

StLA Data and Public Policy Questions
A Paper to Assist in Steering Committee Discussion, December 7, 2000
Prepared by Joseph F. Shubert

I. Assumptions

The following are some assumptions for our December discussion of StLA focus on public policy questions. As Steering Committee members read this paper before the December meeting, I hope they will identify other assumptions in Part I as they may see needed. I hope, also, that they will react to information in Parts II - IV, and give particular thought to the six discussion points in Part V.

1. Since the inception of the StLA survey, the survey has been designed to meet the needs of five groups:
 - Chief officers of state library agencies and their staffs
 - Policy makers in the executive and legislative branches of Federal and State governments
 - Government and library administrators and Federal, State, and local levels
 - The American Library Association and its members and customers, members of the national press, staff of other education organizations
 - Library and public policy researchers.
2. The term, *public policy*, may be understood as “how, why and to what effect governments pursue particular courses of action and inaction.” [A. Heidenheimer *et al*, 1990, as quoted by Parsons,, p.xv]
3. The concerns of *policy analysts* have been described as:
 - “Problems” and the relationship of public policies to these problems
 - Content of public policies
 - What the decision makers and policy makers do or do not do. [and] They are interested in terms of outputs and outcomes. [Parsons, 1995, pp.29-30]

The last of these three points may distinguish the interests of the public policy analyst from those of librarians who use the StLA E.D. Tabs data. Librarians are likely to be interested in the what, how much, and where of inputs and outputs within the framework of the survey as they deal with administrative and budget questions, while the policy analyst is inevitably interested in outputs and outcomes. Note: The Steering Committee’s “Prospectus” for the Survey (updated in 1998) says: “The survey collections information on “Inputs and outputs of state library agency services and operations in both direct library services and library development and networking services.”

4. While we think of “libraries” or “library and information services” (and, in our committee, particularly State library agencies and their services), public policy people work in broader policy arenas. They have connections to various governments, populations, and sectors, and usually are looking beyond libraries. Their interest in

State library agencies may be part of a broader study or concern, such as education, racial equity, social objectives, economics, urban and rural problems, health, etc.

5. When public policy people think of libraries or “library and information services,” they rarely differentiate among types of libraries, their differing clienteles and objectives, and overlapping of users communities. Almost invariably, they think first of public libraries.
6. For productive discussion of StLA data in relation to public policy questions, as Steering Committee members we must focus on State library agencies, what they do, and what they are. In terms of the number of libraries, the StLAs constitute one of the smallest groups of libraries in the nation, yet, their responsibilities and programs have great impact on the larger groups. At the same time, we need to explore:
 - Possibilities for linking various data in the StLA E.D. Tabs for the convenience of public policy researchers,
 - Possibilities for finding and linking data in the various NCES library surveys to meet the needs of public policy people who see the need to look beyond StLAs, and
 - How other research resources are likely to shape public policy review of StLAs.
7. The Steering Committee needs to give some attention to who does public policy research, how they go about it, and how awareness of the StLA data can better known to people embarking on research..

II. Earlier Discussions of StLA Data and Public Policy Questions

We have discussed public policy questions several times in StLA Steering Committee meetings. As a result of our most recent discussion, in March 2000, Mr. Owings constituted a Task Force “to look at Question 33 and other questions relating to the work of StLAs, particularly in relation to education, the “digital divide,” costs of connectivity, and the growth of networks.” The May 24 report of the Task Force appears as Appendix 2.

Earlier -- in September 1997 and again in September 1999 -- we identified questions and organized them under eight headings: State Library Agency *functions, *governance, *functions relating to internet and communications, *telecommunications/accountability, *funding, * Federal impact, *duplication of services, and *changes in the way StLAs do business. (The full text of the questions appears in Attachment 1.)

Taken together, the May 24, 2000 report and the September 1999 discussion summary indicate at least two problems with our earlier discussions:

1. The somewhat artificial and misleading (or at least, limited) identification of Question 33 as “the policy questions.”

The May 24 report makes clear that someone interested in “what impact does or should an StLA have on education in a State?” would find significant information in more than the one table (28) that reports data from Question 33. Table 28 reports financial assistance to public libraries in support of certain education reform initiatives. (Note this is Table 28 in the 1998 E.D. Tabs and Table 29 in the 1999 E.D. Tabs.). While Question Table 28 reports grant expenditures for three types of state and/or federal education reform initiatives, Tables 6a, 13e, and 25a-f provide significant data on StLA services, staff capacity, and financial assistance to libraries in relation to education reform.

Although it may be useful to think of a particular question labeled “policy” as providing policy information, the truth is that **any data in the StLA E.D. Tabs could be useful for policy analysis**, depending upon how the policy analyst frames the question. For example, StLA data provided by responses Questions 22-32 in the FY 1999 StLA survey have conceivable use in responding to public policy study of the “digital divide.” These questions focus on electronic networking, internet access and internet-based services, online databases, licensing, access to other information, and participation in the Universal Service-E-rate discount program.

2. Recognition of the politics of research

Policy research projects are rarely apolitical. Different individuals and entities may see StLAs very differently. Policy analysts may be “given” a point of view by their client.

What the policy analyst can do with StLA data depends upon the way the analyst frames or re-frames the question. Different research analysts may come up with important nuances in framing what appears to be the same question and may be guided in part by the intentions and inclinations of the client. The StLA data are neutral, but their uses need not be neutral.

III. Where are Public Policy Researchers/Analysts and How do they Work?

Wayne Parsons of the University of London identifies the following settings in which public policy analysts work::

- Universities: academics who are interested in policy and problems areas and in the policy process. they are involved in personal research and competing for funds from grant-giving bodies.
- Independent research institution and “think-tanks”; thee may have full-time and contract staff who are involved in specialist research.
- In-house policy units: analysts who are responsible for research and intelligence in government, governmental agencies and public bodies
- Pressure and lobby groups: interest groups, which seek to influence policy, engage in monitoring policy as well as developing alternative ideas and proposals.
- Political parties: will have departments/units or groups involved in policy research and development to support party activities and interests.
- Freelance consultants: people who engage in research on the basic of contracts and fees.

[Parsons, pp.30-31]

As individuals associated with libraries, we likely think of Charles McClure and John Bertot as examples of university-based freelance policy analysts; and we may think of George D’Elia, Christie Koontz and others who have conducted research for government agencies and associations administering or influencing public policy. In addition, each of us likely could identify one or more university-based or independent analysts expert on library finance, and perhaps one or more persons who has looked at libraries as part of a broader study of government expenditure and results – or some study of education and its results. An individual who has worked in a StLA is likely to have worked with policy analysts in the legislative and executive branches of her or his state.

Members of this Steering Committee have commissioned and used various policy studies, and some may have been stung by the findings of studies they consider flawed. It may be useful for us to consider some of the ways in which public policy research is conducted.

Eugene Barbach of the University of California at Berkeley asserts:

Policy analysis is a social and political activity. First, the subject matter concerns the lives and well being of large numbers of our fellow citizens. Second, the process and results of policy analysis usually involve other professionals and interested parties; it is often done in teams or office-wide settings; the immediate customer is a “client” of some sort like a hierarchical superior; and the ultimate audience will include diverse subgroups of politically attuned supporters and opponents...” [Barbach., p.xii]

Barbach also points out: “Policy analysts help in planning, budgeting, program evaluation, program design, program management, public relations, and other functions. They work alone, in teams, and in loose networks that cut across organizations. He asserts, “...problem definition is a crucial step” because it gives a reason for the analysis and “a sense of direction for ... evidence gathering.” [p.1]

If one agrees with Barbach’s points, it follows that the formation of a public policy question and developing a thesis for the policy study may also be political acts. This is borne out by experience: Political issues relating to state library agencies tend to recur in different cycles, depending upon political and government developments. Three examples – governance, functions and change, and finance:

StLA governance – sporadic but usually keen controversy, emerging from state government “reform” or “consolidation” initiatives, and such other developments as:

- (1) Constitutional conventions or when possibility of major constitutional change is contemplated.
- (2) Instances where a strong board and a governor or cabinet member disagree,
- (3) In cases of the StLA located within a larger agency, when over-riding political concern forces a redirection of the larger agency. [Some StLAs located within State Education Departments have fared badly as political developments have intensified priority on k-12 education at the expense of other statutory responsibilities of the Department.]
- (4) disillusionment with current administration of the StLA, or when

(5) the “library community” in a state differs with the administration or policies of the StLA so strongly that it seeks a reorganization of the agency.

Finance –both recurring and sporadic

(1) Recurring in conjunction with appropriations and such “authorizing” legislation as changes in state aid. Controversy may develop in lean times when political decisions drive retrenchment, or in expanding periods when library constituencies expect increases in library aid in line with perceived increases for other functions [e.g., “Why should libraries get a 3 percent increase when schools get a 33 percent increase?”].

(2) Sporadic in terms of sources and uses of funds appropriated to the StLA, sometimes related to what government people, lobbyists, or library constituents may be seen as “windfalls.” Examples may arise with new or expanded federal, or discussion of philanthropic, fees and other income, or business-related income. These may become policy questions regarding “proper” sources and “mixes” of funds.

Functions and Change - recurring and changing!!

StLA functions are affected by broad government, social, professional and technological developments that drive changes in the way that libraries operate. In the StLA, they affect the agency’s operating environment, priorities, resources, and organization. Some changes in the StLA come abruptly, such as those generated by State law and appropriations, changes in Federal aid, or change in administration. Currently, technological and social change drives such questions as the Steering Committee identified in 1997 and 1999 under the headings of “Functions related to Internet and information,” and “Telecommunications/Accountability.” Similarly, change in government organization, technology, and philosophy generate policy questions such as those the Steering Committee identified under the headings of “Federal Impact,” and “Change.” (*See Appendix 1.*)

IV. What about State Library Agencies and Education Policy?

Rob Lowe as speechwriter, struggling on draft of Presidential address: “I ask all Americans...to make education our highest priority.”

Toby, more senior White House staffer: “Hasn’t it always been our highest national priority?”
– The West Wing, November. 15, 2000

In various library settings, and in our August StLA customer survey, we found skepticism about the value of collecting data that demonstrates connections between education, on the one hand, and StLAs or public libraries on the other hand. We may need to consider two facts:

- American Library Association statements on the roles of public libraries have for nearly a century identified education in its various forms as key in public libraries.
- The October 2000 release of the Rand study on education testing results in Texas during the 2000 presidential campaign galvanized newspaper coverage

and underscored the fact that, throughout the campaign, education was a major issue for both major candidates.

To the extent that we argue for LSTA and other Federal and state funds for libraries, the education connection is politically important. The numbers of StLAs within state education departments has decreased significantly over the last twenty years. As political developments cause education chiefs to pare their operations and focus almost entirely on K-12 education, Chief Officers of StLAs located within education departments may become pessimistic about their stake in the education connection, at least on the state level.

V. Where do we go from here? From the brink of the “digital divide”? **Or, “..to don a crimson in the bullpen”**

In March 2000, we had a wide-ranging discussion of the need for data on the “digital divide.” At the time we held that discussion, the 1999 data were being collected for questions we had identified in September 1999 - questions on database licensing expenditures and customers. The 1999 E.D. Tabs reports the following summarizing data collected from these questions: Forty-seven state library agencies reported combined expenditures of over \$25.4 million for statewide database licensing (table 6a). Michigan had the highest expenditure (\$3.1 million) and Louisiana the lowest (\$6,000). At least one-third of the state library agencies reporting such expenditures provided statewide database licensing services to public, academic, school, and special libraries, and to library cooperatives, with public libraries served most frequently (47 states). Other state agencies and remote users were also served by at least one-third of the state library agencies reporting such expenditures. [E.D. Tabs State Library Agencies, FY999 Highlights, p.vi]

Our Task Force on StLA Data and Policy Questions was unable to come up with recommendations for additional questions relating to the “Digital Divide,” hence the preparation of this paper for our discussion and action at our December 6-7 meeting.

So, to what do we direct our attention in discussion December 6-7? The following matters appear timely, and perhaps urgent:

1. **“Digital Divide”** Consider where and how we deal with the un-resolved March 2000 concern with the StLA interest in data on “the digital divide.” It may be that “the digital divide” questions are changing as we better understand:
 - The range of capacity of information seekers to use unfamiliar and rapidly changing information technology [from lack of skills to expert], and
 - Prospects and means for helping people with lower-end skill in using information technology increasing their capacity.
 - The relationship of literacy and learning skills in finding and using information from digital sources.
 - Content issues, reliability, and nature of sources
 - Availability of training

- Other manifestations of the “divide.”

What do we know about how StLAs are formulating their roles, priorities, and means of bridging the divide? What policy information needs are there?

While there are likely to be studies and conferences undertaken by library policy analysts, ALA and other organizations, and, Federal and State agencies, what are some of the longer range “digital divide” aspects on which the StLA survey should be gathering data? Are there Fast Response Survey topics we should recommend to NCES relating to aspects of the “digital divide?”

2. **Our Process for Advising** As we identify topics or questions for the StLA survey, what is the most efficient and expeditious way of following through with advice on wording, definitions, and rationale?
3. **Use of StLA On-line Resources** We now collect data on the significant expenditure StLAs make for statewide database licensing. What recommendations do we have for information on measuring and reporting data on use and results of StLA online data and resources? In May, one member of our Task Force on StLA Data and Policy Questions suggested:

- In relation to impact on education, ask for measures of the database utilizing counts suggested by Bertot; specifically database sessions, queries and searches, and items examined. For example:
 - Total number of sessions? Of this number, how many were for databases designed for school-aged children?
 - Total number of queries and searches? Of this number, how many were for databases designed for school-aged children?
 - Total number of items examined? Of this number, how many were for databases designed for school-aged children?
- If possible, amount of all database use coming from school addresses could also be requested. It may be desirable to ask for a count of school-aged children.
- We should ask at least one question on the availability of statewide full text databases.

By extension, similar questions could be asked for other user-groups.

4. **Linking Data across NCES Library Surveys** In view of the inter-relatedness of data from StLAs and the data from the libraries and cooperatives they serve and involve in statewide programs, what are possibilities for technologically linking StLA data to data in other NCES surveys?

Will NCES have technology that enables policy analysts to link data in other library surveys to StLA data (for instance, is there a relationship between StLA dollar and time investments to services and resources reported by various types of libraries?)

5. **Trend Data** In what data fields should we urge NCES to develop and publish tables for displaying trend data?
6. **Making People Aware of StLA Data** How can we, or others, assist NCES and NCLIS in making StLA data better known to both library communities and to those embarking on public policy research? Put another way, what from the StLA 1999 E.D. Tabs should be put in a press release from NCES or NCLIS?

Bibliography

Bardach, Eugene, A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving. New York and London: Chatham House Publishers of Seven Bridges Press, LLC, 2000. 102pp.

Gerston, Larry N., Public Policy Making: Process and Principles. Armonk, NY and London: M.E, Sharpe, 1997. 163pp.

Parsons, Wayne. Public Policy: An introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis. Aldershot, UK and Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar Publishing Co.,1995. 675pp.

Appendix 1 : Policy Questions Identified by the Steering Committee in September 1997, and reviewed in September 1999

A(4) Public Policy Interest in State Library Agencies and use of StLA Data

The Committee discussed state library agencies and public policy questions related to their functions, roles, accomplishments, governance, organization, financing, and use of federal funds. Throughout the discussion, the Committee commented on StLA Survey reports which may (or may not) be helpful as state and federal officials, public administration and policy researchers, and library sectors deal with such questions. In closing the discussion, the Committee identified state and federal officials, library sectors, and public administration and policy researchers as customers of the Survey. Questions included:

[Functions] What are state library agencies? What do they do and why? Do their functions need to be carried out at the state level? If not, should those functions be carried out at a different level of government?

[Governance] [What significance is there in the location of a StLA in its state government? How do location in the executive or legislative branch or status as an independent board/commission affect the size, scope, operations, performance, and level of support of a StLA? Does a specific StLA carry out its functions efficiently as compared with the other StLAs or groups of StLAs? How do salaries for StLA personnel compare with others?

[Functions Related to Internet and Information] To what extent does and can a StLA help the people of a state benefit from access to the Internet, to government information, and to information generally? For what purposes? What is the growth of peoples' Internet access in the states? Is there a State interest in using libraries to address its interest in economic development and education? *if so*, what role might the StLAs carry out in this regard? How will the FCC discount program responsibilities affect the roles of StLA? What are StLA doing with e-rates? What factors support e-rate decisions? How are e-rate efforts being staffed by StLAs? How do the StLAs relate to state-based universal service funds?

[Functions Related to Education] [What impact does or should a StLA have on education in a state? How do the various types of school, public, academic, special libraries and library systems relate to the StLA and other state government agencies? What are alternatives to current arrangements? Is there StLA collaboration with higher education, particularly in automation and networking, statewide contracts, resource sharing, etc.? How are StLA and their partners using education/distance learning opportunities and technology? Is it important for the StLA to provide primary leadership for school library media center (SLMC) services; where is a state's SLMC supervision and development responsibility most effectively located in a state's government?

[Telecommunications/Accountability] How does the StLA figure into state information/telecommunication policy and accountability/performance measures and indicators? How do Federal programs such as LSTA and FCC oversight of telecommunications discounts affect StLAs and the people of their states?

[Funding] How are StLAs funded? With what results? Do federal funds displace state funds for support of StLA? If so, have they done so at the expense of assistance to local libraries? Is the StLA the best agency for channeling limited Federal funds? What are trends in support of StLAs and sources of their funding? How significant are funds other than those from regular state and federal appropriations (earmarked funds, special revenue, fees, etc.) in the financing of StLA? To what extent to "parent agencies" support the StLA?

[Federal Impact] How has Federal legislation affected StLA development and services? Do changes in the Federal law enable more libraries to participate in Federally-assisted programs?

[Duplication of Services] Do the library functions of a StLA un-necessarily duplicate those of other libraries in the capital city and elsewhere? What StLA functions relate primarily to the government of the state, individuals, and organizations (including the several types of libraries)? Which StLAs have some responsibility for ensuring public access to government information through open records/public access laws?

[Change] What major shifts are taking place in the way that StLAs do business? How is grant administration and financial assistance to libraries changing? Are there more large projects rather than individual grants? More state aid per capita? How do StLAs support libraries in other ways? How are library systems funded?

Task Force on StLA Data and Policy Questions
Final Recommendation, May 24, 2000

I. Our Charge, Members, Schedule, and Process

On March 25, 2000, the StLA Survey Steering Committee for the Survey of State Library Agencies agreed to form a task force to look at Question 33 and other StLA Survey questions relating to StLA focus on policy considerations relating to the work StLAs are doing, and policy considerations for,

- (1) education and education results
- (2) government effort to reduce the “digital divide”
- (3) costs of connectivity
- (4) growth of networks

By late May or early June, the task force is to make recommendations to Mr. Owings on questions 33 and 5 in the FY 2000 survey.

By August 30, the task force will prepare recommendations for discussion by the full Steering Committee. Following Steering Committee discussion of the Taskforce Report, the Steering Committee will decide on recommendations for data to be collected for public policy information needs in the 2001 and later surveys.

Note dated November 16, 2000: Some weeks after the Task Force completed and submitted this May 24 report, the September Steering Committee meeting was indefinitely postponed. The Task Force’s August 30 deadline described in the preceding paragraph was canceled.

Members of the task force are Ms. Lynch, Mr. Shubert, Mr. Wilkins, and Mr. Zimmerman. Federal participants are Ms. Davis, Ms. Kroe, Ms. Chute and Ms. Sywetz. Mr. Shubert and Ms. Davis are co-chairs of the Task Force.

II. Question 33 Currently Provides Useful Data for Some Policy Questions

Question 33 collects data on the amounts of total grant and contract expenditures by the StLA to assist public libraries in responding to a state education reform initiative or the National Education Goals in three areas:

- Readiness for school
- Adult literacy
- Lifelong learning

Data from question 33 appears in Table 28 in the StLA, Fiscal Year 1998 E.D. Tabs.

The question first appeared in the 1994 survey with only two areas -“readiness for school” and “adult literacy and lifelong learning.” This followed Steering Committee discussion in March 1993, which indicated the U.S. Department of Education’s strong “interest in information on state library agencies as they relate to Education Goals.” The Steering Committee advised that the question should be constructed to gather information in the context of state education goals as well as the National Goals. The Steering Committee also discussed education policy interests in subsequent meetings in connection with information needs for LSCA reauthorization. The three-part question appeared in the 1997 survey with emphasis on state reform initiatives.

In 1999 the Steering Committee raised the following as a policy question: ***What impact does or should an StLA have on education in a State?*** (This was the first of the seven questions listed under “[Functions Related to Education]”.) The following analysis provides breakout data on expenditures for “readiness for school” and “adult literacy” inasmuch as those data were collected for the entire five-year period.

What do responses to question 33 tell us?

If a State legislator or staff member, or a Congressional staff member goes to the StLA data for the 1994-1998 period, he or she would learn the following from data gathered in question 33.

- Over this period, anywhere from 26 to 30 states a year made grant or contract expenditures to public libraries to assist them in responding to a State or Federal education reform initiative.
- Conversely 13 states (Alabama, Alaska, DC, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming) did not report any grant and contract expenditures for education reform initiatives in the five years.
- In each of the five years, three or more states reported focussing exclusively on readiness programs. Nebraska, for instance, did so in four consecutive years; and Pennsylvania did so in three years
- The total of the grant and contract expenditures for education reform initiatives was approximately \$105.8 million over the five years.

Table 33 is not the only table useful to policy makers regarding education reform. By checking StLA expenditures for financial aid (excluding contracts) in table 25a, he or she would find that

- Over the same five-year period, the total expenditure for financial assistance (from all sources, state, federal, and other and federal) to public libraries and to public library systems was approximately \$1,883.7 million.

He or she might also go to table 13e and find that

- 38.4 professional staff in StLA Library Development offices consults on, or otherwise assist, children’s and young adult services in libraries.
- 14 StLAs have no professional staff allocated for children’s and young adult services

- 22 StLAs have less than 1 full time equivalent professional staff allocated for these services (some with as little as a 10th of a person's staff time).

or he would see in table 6a that

- 41 StLAs support statewide summer reading programs in public libraries.
- 14 StLAs support summer reading programs in schools.
- 20 StLAs support summer reading programs in library systems.

These data are significant. However, changes in question 33 could make data more useful, as detailed in section IV.

III. Conclusions Following Analysis of Data in Part II

Our first conclusion: Fiscal data are important for measuring response to education initiatives and for comparisons among the states.

Our second conclusion: The term "lifelong learning" is problematic for two reasons. First, it appears that some respondents believe that it overlaps the other two terms, particularly with "adult literacy." Second, the term "lifelong learning" is insufficiently specific to obtain expenditure data that does not overlap with the "readiness" and "adult literacy" areas.

Our third conclusion: Some respondents are unclear as how to relate to "a state education reform initiative or the National Education Goals" inasmuch as reform goals of a state may differ from the National Goals established some years ago for year 2000. Education reform will be widely discussed during the 2000 election campaigns, and a new federal administration and governors will have their own goals for education reform.

Our fourth conclusion: It is inevitable that education reform initiatives will include concerns for learning before a child enters school and a concern for the persistent problems of adult illiteracy and the numbers of children who need to improve their reading.

Our fifth conclusion: We need to improve definitions for Question 33 as detailed in the following recommendations.

IV. Recommendations on Question 33 For the 2000 Survey

(1) Re-state question 33 to read:

Enter total grants and contracts expenditures (from state, federal or other funds) by the StLA to assist public libraries in responding to assist public libraries in responding to goals in a state or federal education reform initiative in the following areas:

Readiness for school

Adult literacy and family literacy

(2) Revise definitions to read:

“Readiness for school” means pre-kindergarten learning that helps a child to enter kindergarten or first grade. Grants and contract purposes for “readiness for school” may include cooperative programs for children’s learning between or among public libraries and day care centers, schools, and other education and cultural organizations, including summer reading programs, toddler, programs, etc.

Adult literacy: Any library or cooperative program with other agencies or literacy organizations that help adults learn to develop or improve reading skills to function as learners, workers, consumers, and effective members of society.

Family literacy: Any library or cooperative program with other agencies or literacy organizations that provides integrated educational services for families, including adult education for parents to help them improve reading skills in conjunction with childhood education for their children.

NOTE: Report the total grant and contract expenditures for “adult literacy” and “family literacy” as one sum for “adult and family literacy”.

(3) The Steering Committee will continue its discussion and definition of public policy questions and modify or expand question 33 and its definition as needed to make the data more useful to public policy review.

V. Recommendations on Question 5 (the detailed checklists of StLA services to the various types of libraries and systems) for the 2000 Survey

We recommend that the following questions be added to question 5:

Does your StLA attempt to monitor or track local developments in interagency cooperation between libraries and other educational and cultural institutions? Yes / No.

Does your StLA attempt to monitor or track local progress on library partnerships with business/community organizations/or other entities? Yes / No.

Response to these questions will indicate for the researcher which StLAs are sources of information on such interagency initiatives. That information could be useful to state library staffs, government policy makers, public officials and library, museum and other cultural associations.

Library cooperation and collaboration is not limited to that with other educational and cultural institutions. There might be another question that gets to social agencies, daycare centers, universities, and community initiatives