Year 2001 begins we will have both some human resources and some financial resources for what Woody has told me he has conceived to be a sort of phase three, whitepaper project where we can get some well-reason documents prepared from some of the two experts in the area.

That's a good transition into the NTIS issue. I've been trying to do my best behind the scenes to assist getting the right companies involved in the issue. Bob and Woody have very graciously offered the private sector people an opportunity for a forum to come together in an environment where they might be better encouraged to ask questions and offer their insights.

We've been active in the two previous meetings, and we have an SIIA staff member committed to give some input and speak at the meeting on the 29th of his month.

Two final comments. There are too many issues and too little time in the legislative arena. Both copyright and UCITA continue to be vitally important, and I would hope that the Commission can provide, now with an expansion in staff, some briefing materials on its commissioner members to help them better understand the gravity of some of these competing situations that are very much in the Congress' gunsights. Whether they will result in passage at the federal or level -- or now it's state legislature level with UCITA -- remains to be seen. But they are vitally important to the public and to the private sectors.

I guess lastly, I'll reserve the right not to comment about a White House conference on the libraries, but refer commissioners to remarks that we exchanged both on and off the record at the Pittsburgh meeting in the summer of 1994. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any questions or comments from the commissioners?

I do have one comment, and that deals with intellectual property issues. While we do have additional funding, we have not been funded to the level where we can bring an

expert on board as a fellow to really help us with these issues. I wish we were, but who knows, maybe we'll get more money next year. We can always hope.

Are there any other comments? Joey Rodger from the Urban Libraries Council.

MS. BOLT: I apologize. I neglected to mention in my comments that are host tomorrow, Susan Kent, who is the city librarian here in Los Angeles, is also the chair of the Urban Libraries Council Executive Board. She wears that hat, and I have great gratitude to her for the way she wears that, and I'm glad she can be your hostess tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Well, we're looking forward to it, myself in particular, because I spent almost 13 years as a children's librarian with the Los Angeles public library.

We do have an observer here, Carol Talen, who is representing literacy.

Carol, would you like to make some comments, please?

MS. TALEN: Well, yes. Bob told me to give you a teaser. I'm not sure what that is. But I am here on behalf of the National Institute for Literacy since Carolyn Staley was not able to be present, and I will be presenting to you tomorrow some background information and bring you a little up to date on what -- as we like to call it, NIFL, but they don't really like us to call it that -- has been doing, and particularly about their commitment to working with libraries and what they have been doing. Hopefully, we'll be able to give you a little bit of information also about some things that have been going on here in California that are both connected to the National Institute's programs and some that are also separate from that. So I look forward to having a few minutes of your time tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. I think that brings us pretty much to the end of this session.

COMMISSIONER CHALLINOR: Martha, I'm going to sign off.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Joan Challinor is signing off. Thank you, Joan.

We do have another observer. You were hidden behind someone, and I didn't see you. Would you like to introduce yourself, please?

MS. NORMAN: My name is Carolyn Norman. I'm the coordinator of Libraries and Learning Resources Programs for the California community colleges. For those of you not familiar with the community colleges in the state of California, they're 106. I coordinate the libraries, media tutorial and learning assistance programs. Whatever they feel they want or I feel they need, I go for it, so I consider myself their "go for."

We've had a major telecommunications program. It started with a grant from the Department of Commerce in 1992, a planning grant for the system, not just for the libraries. As a result of that, we were funded by the state legislature. For the last three years, the libraries have received \$22 million. That was to put their records in MARC format, at least 75 percent of their records; to buy a Group 3 level fax machine; to purchase an automation system -- we still had some homegrown systems here in the state; to connect to the Internet; and to provide access and to develop a library technology plan.

In addition, we have had our board of governors take an active interest in information competency. We've had more than a half million dollars in the area of information competency. We're looking at making it a state-wide requirement for graduation for transfer and/or for a vocational degree. We're in the midst now of developing new regulations for that.

So some of the things that you have done at the national level we have been able to implement here in California, and I do thank you. I was here just as an observer today, and thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Will you be attending the meeting tomorrow?

MS. NORMAN: Yes, I will.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Great. Thank you so much. We're delighted to have you here.

Mr. Willard has a few comments that he needs to make about the rest of the meeting, and then we will adjourn for the afternoon.

MR. WILLARD: Thank you. What I wanted to do is just give you sort of an overview of the rest of the meeting.

The idea behind this meeting and the reason it is here at the times is to focus on literacy, which is not an issue that the Commission in recent years has paid much attention to. So we are going to have a presentation, or at least a discussion this evening, of what The L.A. Times is doing as a newspaper involved in encouraging youth literacy.

Tomorrow in our Commission meeting, we don't anticipate any formal action. I don't anticipate resolutions or anything like that. It is purely an opportunity to discuss literacy and the move to information literacy; and I've always felt you can't really talk about information literacy until the literacy issue is resolved.

We will have representatives from the library. We will have Patricia Breivik, who is the chair of the Forum for Information Literacy, and Wally Baer, who is with Rand Corporation, and has been very involved in information literacy. They'll be joining us, I hope at dinner tonight too.

So nothing needs to be done except to think and to talk and to figure out where do we go from here and do we go somewhere from here with regard to literacy.

In between those two events, we also have the opportunity to do something that we try to do whenever we can, and that's to interact with another group. We have been invited to be the guests of the California Library Board tomorrow, and the function will actually take place in our hotel. It is just members of the Commission with members of the California Board. They set the rules.

So with that, let me turn it back unless there are any questions.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: It's my understanding that dinner this evening will be in the same room where we had lunch, and I guess we get in the same way we did this morning.

We are adjourned until this evening. Thank you very much.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)

U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES
AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Friday, February 18, 2000

Los Angeles Times Building

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Welcome, we are delighted to be here. This morning what we really are going to do is sort of have a conversation on literacy.

Susan, is the director of the Los Angeles Public Libraries. We are delighted to be here today. Most particularly, I am delighted to be here today because I used to work in this building. Not this building, but the old "this" building, BF," before the fire."

Just one housekeeping issue.

(Housekeeping announcements)

With that, I think that we will ask Susan if you would like to say something, besides hello.

MS. KENT: Hello. Welcome to the Los Angeles Public Library. I'm glad that you're here, and I hope if some of you have the opportunity immediately after lunch, I'd love to be able to give you a tour of our building.

Particularly, some of the new services that we've developed here, and the one that's right now under construction, is a major space for teenagers in the library, so I'd be glad to show you that project.

I've also brought copies of our annual report which I won't pass around now, but I hope you will take it. These are the annual reports for the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1999, and it is called 24 Hours in the Life of the Los Angeles Public Library.

We are the public library that serves the largest population of any public library in the United States or Canada and probably Latin America as well. There are 3.7 million people in the city of Los Angeles for the central library, and 67 branches. Currently, we have 37 branch construction projects going on as a result of a (in) that was passed in 1998 for approximately \$175 million worth of construction for libraries, and when we are finished we will have 72 branch libraries.

Our budget is \$82 million. We have a staff of about 1,110 full-time equivalents or 1,500 employees, and we (in) some of the critical major issues of any major public library in the country, which is dealing with constantly changing to the logical environment, dealing with the issue of training for our staff and for the public on the new technology, dealing with the whole issue which I think is right now is one of the premier issue in library and information science -- the fact that there is an entire generation of librarians

that is about to retire, and there is no way that we will replace ourselves through the current programs on library and information science.

In the past 14 months, we alone in L.A. have hired 100 new librarians, and we still have 50 vacancies, and that is an impossible task. Probably more diligently than any institution that I know of, there are no folks out there. There's just not enough, and I think that needs a whole look at restructuring the types of jobs, classifications, the responsibilities of librarians with master degrees and looking at other classifications that can work in libraries, that can be the work currently done by other job classifications.

I don't think anybody is approaching in any kind of meaningful way, and I'm not even sure that there is an answer to that issue. I think the graduate schools that are graduating librarians now are seeing that many of their graduates are going to .com companies. They're going in L.A. to places like Disney and Universal to become digital asset managers at many, many times the salaries that are offered here.

We have a very good starting salary. Our librarians at a little over \$36,000 a year, and within four years without the necessity of having a promotion they're up to \$50,000. And we're still not as competitive as the private sector and that's not as sexy, I can say, as working for the Disney Corporation. So I think that's going to have a really big impact on the libraries in the next 5 to 10 years, and I think it's a critical issue.

In L.A., we have been very fortunate to have tremendous support of elected officials. Our mayor and city council, has been extremely positive, and we've seen growing budgets because of their support of the library, and their support of the library comes because their constituents are telling them that -- like in almost every case, the library is the one public service in the city of Los Angeles that always delivers and delivers good services.

However, now we're basically in the paper for the last couple of days in a major police scandal. The estimates of the settling of the cases from that scandal is going 200 to 300 million dollars a community. Public services throughout the city is going to take a hit because of that.

We also have a very active foundation, the Library Foundation of Los Angeles. It's in its eighth year and raises 3 to 4 million dollars to supplement, but not supplant, the library's budget, and this year we're heading for an \$8 million year because of a couple of major million dollar gifts to the library.

At any time, please ask me questions.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I have a couple of questions about the Foundation.

I'm basically from a trustee background. I helped to start a local, smaller, about the same time you started yours. Yours is on an endowment foundation?

MS. KENT: The Foundation is a 501(3)(c) non-profit entity. It has its own board and its own staff. I think the staff now is 12 people. We have three endowment funds within the foundation, but the Foundation does not only raise money for endowment.

We have the board directed endowment, which actually is not going to be touched until it reaches \$10 million, and then I don't what they're going to do with it. We have an endowment as a result of the National Endowment for the America's Challenge Grant that came actually in the late '80s, early '90s before our foundation was established. We have our newest endowment fund, which is the Gregory Peck Literary Endowment in honor of Mr. Peck who was a member of our foundation board of trustees, and we have just begun a campaign for that.

But most of the money that is raised by the Library Foundation is raised for unrestricted funds and restricted funds. The restricted funds are a result of an annual need presented to the Foundation.

(Audibility of the recording improves)

This year we've raised actually \$2 million on New Year's Eve through a benefit that was hosted by the wife of our mayor and a couple of other people to create the 21st Century Fund for Children and Rooting. That benefit on New Year's Eve raised a million dollars. It was matched by a million-dollar grant from the Wasserman Family Foundation. That money is going into a fund, not an endowment, and that fund will be expended over a number of years for programs for children and teenagers in the libraries.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: You say you're not supplying any public task funds, but then you get unrestricted funds.

MS. KENT: Unrestricted funds that go to the Foundation. We don't get it; the Foundation raises them. They use it for a number of things, including the operating expenses of the Foundation, which as you kind of anticipated are somewhat significant given the size of the staff and the work they do. And any funds that are a net of revenue over expenses of unrestricted funds go into the board-directed endowment at the end of the fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I would like to interject here because some of our guests have to leave at lunch.

Could we continue this discussion?

MS. KENT: Sure, I'd be glad to do that.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We will go into the major portion.

There has been a lot of talking, not only yesterday, but over a period of time, about literacy. I would like to see us make a jump now from literacy to information literacy, and with that I'm going to ask, Patricia, if you would like to discuss some of these issues?

MS. BREIVIK: For a few of you who were in Detroit, this will be rehatched. I want you to know, based upon your comments, I've spoken to a lot of other groups.

What we talked about was the fact that the current administration has done a wonderful job of getting access as a public policy issue that didn't exist before the Clinton-Gore Administration. Whatever one feels about other things -- it just was so important.

But it's not enough, and that's what finally we're beginning to hear out of Washington and other places. You'll hear Gore now and others talking about this digital divide.

We Americans always like that quick fix, and technology always seems to be the thing that's going to give it to us. In the '60s, it was instructional television, and now if we get a computer into every public library and into every school, all will be the well. But, in fact, that divide is getting bigger and bigger, and people are beginning to be alarmed.

So when we look about what we need in terms of public policy, this is sort of the goal which I hope this very esteem board can help our country move, is that we've got to look at the issue from a three-pronged approach. One is that universal access, and we've made tremendous strides lately.

Another one is the quality of information that's out there. In a democracy, we don't want to be sensors, we don't want to keep things off, and we know that the bulk of the stuff on the Internet is plain junk, and there's no way -- again, within a democracy, given the nature of Internet -- to have it be anything other but that.

We know in this room, because we're more sophisticated -- there's an awful lot of information that never gets on the Web, and so that other forms continue to be essential and important, whether that's television -- whatever.

But since we can't do much about controlling quality of information, the third point becomes absolutely essential if we're going to get our investment out of these dollars that we're putting into technology and into networks. And that is, how do we help people become information literate so that they know when they have a need for information can locate the kind of information, can help them evaluate it and use it effectively?

Every time I see the headlines that Congress is being asked to appropriate millions and millions of more dollars for basic research into computers, I think that's wonderful, but I keep thinking, what if just 5 percent of that or 10 percent of it went to the part to empower people to be able to take advantage of what we've already got.

So this is the big challenge, and that is, how can we get a more rounded public policy issue that takes into account -- because when we talk about the knowledge infrastructure

for our country -- the thing that's going to make information power really mean something to our country -- we have the technology and the contents, but we need the information literate citizenry to have a knowledge of the structure; otherwise, the information is there, the technology is there, but it doesn't translate into something that really benefits our country or us as individuals.

So what is information literacy?

A lot of people if you say that, they immediately think computer literacy. That is, people can turn on computers. And again, we've put a lot of money into that. How do people get on the Net, how do they do this?

But that's only part of it. We have library literacy which has been around for a long time, we have media literacy. How do you tell when they're really selling you something other than what they say they are, like violence towards women and ads and stuff that are in the media? Network literacy. How do you navigate the Net? Digital literacy.

These are all things that various groups are behind and very excited about, but if you put them together, and if a person can do all of those, then they're information literate.

But please notice the handle of this umbrella, and this is what we were talking about at dinner last night. There is nothing to hold that umbrella up if there's not a basic literacy.

So we cannot have information literacy without literacy, but literacy by itself isn't enough. If I can read, but I can't get the information that's going to change my life, then I am still helpless.

All of this together is our critical thinking skills that employers are calling for. We want a workforce that is flexible, that can solve new problems, and you can't do that when information's constantly changing, when you're moving into new directions, if you're not information literate.

I think many of you know, I chair the National Forum on Information Literacy which brings together over 80 broadly-based organizations -- a few of them international but most of them national, of people from education, from librarianship, from advocacy groups, from government groups, all concerned about people empowerment in the information age.

But now there's a new group, an international group called the Global Knowledge Partnership that our U.S. Department of Commerce through its now TOPPS Program is hooked into. This includes some governments, this includes the Canadian Broadcasting Company. It's a very eclectic group.

If you notice, they're concerned about the digital divide across the world; that in countries as well as for individuals that the technology as it comes in is just, again, broadening that

gap. For them, they've acknowledged that part of it is that people can make effective use of that information, that not only that they have access to it.

So this is something that's not a concern to only or country but across the globe. In fact, I don't do very much abroad, but every time recently I've been asked to speak abroad it's because some country has decided that they need a lifelong learning workforce, and when they discover they need a lifelong learning workforce, they discover their need for information literacy.

For a background for our discussion, I'm saying what information literacy is. It's, first of all -- and this is hard for people. They know they've got a problem, but they may not know that they need information to solve it. So knowing when you need information to address a problem or an issue at hand, being able to identify the kind of information that can help you, be able to locate that, evaluating it, organizing it and using it effectively. And that's what information literacy is.

In fact, when you think about the definition of information literacy, it has continued to change through the decades. At one time, if you could write your name, you were considered literate. It has always meant that you could function well in the society in which you live. Certainly, by that definition today, when we say literacy, we should be thinking not just basic literacy but also information literacy.

Is that what you wanted, I hope?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Love it.

Wally Baer is with us this morning, and you're on next.

MR. BAER: Thank you very much and thank you for inviting me here. I work for Rand Corporation, not too far away in Santa Monica. Rand does studies of public policy, principally, government policy at the national and state, and increasingly, international level.

My colleagues and I have become very interested and involved in a number of these issues. I hope we'll keep that chart up because I have to start off by saying that I say Amen to almost everything that Patricia puts up. We use her materials, and this book in particular, is kind of a model in the work we do. I can't commend too highly this work and the other things Patricia has done.

I also have to make the usual caveat that my comments this morning are my personal views and don't reflect those of my colleagues or of Rand Corporation or of any correspondences.

Having said that, I did want to at least discuss a few points that come out of some recent work that we've been doing, not with literacy as the title or focus but more on these broader questions of access to information, the government's role both in providing

citizens with access and in providing government information and how one tries to develop policy for the use of technologies to improve education information access and the private sector literacy.

I've brought a few examples of the work we're doing which I want to leave with you. For example, on the digital divide issue, we have done a review of the trends and where we think they're going, called, Citizens, Computers and Connectivity. What it says -- it won't surprise you -- is, yes, there is a gap; yes, in the past few years it has increased in some areas and seems to be decreasing in others. For example, the gender gap appears to be decreasing, but it hasn't gone away.

But we do have some projections in here that suggest that five years from now there will still be gaps, particularly by income and education level, but many of the other gaps we think will have diminished significantly. We're very interested in that topic.

We have done a fair amount of work for the U.S. Department of Education and the Science Office and the White House on educational technology and national strategies, and this is a recent piece on that that describes what you need to do to develop a national strategy for the use of technology in education. And again, we say it isn't just enough to put hardware -- even software -- in libraries or classrooms; you have to train people, and you've got to put in the infrastructure that makes it useful.

We're also very interested in how this technology changes institutions. In fact, we believe, I would say, that the main impact of technologies is how people use them and how people then change the institutions that they are working in.

That is certainly true in business today. You look around you and you can see this .com world which is very different from any business world we've known before. It's becoming true in the institutions that are represented here and libraries in government and to some degree in education, although the educational sector seems at this point to be among the most resistant to actual institutional change. A couple of papers here on how the Internet or may not transform or change institutions of higher education, which I think is relevant to this.

The final Rand report that I brought is a recent one entitled, Sending Your Government a Message. This really picks up from earlier work, in which we concluded, that it would be very important to increase the use of electronic communications -- mainly e-mail and the Internet -- among all citizens so that they could get information from the government and send information to the government. This report talks about that in more detail.

I think everyone one agree that we would like to see citizen access to government information, and we would like to see government information widely available in electronic form. However, as we all know, that isn't so easy. One of the case studies that's explored in this report have been the problems of the federal government in getting Medicare-related information up on the Web and available both to individuals with Medicare accounts and to the institutions that serve them.

Without going into detail, I think you're well aware that there was an initial attempt, I guess about a year and a half or two years ago, which had to be pulled back because of concerns about privacy and security. This isn't obviously unique to the Department of Health and Human Services, but it's very important; and these issues of security of information, privacy, what to do about offensive content -- these are all comments that have to be successfully dealt with, I think, before we are very comfortable in having a lot of government information regarding individual accounts available on the Internet.

It is strange though, today I can get day-to-day information on how my Rand pension plan is doing, very detailed information with security features presumably so somebody else can't get my account, but I can't get similar information about my social security accounts. In my view, we need a plan to bridge that gap in a very short time.

Just a few other points, although I'm really eager to listen more than talk for the little time I have remaining this morning.

In our studies of educational institutions, and particularly looking at how computers and the Internet has been used in elementary and secondary schools around the country, one of the things that's quite striking -- and again, won't surprise any of you -- is that in many, if not most cases, the students are way ahead of the teachers, at least at the beginning.

Now there are students who have not had any experience with computing or the Internet. I'm not saying that this digital divide doesn't exist, but by and large, students now who are getting into elementary and secondary school generally have some familiarity with the Web and certainly with computer-based games and take to it fairly readily. In many cases, it's more comfortable for them to use these technologies than it is for the teaching staff.

There are a lot of reasons for this. You know I'm sure better than I, but we've identified in our work is that teacher training really is an essential element, perhaps the most critical element, both in-service training and pre-service training, and I think that some of our work would have us focus on teacher training institutions and their role in being more, hopefully, on the cutting edge, but at least up to speed on the use of information technologies in education at all levels. I think there is a bottleneck there, and I think it's one that from a public policy's standpoint we really need to deal with.

Again, I would emphasize the institutional and human factors. We're talking about information technology with very broad and deep impacts, and the technologies are really fun and exciting and scary. But I think that the real importance of these changes are going to be on how they change individual behavior and how institutions are structured and function, and that I think is a real challenge to all of us, particularly who deal in public sectors.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Would you be kind enough to also pass around Patricia's book?

MR. BAER: I certainly will. In fact, if Patricia will send me another copy, I'll even leave it here.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Actually, I have a copy, and I use it in one of my classes that I teach.

MR. BAER: I'd have to go back to her chart and say, we couldn't agree more. All our work suggests that any discussions of information and literacy have to rest on the bedrock of what we call traditional literacy; reading, writing, numeracy, which includes calculation, but I would say today also includes the ability to estimate what are reasonable answers, when you use a calculator or computer.

It's quite amazing to me teaching mostly graduate students -- and even Ph.D. level students in my classes come up with very high level calculated answers that are completely off the mark because somehow they've missed a few decimal points. So I think estimating is another factor that I might add to this chart.

The only other one I would add would be the notion of collaboration; that one of the themes I think in using the new information tools is the ability to collaborate at a distance and actually in the classroom, and that this is turning out I think to be a very important function and advantage with these tools.

MS. BREIVIK: May I just follow up on that for a second?

My sister and I did the research for this book. I only worked very briefly in elementary education, so when I was asked to do this book, aimed at elementary school principals and other leaders, I wouldn't do it without collaborating without somebody that taught a lot.

The big surprise that we had when we went out and started interviewing places where this was happening were two-fold. One was that it did always happen in a collaborative setting, and there are many examples in there of where whole classes or all the second graders would be working around a common theme like pioneers. If you were a pioneer family setting up in St. Louis, and you only had a covered wagon of this size, what would you take with you? And all the subject areas would relate to that.

It became like play. It was fun, but it was learning. All the subject areas were in that. So it was highly collaborative, just the way real life is. And when business says, we want people that can work together and team, if people are going to become information literate, they learn most of it in that collaborative setting the way you were saying.

The other thing is, they always shared what they learned, what they produced. It was always a product, and they shared it, which gets back to that being able to use effectively. That was a surprise. They always shared what they came out with, with parents or other students or with something.

One other thing, it allowed children to come to the learning place at their point of strength. We all know children learn differently and at different rates and have different preferred learning styles, and yet we continually try to make them all do the same workbook or the same textbook at the same time in the same way, and it doesn't work.

With this kind of adventure, where you go out and use all the real world resources -- on the Internet, in the library, in the community -- all of a sudden students can learn the way that's easiest for them, and they can be successful as part of a group and then be simulated to start getting at some of the places where they aren't so good.

So information literacy, if that's the goal, it's transforming how learning takes place.

Here in California, the crediting agencies for colleges and universities in California and Hawaii are taking a complete new look on how to do accreditation. I think it will be the wave of the future for accreditation across the country, and they're focusing on student learning outcomes, and they have information literacy on there.

So this is the goal. We want all people to be this, but the way to get there is a way that transforms the learning process and has a very heavy role for the school library and media center.

MR. BAER: Let me pick up that point on accreditation because that's something that has come out of our work as well.

Accreditation has been done pretty much the same way for a long time, and by and large academic institutions have become comfortable with it. But now it's clearly not really ready or able to tackle the hard problems of how to accredit Web-based or predominantly distance learning-based institutions. The processes just really don't work well enough there.

I don't have an answer for it. One of them is the question of library or information resources for a distributed institution, a virtual university whose presence is largely on the Web. If they're affiliated with an existing institution, that's one thing; but if you take some of these newer institutions, like a Western -- University, some of the other virtual universities, Jones International University, a for-profit, it's a real issue about what criteria you need for accreditation.

I know in the Jones University accreditation came up last spring. There was a lot of objection to accrediting Jones, some by the American Association of University Professors. One of the criteria, they said the reason they thought that Jones was not worthy of accreditation is that they didn't have any information collection of their own that they could then relate to their instructional programming.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: This may be a perfect opportunity.

Carol, would you like to introduce yourself? I think you have some comments that might be very pertinent to this point.

MS. TALEN: I am Carol Talen. I'm actually the Library Literacy Programs coordinator with the California State Library, but I'm here today representing the National Institute for Literacy. Carolyn Staley, who is the deputy director, would have loved to have been here with you, but since she could not, she did ask if I would come and share with you some of the work of the institution.

There main focus is on the handle of the umbrella, which is -- s people here have already mentioned -- that without the basic literacy skills there is no access to information literacy because they cannot access it.

Just very briefly about the National Institute for Literacy, it is a federal agency, and it was created as part of the 1991 National Literacy Act, and it has a number of areas where it focuses. One is on public awareness, about the importance of literacy, and to that there have been some national campaigns.

They did prepare a packet for each of you, and I'll go through a few of the things in it with you, and also let you know that there is much more information. If you're particularly interested in any of these major projects of the Institute, you only have to give a call or go into the website, and you'll be able to get much more information.

One of the things the Institute has been very actively involved with is technology, and they have formed -- and actually I understand that it was begun in 1994 and 1995, and the director at that time of NCLIS, who was Peter Young, was very instrumental in helping the Institute to create -- it was partially his vision that established what you'll see in your purple and white folder, which is now called LINCS, Literacy Information and Communication System. Particularly, Jaleh Behroozi at the Institute wanted to give him credit because she said he really helped her tremendously as she moved forward with this.

LINCS alone gets over one and a half million hits every month, and we're assuming that most of those are from people who do want to know some basic information about literacy, primarily adult literacy, but also we do have some information about children, particularly family literacy.

You'll be interested in knowing that the Western Pacific Hub, which is the one in whose territory you now reside, is based in California, and actually I oversee that as the project administrator, and we fund that through Peninsula Library System. So we're the only one of the four hubs who are actually based in and around the library.

I have been also responsible for the Fate Literacy Resource Center of California, and this is how that came about. But we're very excited that libraries play a very large role in this.

As part of the LINC system, we do provide list serves for our library literacy programs, and our rule, library initiative, and a number of other public library -- as well, as we do the California Reeves website and initiative. So we're really quite involved much beyond just the adult literacy realm. I do encourage you to go in and look at the wealth of information that's available through this system.

Also, the Institute has been charged from the beginning with something that interest public libraries very much, and I think that's the whole issue of ADA specifically around learning disabilities. They've had a number of activities. They've had a member on staff who is a learning disabled man who offers and brings much to that whole issue. And again, there's much information if you'd like to learn more. I'm sort of going pretty safe, but as I keep saying, you'll be able to get more information of those you're interested in.

Another part of the Institute which I have been very much involved in and I find particularly interesting to public libraries is what we call the Equipped for the Future.

The Institute is looking to reform the adult literacy system through their long-term initiative that is called EFF, Equipped for the Future, and its aim is to ensure that all adults will gain the tools that they need to build the knowledge and skills that are necessary for them.

In the beginning, they went to adults who had limited literacy skills and asked them, what is it you need to know and why do you need to know it and how are you going to use it? So the adults themselves have been very much involved in this whole process

They really identified -- I hate to be the one that tells you this because someone from the Institute probably wouldn't. Initially, they identified four areas that were a major concern, and that was the role that they have as a family member, as a citizen, as a worker and as a lifelong learner.

I'm sorry to say, through the years of trying to shape this into something that was actually usable for local programs, the lifelong learning kind of got left because they said it was rolled into the other three roles; that all three of those roles really reflected lifelong learning. But working from the public library, I'd always felt lifelong learning was a little different and sort of means it's what you do for yourself in some ways.

So it's still there, it's just rolled into the other roles. But I think if this is something that interest you, they've just released some new standards. A lot of publications aren't equipped for the future, and it particularly appeals to most public librarians because of the strong component of the family and the recognition of the importance of the home and/or the primary caregiver, which as you know doesn't have to be a parent, but can be a next-door neighbor sometimes or a daycare provider, and the whole emerging literacy of preschool aged children long before the schools ever see them.

The Institute also works very actively in partnerships. They collaborate with ALA. They do have a list serve with ALA, and they archive all of that information -- working in conjunction with a number of others.

This is a report that was done in 1988 on the state of literacy in America, and it took the UNOW data and it extrapolated it down to cities and counties. This is also available on the Internet.

What it does, is really give some background for particularly when a community wants to know, at least statistically, what are the numbers in my community or in my city of people who probably are functionally illiterate. This is a wonderful resource. The Institute hopefully will be doing another one of these real soon. They've been doing a directory of national and state literacy contacts. This is also available on the Web, and we try to keep it updated as well as we can, although the paper copy is not probably as recent as the information on the Web.

They've also worked very actively in partnerships. You mentioned the importance of collaboration. The Institute has been working both with other federal and state agencies, particularly through the LINC program. I can speak very openly about what's happened here in the western hub because I've been involved in that and responsible for it since the beginning.

We have helped initiate a very strong partnership with GTE which now contributes to all of the four hubs. Fifty thousand a year we've been getting to help implement our work.

Sun Microsystems gave us a \$65,000 server when they found out what we were doing. They said, this is something that we would like to contribute to. I mean, it does help them in the long-run too, but it was a very nice server to have, one we wouldn't have otherwise. And similar types of private partnerships that have been developed over the life of the Institute.

Do you have any questions about National Institute? I might or might not be able to answer, but I could try.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Before we do that, I'd like to point out that Mr. Baer has to leave to teach class, so before we ask questions of you, do you have any questions for Mr. Baer?

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I'm just curious. You didn't say how long you've been with research. How have you seen technology change the place where you were? And assuming, as some people say, that we're in the bronze age of IT, how do you assume it will further change?

MR. BAER: Those are very good questions. Actually, I've been involved in this area for maybe 25 years. I've been at Rand the last 10 years. But the 10 years before that, as Bob Willard knows, I was at the Times Literate Company where you had dinner last night.

My job there was to actually help them or preside over their transforming from an analog publisher to a more digital publisher, so I saw the big changes in the Times Literate Company in terms of their newspaper systems going digital, their mapmaking systems going digital, books and magazines going digital; not always easily and not without trouble, problems, human factor issues. But basically, over that period of 10 years the mission was pretty well accomplished.

One of the interesting things that came out of experience -- which I think has been replicated most every place else -- is an important corollary of putting the digital technologies in every business was the interest of the people in e-mail communications. Very few of these systems in the early '80s built in e-mail except kind of as an after thought. At the L.A. Times, for example, the idea was the reporter ought to be able to send the draft material to the editor, then the editor ought to e-mail back to the reporter, and the reporter could be in contact with the auditor. But the idea that the reporters would want to e-mail among each other and among other places, that just wasn't built into the early systems.

So one of the things I think we've all learned is that communication is an absolutely essential -- perhaps the most essential part -- of any of these technical information systems.

Rand does pride itself as being kind of ahead of the curve on technology. I can tell you some very funny stories in which it seems to not have been at the head of the curve. I would say at this state that everybody at Rand is information literate and works on information systems.

One of the changes I can say in the past 10 years is I essentially do almost all of my business communications now by e-mail. It's replaced not just letter writing and memo writing but also phone calls to a large extent. So we do our calendaring and our scheduling and setting the administrative processes on e-mail.

That brings again the issues of privacy and security and the legal obligations to either e-mail or the incentives to get rid of e-mail so it doesn't come back to haunt you -- a lot of things that all institutions are dealing with. But I think that schools, libraries and government agencies are facing these same kinds of issues.

Now, in the future I laugh because I'm on a panel of the National Academy of Sciences that is just finishing a report on the Internet evolution, which is trying to deal with a number of these issues. The fact is, that among the experts that we've assembled, I would say, we can give you some pretty good ideas for the next 18 months, but 10 years from now we haven't a clue.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any other questions or comments for Mr. Baer? Don't everyone speak first.

And certainly, the observers are taking this conversation because this is suppose to be a dialogue.

Sandy? The logistics are going to be interesting. We need to get you a microphone.

MS. SCHUKETT: I was interested in the use of informational technology where you mentioned the schools that are technology rich. I'm wondering what their school libraries were like and what the librarian in those -- specifically, the ones in California, but all of them.

MR. BAER: I can't answer that question since I was not an author of that study; however, if you e-mail me -- baer@rand.org -- I'll put you in touch with the authors and see that they get back to you.

Incidentally, I only brought one copy of these reports, but I do believe that they are available on the Rand website. So any of you that are interested in that or other work we're doing, it's www.rand.org, and I think from there you ought to be able to find your way into the current publications.

We are trying to make our publications available on the Web as well as in print, and I would say in response to Mr. Abramson's earlier question, that's one of the big chances that have occurred in our institution in the past 10 years.

I thank you very much for inviting me here. I've enjoyed it. I will look forward to a dialogue. I'm sorry I do have to run back and teach class, but by e-mail or other means, I would be delighted to respond to any further questions you have.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you for coming. We really appreciate it.

(Applause)

Carol, would you like to pick up where I rudely interrupted you.

MS. TALEN: No, that's okay. I also wanted to provide you with a background on, specifically, on public libraries, but if you had questions about the National Institute first, I'd like to try.

MR. HORTON: Since we have both you and Patricia sitting together, and since we heard Patricia talk about information literacy -- and I've heard you mention adult literacy, lifelong learning -- but I guess the obvious question that I have is has the National Institute for Literacy addressed the concept of information literacy? And if so, what is your reaction to this concept or do you fold it into some other label?

MS. TALEN: One thing that you'll find interesting when you look at the information about Equipped for the Future, as she was putting this up earlier I thought, these are a lot

of the same issues that adult learners identify; they just didn't use that term. There's a lot of overlap.

Primarily, the National Institute at this point is really looking at basic literacy skills, both for adults and for children. They recently received funding for the Reading Excellence Act. Part of their role there will be to help public schools, teachers to improve children's reading. So they are gradually expanding as an agency, but right now they're primarily focused on basic literacy skills.

MR. HORTON: Just one follow up.

One of the things that the Information Literacy Act -- and I count myself as one of them in trying to advocate -- is that the traditional basic literacy skills of reading, writing and arithmetic are not enough in the information age. And the notion of information literacy as a fourth basic literacy skill is an obvious proposal or suggestion that I would hope that your institute at some point would take up debate and discuss to see whether you agree or disagree with that proposition. I think that could be very helpful to both sides, if you will.

MS. TALEN: I will certainly take that back. I think part of what the whole electronic communications systems is about -- the LINCSS folder you have does deal with information literacy. It's not al just -- we put up a lot of curriculums. We're doing a lot of different things on that. I would encourage you to go in and look at that website. I think you'll be surprise at the amazing amount of information that's available.

But they haven't looked at that as that kind of a focus, but I will certainly take that back. Thank you.

MS. BREIVIK: I just want to say that the Institute is the newest member of the National Forum on Information Literacy. I got an e-mail message a week ago from out of Washington saying, we just discovered you. We would like to be a member. What do we do?

So if Carol takes that back -- and now through their being a private forum -- I think that may happen because I agree, that unless it's a conscious part of what's going on an awful lot of the people involved with the programs won't promote that next step.

The Literacy Volunteers of America are also a member of the Forum, but again, I have not seen them do anything systematic about getting out to all their -- and they're a little more loosely knit than the Institute, so progress could be made much more quickly with the Institute, I think.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I'm curious -- and I'm going to turn this out on the table. I'm looking at Emily and at Joey and at Susan.

Everything that we've heard this morning so far, what is the impact and what is the role and what is the responsibility of libraries in general -- and I'm not saying public or school or academic, but libraries in general in addressing and sort of bringing together all of these issues? And don't all of you speak at once because I have to get you a microphone.

MS. KENT: One of the things that we're doing here at the Los Angeles Public Library that you may not be aware of is that we have a magnet high school -- that's the electronic information magnet high school -- that lives in this building. We have over 200 students in grades 9 through 12. This is our fifth year in cooperation with the Los Angeles school district.

Those students are part of a larger high school -- Belmont High School -- but they are one of the sub-magnets at Belmont, and every week they are here for part of their day to take classes in our library and to use our information resources and to work with our staff so that they are learning information literacy and electronic resources as the main thrust of their curriculums. So when they take history, they use the electronic resources -- book resources -- to learn about how to do research. I believe, although I'm not sure, that it may be the only electronic information magnet high school in the country.

It's been an interesting partnership with the school district. It took a little massaging and prodding over the first two years of its existence. We have a very large school district here, sometimes in disarray. But as the short edges were worn down and the different cultures that exist between teachers and public librarians and how to instruct young people began to merge somewhat, the idea that the librarians were not treading on the curriculum development responsibilities of the teachers -- which was something that was really difficult at the beginning -- became more smooth over. It's a very good partnership.

Now I should tell you that one of the things we look at from the library's perspective is that we provide the space, we provide the electronic resources and we provide our staff assistance to this partnership, and we get not a penny of money from the school district for doing any of this. So it is our collaboration that is adding to the value of these young people's education, and it's been an interesting partnership.

From the basic information literacy point of view, we see that as a real key for almost everyone who uses the library, including our staff. They're the first ones you need to have all the tools in place for information literacy. In a changing technological environment those tools change and those skills change, and they need to be constantly updated.

It's further complicated in a city where you have so many people whose native language is not English. So you have the whole English is a second language issue, you have the whole basic literacy in English or in the native language issue before folks can become even a bit adept at some of the information literacy things.

So I think it's a very complicated package, but something that's essential, for public libraries anyway, to do as part of their future.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I think that libraries do play the key role. If you start out with a good school library media specialist training students in information technology -- how to find information, how to do research, how to evaluate information -- they can take those skills on and become good citizens as they use their public libraries, college libraries, specialty libraries which they will need for the rest of their lives.

There needs to be a commitment in this country to lifelong learning if we're to continue to be successful, and the library plays a critical part in lifelong learning. To be successful at that, libraries need to recognize that librarians need to have continuing education, and we need to have educational opportunities that afford librarians the ability to continue to learn. So there needs to be cooperation on many levels to accomplish what I think most people agree need to be done, and I'm not sure we're there yet.

MS. TALEN: Joey Rodger.

MS. RODGER: I don't know a public library in this country that does not believe that a part of its mission is the support of literacy. How they do that varies greatly from library to library and community to community.

I think for them there is a deep respect for the professional skill that is involved in much literacy training; and the idea that you can take any librarian and have him become a literacy expert is not common, thank heavens, because there's a professional skill to running literacy programs.

I think with information literacy, public libraries have defined it as less their business -- and I'm trying to say this very carefully -- to teach it because most public libraries, apart from some exemplary programs like Susan's here, are not in the instructional business.

I think where they have seen -- and this is speaking very broadly -- where they have seen that they add value is in doing some of these things out ahead of the customer. So their adding value, for example, is in identifying and locating good websites rather than in doing a lot of extensive teaching about how to do that.

I think most of them understand that as more the role of the schools and of community colleges and others who have people walking in their doors subject to instruction, and who are coming in bringing instructional experience. The average public library user coming in wanting to find something on the Web probably doesn't want a 15-minute lesson in how to evaluate websites any more than you'd want a cooking lesson when you go to the grocery store.

There are exceptions to that of course, but by and large the positioning of the public library community for information literacy has been to run a system that delivers it as best they can with the major instruction coming from schools and college libraries.

And I've asked Susan for -- disagreeing with it because certainly she touches it more clearly than I do.

MS. KENT: I think what you said is very true, but I think it's going to have to change because it's overwhelming now.

Somebody comes in to you, a library, to use its electronic resources, and the proliferation of electronic resources is just staggering. Just read the newspaper everyday, every page is .com, and I just can't even keep up with what is now available on the Web.

So in stretching the use of our resources -- the same way librarians use to assist people in using the Readers Guide to Periodical Literature or any of the other indices, it's almost going to have to be a one-to-one teaching experience. I believe that libraries are going to have to offer more training opportunities.

In California, for example, I think the point Emily made about school media specialists is very critical. Yes, they're key in educating young people. And Sandy's nodding her head. And I can tell you, that at 600 elementary schools in Los Angeles unified school district, I don't know how many of them have school media specialists, but -- 10 out of 600 -- but of all the schools, where are those young people getting their instruction on how to use resources? They're getting them at the public library, and they're getting them at the public library in many states and many cities all over the country because the school media resource people are not there.

Beyond the young people, it is the mass of population -- the adults -- who are using our libraries who don't have a clue. If we didn't have to use it as part of our job, we wouldn't have a clue either. I think while we would like to say we're doing a lot of organizing, identifying websites and organizing things on the Web, we're going to have to really look carefully at more instructional, both on the one-to-one and group approach in the coming years.

MS. BREIVIK: I just want to add to that. In that book I did with my sister, there's a wonderful story in there about a public children's librarian who knew the schools -- even in Connecticut, where they have school librarians, but it wasn't happening. And we just kept going back to the principal until, in fact, it got started. Eventually, the school librarian got involved.

But other states, like California, where there's been nothing for so long -- maybe it isn't a leadership role that public libraries would like to take, but they have to be active partners at some point.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Sandy, first, and then Emily.

MS. SCHUKETT: I agree with what Susan and Patricia have just said, but I think that that points to the need for advocacy, for fully funded school librarian positions in every school in this country.

I agree that public librarians now working with adults and students who have not had the advantage of learning information literacy from kindergarten, where a student learns to take notes, for example, visually, by looking at a picture and pulling out key words. This is developmental teaching that's done by a librarian who is also a teacher and who collaborates with the classroom teacher.

I'm speaking of an ideal world that which we don't have now. But I think, again, I'll repeat, this points up the need for strong advocacy, and I think that anyone who is committed to information literacy, to make it really happen for all of our citizens, regardless of economics, regardless of language and regardless of everything else, I think that another piece of it has to be strong advocacy, beginning at the kindergarten level in all schools.

MS. SHEKETOFF: The public library has always been the citizens' university. It's always been a place where people could go to gather information that they needed and get things that they couldn't get in other places. Just like there's story time, there's programs to prepare children how to learn.

Now public libraries really need to serve a more senior population as well, teaching them this new technology. And public libraries are going to have to change because they need to serve their community, and they need to give their community the things the community needs. Whether that's information technology or learning how to use databases or learning how to use the computer or the Internet, that's what public libraries are going to have to do. And they're going to have to look to new partners to help them do that because there's not the taxpayer money to help to pay for these programs.

I think the library is going to have to change to keep up with the times, and many libraries are. I toured the L.A. Public Library Wednesday, and it very much is keeping up with the times, accessing what its population is looking for, what the library user needs; and they're changing to give the library user what he or she needs.

I think all public libraries are going to have to do that as well as community college libraries, college libraries and the others, but very much the public library. Hopefully, they're not going to have to make up for what school libraries are not doing. It would be nice if they could be partners and have the students learn what they need to learn in their school library and then graduate to the public library. But if that doesn't happen, the public libraries may have to step in and do that as well.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Rebecca?

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: I have a question about the status of this electronic magnet that meets in the library. My question relates to, what kind of library services do

they have at that particular school before the youngsters come in? Is there an adequate library there or is there an utter absence of a library?

MS. KENT: Sandy might be able to answer that better than I can. There is a high school library --

MS. SCHUKETT: There is a library there. You're putting me on the spot.

MS. KENT: There's a library at the high school.

MS. SCHUKETT: There's a library at the high school. There's a credentialed librarian at the high school.

MS. KENT: See, they're using electronics -- the focus is to be sophisticated users of electronic information resources -- just the way if you went -- we have a police academy in the magnet high school to help prevent --

So if they're doing a history project for Black History Month, and they're looking into the papers of Dr. Martin Luther King, they'll be using our book resources as well as being able to mentally use and find electronic resources and to evaluate them as to credibility and as to whether they're providing real information.

It's a whole technique in terms of teaching young people to be -- it's almost as if they were doing a basic library education but only through electronic resources.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: I asked the question because in the area from which I come there is access to the public library from the school library, and the teaching of the library use within the curriculum is done by the certified -- and, of course, we have a state certification -- of the high school librarian; and the youngster can plug into the terminal, to the public library, to do the same kind of electronic exploration. And therefore, the public librarian does not have to have the curriculum kind of background or the curriculum kind of teaching background.

That's happening in a number of places so that the school librarian is, in effect, also an interface and a gateway to the public library and teaming in a sense with the public library.

MS. KENT: All schools have access to our resources electronically. They all have access to our website and to our resources.

To say one more appeal. The whole advocacy issue of the school media specialist is very important. I think the issue of where you're going to find them is equally important. You can train them, but where are you going to find the people to train in that area?

COMMISSIONER GOULD: We have a representative here from community colleges which seems to be an institution that sometimes is neglected, but I think has a very important role to play.

MS. NORMAN: Thank you.

When the community colleges were working on their information competency initiative, one of the realizations that came to me was that, we have a 106 institutions, we have less than 60 library schools in the country that train librarians. I needed at least one librarian for every institution, and there was no way that I was going to be competing with Harvard, the multiplicity of community colleges in the country, of public libraries and school libraries to get 106 librarians in the state.

I also had to increase the awareness of my administrators that they needed to look at how they could fund this. When you hire a librarian in an academic institution, they could be on the instructional side of the house or they could be on the noninstructional side of the house, and the institution can be penalized. So there are regulations that need to be looked at as we do this.

So all of these things came to my mind as I was going about this process. Knowing that I wasn't able to enact all of that at one time, I had to start small, and I think that's what we have to look at, is starting small.

What are the things that we can change realistically? As new initiatives are being put into place, California's governor, and I'm sure most of your governors as well as the president, have put in initiatives that deal with reading, that focus on education, but if you look deep into it, libraries are not mentioned.

I just attended a conference on high school drop-outs, and there's all this money that's going to high school drop-outs and community programs, but libraries are not mentioned. When we talk about reading, when we talk about special projects -- the police magnet program that we're talking about -- are library's written into it?

So when we talk about advocacy I think we have to look at the fact that we are embedded in every single initiative that is put forth in this country. My librarians picked up on that, I guess, and we had \$100 million extra coming to the system in partnership for excellence, and as a result of that, last year I saw 30 new positions in the state for community college librarians. I didn't have anything to do with it personally; I planted the seed.

Every time a grant is written, there needs to be a slot for librarians, and if you put \$5,000 in every little pot, you'll be able to fund a position. Then we have to go back to our library schools and start to work with them to see what they can do to get more people.

The last thing I want to talk about is just training teachers.

The people coming out of teacher training programs is not aware of what good library service is. If you've never experienced good library service, you have no idea what it is. It's like going from a Volkswagen to a Jaguar. If you've never ridden in a Jaguar, you have no idea what comforts and luxuries are there.

I have a friend that's a middle school teacher, very versed in technology, and I watched her go to the public library and pulling all these books and taking them to her class, and I kept saying, what's your school library have? Have you talked to your school librarian? Have her order them, especially when the kids start losing the books. And it's taken three years to get her to go to the library, to work with her librarian and to begin to address the issues that are there.

So I think that we have to look at the schools of teacher training, and to work with those people to increase the awareness so that they understand what quality library service is and how libraries impact their teacher learning process.

MS. BREIVIK: I'd like to build on that. To the NCLIS commissioners who are here -- I agree. All of us have to do what we can. We have wonderful things happening with accreditation for California and other things happening.

Part of it comes down to is what our public officials, what our school leaders, what are people hearing out of Washington. This is where NCLIS, to me, is at such a key pivotal point. You're the ones who are the advisors to the President of the United States, and if we can't start getting the message coming out of the White House to say -- again, access is important, and to go that next extra step, that we're not just advocating for basic research about computers, but we're getting a percentage of that money to go into research about what's happening to people who have access.

It's a total lack of visibility to the question, and so everybody across the country in public libraries and school libraries -- everybody -- are fighting these little tiny -- holding the fort because and it's besiege mentality because there's no vision at the national level.

If NCLIS has ever been creative to do anything and ever had an opportunity to make a qualitative difference in the future of this country, it's to get the leaders of our country to take that one extra step. They're headed in the right direction, but they've got to go a little bit further.

So my question is, what can you all do to help us fight our little battles? We're not going to give up and do less where we are, but how can you help the generals of this war for better education to understand that information literacy has something to do with that? Creating a lifelong learning course requires information literacy, and that requires libraries, and that requires librarians.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I guess I have a chance to say something.

When I attended the Digital Divide meeting in December, I came out of that particular meeting, and I was somewhat irate. In fact, at the session that I attended, after I found my way to the room -- getting lost in the Department of Commerce is very easy -- they talked a great deal about training; never once did anyone use the word "education." Not once.

I was sitting in the back of the room -- as you know, I'm a little short -- and finally to get the attention of the group up front, I had to take off my shoes and stand on a chair and wave my hand. I brought up the very issues that we are talking about this morning, and they all sort of looked at me and went, duh?

So I came back and I said it's time for me to write some letters. And I did draft two letters, one to the Secretary of Commerce, which has to be made a little more tactful, and the other to the gentleman's whose name I constantly block out -- Tom Culeo -- who is the policy advisor to the president because of the statement he made, "All you have to do is connect, and then everything will take care of itself." But it won't. I see a real role here for the Commission.

I've discussed this with other commissioners and with our executive director. I know that we are going to do something in the way of a hearing on school libraries. I see a number of things here that we're talking about, and it's more than just information literacy, and it's more than just connecting.

I see a need not only to work to change policy at the national level, but a need to reach out to some other organizations, like the National Association of School Superintendents, the National Association of School Trustees, the National Association of School Principals, none of whom really understand the changes that are taking place. I also see a need for us to go back and look at what is happening not only with teacher education, but again, with the education of librarians.

I went to the Congress on professional education and stood up and said to the gentleman for Wired magazine who went on and on about this glorious new world, that it would be really great if you understood the world as not wired, and that not all the information in the world happens to be on the Internet, and there is still a need for books.

There is still a need not only in terms of addressing in schools and education and in library schools, there is a terrible need to retrain and bring up to speed teachers and librarians who are currently working, many of whom are from my generation or the generation just behind me. We are not necessarily computer literate. We are literate, hopefully, but we are not computer literate. I mean, I can look at a terminal and immediately fry it.

So there is a terrible need to work with teachers in terms of this whole issue of how you can take the knowledge that is available for technology and make it viable in terms of not only the school library but classroom.

I am not quite sure where we're going to go with this. Emily, do you have any words of wisdom?

MS. SHEKETOFF: I'm not sure if these are words of wisdom, but I do think that NCLIS has a critical role to play now. I think that someone needs to sensitize the Clinton administration to the fact that libraries play a critical role in the digital divide.

This is something that we spent a lot of time with Tom Culeo, and we couldn't get him or Secretary Daley to get it. Although, Daley has now said he was wrong, and he really needs to look at libraries, but hasn't changed the fact that he's done a number of digital divide events and the libraries haven't been a part of it.

But there's also a number of education programs that the Clinton administration is proposing; paying for training, paying for graduate school -- all for teachers, not teacher and library media specialists, school specialists.

There has to be a sensitization that you cannot have improved education without good school libraries. You can't have a good school library without a trained school library media specialist, and the ALA can't do it alone. You are the official advisors to the president. You need to advise him of this.

Somebody needs to let him and his staff know that this is going on. There's hundreds of millions of dollars now that could be used to train more librarians. I don't think it's going to fix the librarian shortage, but it will certainly make a dent.

It's very hard for somebody who's looking at their educational options to decide, well, should I take on the financial obligation of a masters degree, and then go into a job that pays \$36,000 or get out of school in four years and walk into a \$90,000 job?

Well, you could ease their decision a little if they knew that some of the freight for the education could be paid for by some of these educational opportunities that are now being offered to teachers. And the way the legislation is written, it could be interpreted either way, but somebody needs to make a little push; and I think the push comes much better from NCLIS than from ALA or groups like ALA.

MS. BREIVIK: I guess I'd like to play devil's advocate here just a little bit, and that is I don't think NCLIS should be pushing libraries, not even school libraries. I know you're sensitive on this, but let me say.

We have never as a profession -- though we have tried -- ALA president after ALA president to get anywhere pushing libraries per se. Because we sound like just one other group that's out there wanting our share of the pie.

I would think it would be a waste of NCLIS to push a particular thing like that. When are we going to start to say, here are our national priorities. We need a lifelong learning, active, flexible workforce. This can't happen unless they're information literate.

We have put critical investments into technology, and there's no proof that there's any payoff from it. When are we going to start making sure that we're getting the payoff from the technology? And we can only get that if people can use it well. When we start aligning ourselves with the identifying needs, and we show how these kinds of skills can make those things happen -- make the payoff in technology -- then they will realize they need libraries. If we just short-change that awareness, a waking kind of thing, we're not going to get any farther in the next three or four decades than we have in the last one.

All the things of that kind of thing is true. I'm hiring people. I'm concerned where they're going to come from. It's just that I don't think that we're going to get there, we're going to accomplish what we want if we can't change the mind-set of our political leaders, that access isn't enough, they have to go one step further. Once they understand that, once the light bulb goes off, all the rest of this will be easy to bring about.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Okay. Sheketoff.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I think we're facing a critical need right now, and I think that unless we can raise the recognition in our leaders, that it is true, with just the technology we're not going to accomplish what we need. We need people who can use that technology, so they must be literate, not only literate in the reading but in technical literacy and information literacy. To get that way, there needs to be people who can help them achieve that, and that's not only librarians and school librarians, but effective teachers as well.

There is now a commitment in our political leadership to put resources into education. What I'm saying is, we need to raise their level of awareness that it is not enough merely to train 100,000 new teachers; that you need to train those teachers to recognize that they need to work with their school librarians, and we need to train librarians. And now is the time when there's a commitment to put money into that training.

We need to make our leadership understand that the training and education includes not only kindergarten teachers and third grade teachers but school library media specialists as well. They're an integral, critical part of education.

We know that a child who is educated in a school with a school library with a certified school library media specialist gets a better quality education than a child trained in a school with no library. So we need to give the children who are going to school now the opportunity of going to school with a school library. And we don't have --

MS. BREIVIK: I don't disagree with that. I'm just saying how are we going to get there.

MS. SHEKETOFF: Well, that's where I think NCLIS can play an excellent role in sensitizing the leadership to this need. It's sort of like a hidden behind the door need. People within the library community recognizes it, but we have not done a good job of informing the larger educational community about this, so that when the political

leadership talks about education, they think and talk only about teachers and classrooms. They don't think about the critical need that a school library plays. Now is the time where all these resources are being poured into education.

It will be the same situation that happened in California where they went through a period of 10 years where they were not putting any resources into school libraries. Now they're in a deep hole that's going to be very hard for them to dig out of. We don't want that to happen to the rest of the country.

COMMISSIONER BINGHAM: This seems like a conversation or a group in which I set in 1965 when we were organizing the First Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its implementation in the area where I happened to be working. That was the year I came into school district supervision, making history in Kentucky, looking like I do, and being given control of this much money and funding and all this sort of thing.

That First Elementary and Secondary Education Act had several titles to it. One of the titles, Title 2 addressed the collection and collecting building, and I believe it was Title 5 that addressed the personnel, the training of the personnel and provided for workshops for school personnel.

The teacher, the classroom people as well as the librarians worked together to do these very things that we're talking about, and that is when we had the bursting of elementary libraries all across these United States because they wanted to get the money, and we had selection sources and these kinds of things to get quality kinds of things rather than just their money. There was a tremendous growth in elementary librarianship, and it was reflected in the higher levels.

Then when we came along with the Educational Consolidation Act, when we did not hold funding harmless for the building of collections and for the training of personnel, that we had the erosion of the growth that had taken place.

Now last year in California you people had a wonderful demonstration. You had an Irvine -- and I know Irvine is quite an affluent community. But way back -- and this was in the dim, dark ages when I was president of the Association of School Librarians. The Irvine school district won the National Encyclopedia Britannica funded award for the Exemplary School Library media Program.

We had numbers of good programs applying for these kinds of awards because they were using these monies to do the very things that we're echoing here. When the federal level of funding changed, that's when communities decided it wasn't important.

We are now facing, if I'm not mistaken, an ESEA reauthorization, and I'm just echoing everything said here, embracing all of the good comments I've heard. I don't know whether it's NCLIS -- and I'm certainly local enough to help NCLIS work on it.

I think we need to strike while the iron is hot, and while the reauthorization is being undertaken, we need to capture on some of the victories we had back there in the '60s that gave birth to the growth and awareness of several of those libraries that are still existing today in various communities that unfortunately have eroded away here in California.

Now I'll be quiet.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Carol, you're next.

MS. TALEN: I want to just give you a little background. I've been working in literacy programs for 30 years, and almost half of that has in been public library-based literacy. I come from education. That's what I did before. I've been a college and university professor, and I've done a lot of things within the field including correctional ed. I've worked for libraries now for many years.

I think I have trouble sometimes understanding why a library is separate from education. I have difficulty with that. To me, every librarian is a teacher. Every librarian is constantly teaching, maybe not in the same way that the classroom teacher is, but I find it amazing that school media teachers would be the first to go when budgets were cut. Well, after art and maybe music, I don't know.

But I think libraries as a whole have not made their argument -- their voice -- in the way they could. Using just specifically California as a model, California public libraries have benefitted thousands of times more than literacy has ever cost them. I can be very specific with that.

We do have state money. We have a 16-year old program that's primarily -- not totally -- state funded. But I was just listing some things that have come to our library because they are involved in literacy, and they were seen by this administration -- our governor particularly right now -- as a solution for literacy, not as just a public library.

He gave \$14 million last year to increase our public library fund, and when he authorized that he said in his language, "I am doing this because I see public libraries as part of the solution to the literacy problem," not because he saw public libraries as this wonderful thing that was going to give people information. He saw it, and that's what he was interested in funding.

We've been trying to get a bond debt for rebuildings for public libraries in this state. The administration would not let us move forward with that until literacy was attached to that bond debt.

Our governor -- at least the one we have right have, and may have for a while -- doesn't see -- he sees literacy and libraries as one. He truly, truly does. I'm not sure how you do that, but this is what we need to happen on the national level too.

It's taken us a long time here, but constantly we're seeing how libraries that are truly actively involved in literacy, who consider themselves part of the whole educational process, really are benefitting. It is not costing, it is bringing back.

I just walked away with \$3.2 million the other day for our family literacy programs. If I had just gone and said I want to do this public libraries do preschool activities, and they do it well, I would never have been funded, but I went with another proposal. I went and said, we do family literacy, and we do it very well. We know how to do it, and we've been doing it for 13 years, and public libraries can do this. And I walked away from the Prop 10 Commission with that kind of money.

So as an outsider/insider, I just really encourage you to take this approach, to see literacy as something you do. As Joey said, you don't all have to do it exactly alike, but it is to the benefit of libraries to really embrace and show that they are part of this because they are.

MS. NORMAN: I want to echo what Pat had said about NCLIS not advocating at the national level for libraries. I don't believe in advocating for myself. I plant the seeds, I provide the information, and I let the ones who it impacts the most advocate for me.

I was at a community college for 10 years, and at that college, when I first came in I was in half of a triple trailer. Now this is a college that had been in existence for 20 years as a regional training academy and decided to become a college. They had never had a full-time librarian.

When I came in, like I said, half of a triple trailer. Two months later, we moved into 2,000 square feet, so I stayed for about 6 years. They wanted to give me another 1,000 square feet, and I said no. I can't keep going linear, I need some other things.

I had gone through two accreditations, wrote everything. The accreditation commission said these are the things that need to be done. Those changes were never made. When it came time for the third accreditation, my president came to me and said, "You have to do the report." I said, no. He says, "Well, you have to do it. Who else is going to do it?" I said, no. Where does it say that the librarian has to do the report? I can do counseling, I can do institutional research, I should be able to do anyone.

So I was ad hoc to that. I provided them with what they needed. I never went to the meetings. I let them come to me.

When they read my previous accreditation reports, they saw that I had asked for everything and nothing had been done. My teachers, my students, began to raise the issues with the governing board, and as a result of that we got money, we got a new building, we got personnel.

So it's not up to us to advocate. We need to find those success stories out there, and let them advocate for us.

The other thing that we need to do is to document our information. Emily made a statement about we know that students who do good in school have good school libraries.

Where is that documented? Who have we provided that information to outside of the library community? If we haven't provided to anyone, who knows that? And how can we document if the data that NCLIS has on school libraries is more than five years old and there study is only done every five years? We can't. We can't do it with good credibility.

Going back to the last thing that Carol said, I have never considered myself -- I was a school librarian also. I always considered myself a faculty member or a teacher, even at the college level. I was a faculty member, I was a teacher.

If you want to look at it as a laboratory as opposed to a classroom where you have the students all lined up in little chairs? The library is my laboratory, it is my classroom; and until we change that mind-set in librarians, we're not going to go anyplace. Anybody can run a library.

MS. BREIVIK: Emily, I want to end up where you want to end up. I think we all want to end up there. I think we all are convinced to know that it makes a difference when a physical librarian is in each school.

Carol gave a perfect example of what I was trying to get across, and that is, people have to see us as part of the solution. What we need is NCLIS not to have a conference on school library media centers, but to have an educational conference in collaboration with the Department of Education and others who explore why we're not making proper use of the technology, why our students aren't graduating with the kind of lifelong learning skills that employers want, and let people discover as part of that process the incredibly essential part that school libraries have to plug in. Please, don't do a conference on school libraries.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I promise I won't.

MS. RODGER: I was just going to be very supportive of Patricia's view, and I think Carol's was evidence of that. When we push libraries as ends in themselves, we are self-serving one-note people. When we see libraries as partners in, in this case, the success of students -- and certainly Keith Lance's data that Nancy mentioned yesterday would be bring evidence of that.

Then what you do is a conference on student success, and you do all of this in the name of the beneficiary, not in the name of the organization or the professional that's delivering it. I think that's when you become a player, and an important player, not a one-note advocate, which has very limited appeal in the political environment.

Sometimes it's the best thing, and I want to make sure to say that, but often it's not. My own favorite thing for libraries is that they're about solutions and delight, and we need to sell it that way, but sell it in terms of the beneficiaries not in terms of our institutional goals.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Sandy and then Commissioner Abramson, and then we're going to have to face the fact that we're running out of time, but much of this discussion can go during lunch.

MS. SHEKETOFF: I agree with the last three people who spoke, Joey, Carolyn and Patricia.

One of the things that happened in this district in 1989 was that the middle and high school librarians received pink slips. I was the president of the local association at the time, and I had people calling me on the phone crying, what am I going to do? They're taking my job.

I said, what you're going to do is you're going to get one parent, one student and one teacher to speak before the Board of Education about you will not cut this program from my school.

It was very interesting because some of my colleagues said, okay, I can do that. I said, good, give me their names in two days. And others said, well, I don't know if I can do that. And I said, then I don't know if I can save your job.

I think this idea of a conference, showing the value to students is a wonderful idea, and then publicizing it such that PTAs will say, why don't we have this in our school? Such that school administrators will say, wait a minute, we're missing the boat here. And perhaps that, along with the other advocacy -- that certainly doesn't hurt -- perhaps we'll make some changes.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Thank you.

Commissioner Abramson.

COMMISSIONER ABRAMSON: I don't have to be as careful as some people have been because, first of all, I don't have to be right -- I'm not used to being right.

I think some of the discussion has assumed that -- and I'll speak mainly about public libraries -- want to be involved in even basic literacy. I don't think that's true. My experience has been as public librarians there is at least two things they don't want to do. They don't want to hand out IRS forms because people are going to ask them how to fill them out. People are going to ask them which form goes with the other one.

The other thing is, they don't want to deal with people that don't know how to read. They say I've got shift work. As a senior MLS, I'm getting paid less than a starting school librarian, and I don't want to have to deal with people that can't read.

As advocates, librarians in the mass are lousy advocates either for what they do or for what they accomplish. So I think that there may be a role, and it may be one of them that's been suggested that NCLIS can have in terms of what we used to call when I was younger, consciousness raising, when it comes to the importance of the results of having good libraries and well trained librarians.

The school librarians are in a different kind of a spot because the world they live in is controlled by athletic coaches who teach drivers education in their off seasons. So it's asking an awful lot for their bosses to become advocates for even the results of good librarianship in their institutions if they understood it, and I'm not sure they do.

So I think that one thing is, on the local level school trustees and public library trustees have to be the advocates. In the main, they're volunteers. By most perspectives they have a lot of understanding and a lot of energy, and I think they have to take that role.

Some of you have heard me say before that I personally feel that libraries -- all libraries -- are the civic cathedrals of the arts, humanities and even the sciences, and I feel that very strongly. No one can be against libraries. That's one of the problems that libraries have. You can't accuse anybody of being against libraries, so then they don't really have to do anything to prove they're for them. So you have to have strong advocates.

The point has been made that you can't be a single issue person, we've got to have libraries because we've got to have libraries. We have to have people who are dedicated, devoted and have an understanding of the results and the joy to be those advocates.

I guess the critical difference I have to what's been suggested is, I guess almost everyone has implicitly assumed that librarians are in favor of being personally involved in raising basic literacy. I don't agree with that. I think that in my experience -- I don't have a lot of experience with school librarians, although I had excellent school librarians, and they were important and making me as disruptive as I am probably.

As far as public librarians go, they don't want to deal with people that can't read.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: Are there any other comments from the commissioners?

COMMISSIONER SHEPPARD: I'm sitting here writing notes kind of all over this paper and on the next page and the next page, and I keep coming back to a whole series of common themes. But I think one of the most important things that I'm hearing is that this is truly a multilevel problem and requires all the sorts of things that are being defined in this room.

It requires advocacy at a national level, but we all know that that really is not achieved unless the advocacy also is at the constituent level. It requires a very clearly articulated definition of the problem that focuses on the user; who is experiencing the problem and why does it make a difference? It requires a very thoughtful approach to collaboration to thinking in terms of who are all the players who are involved in this whole approach to information literacy.

So that libraries cannot assume this as their sole task, it's just much too huge, but they can help to articulate, they can help to define how to go about solving these problems in terms of the training. They can help to build the coalitions within the communities of all those other agencies and organizations that are doing computer training, those who are working with senior citizens.

I think we need to think very broadly about how do we define and make those connections with everybody involved in this very, very critical kind of thing, and we need to keep this conversation going.

I think what we need to do is really looking at this as a very significant, long-term, 21st century problem here, defining who the end user is and what the needs are. I have to agree that starting there and bringing together a broad, national conversation on it is really essential. I think this has been an extraordinary conversation, but it's many, many levels where it has to happen.

MR. HORTON: I just want to get one thing on sort of the official record that has not come up in this discussion. That is, we invited Patricia here today, I think, to discuss ways in which the Commission could advance the concept of information literacy. Patricia has urged us to -- I would put it in different terms -- instead of using a supply push to shift to a demand pull kind of a strategy in doing that. You may not agree with that, but that's how I interpreted what you were saying. Don't push -- in fact, Joey used the term "push" at one point in her remarks.

There is one concrete way that I think we could demand pull -- and this came up at your National Forum on Literacy at the last meeting that I attended, and that is to escalate this to the international level.

In just a few weeks, Mr. Willard and Commissioner Challinor will be meeting with UNESCO people in Paris, and the Commission has intensified its dialogue with UNESCO on the whole range of library and information issues.

It just so happens that one of the activities that UNESCO is very keenly interested in is ways to strengthen the link between the UNESCO network of associated libraries -- the so-called UNOW Program -- and the Sisters Libraries Project that I think, Patricia, you may be aware of, which is the White House Millennium Project that we discussed yesterday. If you are unaware of that, I'm sure we can give you information on it.

In her report yesterday, Beth Bingham -- who's sitting back there now, and there's a written report we can make available to you -- had at least one case where the linking together of Tijuana and San Diego -- can I mention San Diego in Los Angeles? -- have gotten together, and -- I'm quoting from her report -- "the students are using the Web for research as well as keyboarding and publication techniques. This is called information literacy in progress, according to Marcia Korobkin." And then it goes on.

Already, the notion of information literacy is finding its way into the context of the Sisters Libraries Program.

What I'm leading up to then is, if we can work with you, Patricia, on flushing this out a little further so that when Commissioner Challinor and Bob go to Paris and talk with Mr. Yushkiavitshus, who's the assistant director general for Communications Information and Informatics of UNESCO, we can suggest the information literacy element be a part of the strengthening of the tie in between UNESCO Sister Libraries Program and our own, and that would certainly be one concrete way to elevate the whole information literacy, using the vehicle of ties between the respected Sisters Libraries Program of UNESCO and the United States.

MS. BREIVIK: You missed the last National Forum on Information Literacy meeting, and at that it was clear that there is enough now going on internationally that the forum members feel that we should take some steps to facilitate -- in fact, I've had one talk with Bob and Martha about this -- should take some steps to facilitate an international dialogue, and I would be very delighted to work about how that might fit in with what you're already doing.

Again, just in the last few years have been the First National Conference on Lifelong Learning Information Literacy in Taiwan. There was one in Japan a little bit earlier than that. There's a lifelong learning conference in Australia in July that is going to have a major focus on information literacy.

It may be that the timing for something like that would be very good. Plus that we could help try to tie in with the Global Knowledge Partnership as sharing concerns.

MR. HORTON: And just yesterday, this very commission approved resolutions supporting the United States rejoining as a member state of UNESCO.

COMMISSIONER GOULD: I cannot begin to tell you how much I have learned this morning, and I think the other commissioners will agree with me. There's a lot of food for thought here. I'm not quite sure where we're going to go. I am very grateful for everything that has been said this morning and for those of you who took the time to come and to talk to the Commission and to inform us.

I will remind you that in our policy advisory role, we speak not for the professions, we speak for the end user. We advocate for the people who use and who also pay for the services with their tax dollars.

I'm really not sure where we're going to go from here. I can see myself going back and not reading the minutes but actually reading the formal transcript to try and pull some of my thoughts together.

Again, I'd like to thank you, Susan, for hosting us here today, and it's great to sort of come back to where I was once upon a time.

Thank everyone, please, for being here, for your words. Keep in touch with us. Let us know what you're doing. I will be working and talking with Emily when I'm back in Washington. The same with Beverly.

Lunch is now here. I think this is a great opportunity for everyone to come around the table and continue informally our discussions and sharing of information. With that, I will adjourn this meeting.

(Meeting adjourned at 12:11 p.m.)