

## NCLIS RETREAT

The Retreat, the first of its kind, was held at the Airlie House in Virginia on July 18 and 19, 1980..

Helmut Alpers served as the Facilitator; he was one of the Committee of three (with William Welsh and Phil Sprague) appointed to plan the retreat.

At the end of that retreat the following motion was passed unanimously:

IT WAS MOVED BY MARIAN LEITH, SECONDED BY BESSIE MOORE,  
THAT THE COMMISSION CONSIDER HAVING A RETREAT EVERY SECOND  
YEAR. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Attached are: (1) Minutes of the Retreat; (2) Implementation of Retreat Findings; (3) Commissioners' Comments; (4) NCLIS Goals-- Short, Intermediate, and Long; (5) Long Range Goals (10/1/82 and Beyond); listing of NCLIS activities; (6) Retreat Planning and questions for the retreat; (7) Wrap-Up of comments; (8) "Net Out" of key ideas at retreat; (8) Remarks by Col. Aines entitled, "NCLIS-- Its Genesis and Early Years; and (9) Comments by Robert Burns, Jr.

Barbara



**National Commission  
on Libraries and Information Science**

**NCLIS Commission Meeting  
Airlie, Virginia**

**July 18 and 19, 1980**

**Members Present:** Helmut Alpers; Robert W. Burns, Jr.; Carlos A. Cuadra; Joan H. Gross; Clara S. Jones; Francis Keppel; Marian P. Leith; Bessie B. Moore; Frances H. Naftalin; Philip Sprague; Mildred Younger; Margaret Warden; William Welsh (for Daniel Boorstin); and Charles Benton, Presiding

**Staff Present:** Douglas S. Price; Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar; Gerald Sophar; Ruth L. Tighe; Ruby O. Woods-Robinson (Saturday only); Carl C. Thompson (Saturday only); Patricia Ross Jones, Recording Secretary (Saturday only); and Marilyn K. Gell, WHCLIS Director

**Friday, July 18, 2:00 PM to 5:30 PM**

The Chairman opened with a discussion of the background of the suggested outline of a National Library and Information Services Act as contained in the WHC Summary Report and the actual legislation (S. 2859) submitted by Senator Javits. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that the Commission would split into two groups, of their own selection to discuss:

- (1) Input to the Interagency Task Force on the WHC
- (2) The Ad Hoc Committee meeting in Minneapolis

**Saturday, July 19, 1980, 8:30 AM**

The business meeting began with brief discussions of matters determined during the Retreat for which formal confirmation in open meeting was required.

**Budget Cuts**

There was brief discussion of budget cuts recommended during the Retreat. Mr. Welsh read the following statement:

"Being relatively certain that the recommendations of the Interagency Task Force on the WHCLIS will contain targets of opportunity for implementation in fiscal years 1981 and 1982, I recommend that the \$12,000 set aside for the International Cooperation Task Force in each of those fiscal years be deleted to provide some uncommitted funds for such purposes.

Ms. Pall read aloud the following resolution passed by the Ad Hoc Committee, possibly renamed the Committee of 118:

WHEREAS, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science has assisted the Ad Hoc Committee of the White House Conference to plan and implement this meeting of delegates, and

WHEREAS, the continuing commitment of the National Commission to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee is called for by resolutions of the White House Conference, and

WHEREAS, the Commissioners and the members of the Ad Hoc Committee share a concern for the furtherance of strong national library and information resources,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ad Hoc Committee delegates acknowledge the contributions of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to the implementation of the work of the White House Conference, and it is

FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ad Hoc Committee looks to a close relationship with the Commission that will continue to develop, improve and support library service for all of the citizens of our country.

A statement prepared by the Steering Committee stated, "As an independent body established by resolutions passed by the delegates to the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, this Committee has as its function the planning and follow-up of implementation of the WHCLIS resolutions. The method for doing so includes, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Identifying implementation steps and strategies at the local, state and national levels;
- Identifying agencies and organizations at each of the above levels responsible for implementation of specific resolutions;
- Establishing its own priorities for implementation and developing plans for doing so;
- Monitoring overall implementation progress.

A few interesting statistics cited were: (1) 91 of the 118 people invited did, indeed, attend; (2) 45 of the 91 attendees were lay (46 professional); and (3) 7 of the 9 persons elected to the Steering Committee are lay, maintaining the 2/3-1/3 lay/professional balance.

It was MOVED by Philip Sprague, seconded by Joan Gross, that the following committees be established: Finances/Fund Raising, Legislation/Public Awareness, and Planning/Futures. Committee membership and structure to be reviewed by the Spring meeting. Passed unanimously.

Members present agreed to serve on these committees as follows:

Legislation/Public Awareness: Gross, Keppel, Leith, Moore, Warden

Planning/Futures: Burns, Cuadra, Welsh, Jones

Finances/Fund Raising: Alpers, Naftalin, Sprague, Younger

Charles Benton ex officio on all committees.

It was MOVED by William Welsh, seconded by Robert Burns, that task forces and ad hoc committees will be established with the approval of the full Commission, except in emergency situations. Passed unanimously.

#### Selection of New Executive Director

Mrs. Moore pointed out that because of the extension of the deadline for the receipt of applications, it was not possible to have the final interviews on the day prior to the Retreat, as originally planned. Therefore, it will be necessary to have an additional meeting of the Commission in Executive Session on September 5 and 6, 1980, to have the final interviews, and make a selection. Because of the tight budget situation, Commissioners would be asked to contribute part of their time, asking for only one-half day of pay, to cover the expenses not reimbursed on the travel vouchers.

It was MOVED by Bessie Moore, seconded by Carlos A. Cuadra, that a meeting of the Commission in Executive Session be scheduled for September 5-6 (Friday and Saturday), for the purpose of interviewing and selecting the final candidate for Executive Director. Place to be determined. Passed unanimously.

It was then pointed out that Chicago was centrally located, with a major airport, providing easy and frequent access from all over the country, permitting both the Commissioners and applicants to get in and out quickly. If a hotel adjacent to the airport was used for the meeting, ease of access would be enhanced and taxi fares minimized.

It was MOVED by Joan Gross, and severally seconded, that the Executive Session on September 5 and 6 be held adjacent to the O'Hare Airport. Passed unanimously.

Staff was instructed to find a hotel adjacent to O'Hare Airport for the Executive Session.

A question was raised about the attendance of Commissioners whose terms have expired attending the Executive Session. Staff was instructed to get a legal opinion on their attendance and voting.

#### Election of Vice Chairman

It was MOVED by acclamation that Bessie Moore be elected Vice Chairman.

#### WHC Wrap-up

Marilyn Gell was asked to report on the apparent discrepancy between the Department of Education records and those of the WHC on the funds remaining. Mrs. Gell provided background information on the problems of reconciliation, and additional comments were provided by Mr. Price. It is felt that the situation is under control and should be resolved within the next few weeks.

#### Travel

Mr. Price called attention to several forms which had been given the Commissioners. The first form (green) was a travel request for the Executive Session in Chicago, September 5 and 6; the second (yellow) for the Ad Hoc Committee/NCLIS meeting in Minneapolis, September 15 through 19. He asked that the Commissioners complete and return these forms as soon as possible. The third form (blue) was supplied in multiple copies and is to be used henceforth for any travel which is to be reimbursed by NCLIS. If at all possible, the form is to be sent to staff in advance of the travel. If time does not permit this, the staff should be informed by telephone and the form sent as confirmation.

In the past, there have been problems with some Commissioners failing to submit expense reports in a timely fashion. Mr. Price indicated that unless expense reports for all trips to date, including this one (the Retreat), were in the office before the end of September, it might not be possible to process the reimbursements. For the September meetings, the office must have the expense reports no later than the end of October.

Commissioners and staff are encouraged to use Super Saver or equivalent discount fares whenever possible. Mrs. Moore suggested that reservations should be made on a later plane if Super Saver is used. You cannot change a Super Saver ticket, but you can "stand by" for an earlier flight, without sacrificing the savings.

Staff was instructed to make reservations as soon as possible, send out a letter of guidelines, and explore the possibility of substantial savings if reservations are made 30 to 60 days in advance.

#### Fiscal Matters

Mr. Price asked that staff be informed immediately of any financial commitments which have been made on behalf of the Commission. He

requested that no such commitments be made in the future without informing the staff before making the commitment.

He pointed out that money is tight this year and next. The actions taken earlier will ease the strain a little bit, but there are more than enough projects on which money can be spent in Fiscal Year 1981. A complete financial analysis will be prepared for the December meeting, so that we will know more precisely what there is left to spend.

#### FY 1982 Budget Proposal

Mr. Price pointed out that by September 1, he must submit to OMB a full Zero Based Budgeting package for Fiscal Year 1982 with justification for at least three levels--minimum, current and enhancement. He expressed reservations about the activities included in the enhancement level of the preliminary FY 1982 budget presented at the June meeting. He was particularly concerned about the inclusion in these activities of additional personnel in view of the current environment. There followed considerable discussion of these activities and proposed alternates. Following this discussion,

It was agreed by general consensus that the enhancement level for the FY 1982 budget submitted to OMB include \$10,000 for CI&R, \$15,000 for Public/Private Sector follow-up, and \$75,000 for policy studies relating to the President's initiative in response to the WHC recommendations.

#### Interagency Task Force on WHC

At the Chairman's request, Mr. Keppel briefed the Commissioners on the proposed NCLIS input to the Interagency Task Force, identifying the principal kinds of input which should be provided. He then read a draft letter he had prepared to be sent to the Chairman/Coordinator of the Task Force, Dick Hays. The draft was discussed extensively and in detail. After this discussion and modification of the draft,

It was MOVED by Francis Keppel, severally seconded, that the draft memorandum to Dick Hays providing input to the Interagency Task Force be approved. Passed unanimously.

#### Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Planning

At the Chairman's request, Mrs. Naftalin reviewed the plans for the meeting, beginning with an opening session Monday evening, at which Mrs. Moore will provide orientation, through agenda determination Tuesday morning, workshops, plenary sessions, a reception Tuesday evening, more workshops and plenary sessions and close on Wednesday. There was considerable discussion of various elements of the program. The Planning Committee will continue its work with the assistance of the Minnesota delegation to the WHC and NCLIS staff support from Mrs. Reszetar and Ms. Tighe. Commissioners are urged to attend both the Ad Hoc Committee Meeting and the regular NCLIS meeting in Minneapolis.

### Executive Session at Minneapolis Meeting

Mr. Price pointed out the possibility that the Commission might want to provide for an Executive Session at the Minneapolis Meeting.

It was MOVED by Bessie Moore, seconded by Carlos Cuadra, that an Executive Session be scheduled at the Minnesota meeting at 3:00 p.m. Thursday afternoon (September 18) for the purpose of discussing personnel. Passed unanimously.

### Consultant Proposal

Mr. Benton requested authorization to seek funds for a consultant proposal (CD #80-69), copies of which were in the Commissioner's packets. After a brief discussion,

It was MOVED by William Welsh, seconded by Carlos Cuadra, to table discussion of the Consultant Proposal from William Henkel (CD #80-69) until the September meeting. Passed unanimously.

### Commission Position on Proposed OMB Circular

There was a brief discussion of the Commission response to the proposed OMB Circular, "Improved Management and Dissemination of Federal Information." It was agreed that Ms. Tighe would take the ideas generated and prepare a response. (See CD#80-75)

### Condolences to Mr. Velde

It was MOVED by Bessie Moore, and severally seconded, that a letter be sent to Bud Velde expressing the Commission and staff's sympathy on the loss of his wife, Gail Patrick. Passed unanimously.

### Other Motions

Several other actions were taken during the meeting as follows:

It was MOVED by Marian Leith, seconded by Bessie Moore, that Commission consider having a retreat every second year. Passed unanimously.

It was MOVED by Frances Naftalin, seconded by Mildred Younger, that on the occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the Commission letters of commendation be prepared for all former commissioners. Passed unanimously.

It was MOVED by Mildred Younger, and severally seconded, that the retreat planning committee be thanked for planning the first retreat. Passed unanimously.

NCLIS STAFF COMMENTS

The attached responses to the questions posed by the Retreat Committee and the additional comments were prepared independently by the individual staff members. No one had the benefit of other responses or comments when preparing theirs. In addition, these were done in a very short time frame.

## NCLIS STAFF COMMENTS

In my judgement, the four major accomplishments of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. The development, completion and publication of the National Program Document and, most importantly, concentrating the Commission's activities toward its implementation.
2. The White House Conference process--from passage of the bill to the state and national conferences.
3. The Commission's role in the revision of the Copyright Act. Its work as a mediator with the various stakeholders, its photocopy study which supplied basic data, and its influence on the legislation resulting in the five-year review clause.
4. The leadership role in the National Periodicals System/Center area - studies, fora, legislative draft, etc.

B. In my judgement, the four major shortfalls of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. Failure to obtain the appropriation equal to the Commission's authorization level.

2. Reluctance to develop more legislative initiatives in the area of library and information services.

3. Procrastination over starting cultural minorities efforts.

4. Limited and delayed efforts in the area of international cooperation

C. Comments (In the context of the objective of the retreat, i.e. "review, assess, and agree on the purpose and future goals of NCLIS.") (Continue on reverse, if necessary)

## NCLIS STAFF COMMENTS

A. In my judgement, the four major accomplishments of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. Developing, publishing and gaining acceptance of the Program Document.
2. Influencing the Copyright Law Revision, e.g. CONTU Guidelines and the 5-year review.
3. Getting 49 states and 8 territories, etc. to hold what were generally very successful pre-conferences and running the White House Conference without a Major Disaster.
4. Maintaining viability of Z39 via task force to seek new solutions and continued support.

B. In my judgement, the four major shortfalls of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. Failure to develop the communication and rapport with the Executive and Legislative Branches which would have enabled us to get the resources we need to do an adequate job, without having to fight almost constantly for our very existence.
2. Failure to develop adequate communication and image with the library/information community, which would have helped in B.1 above.
3. Failure to maintain our influence in the field of copyright, e.g. dropping the already inadequate support of the follow-up photocopy study.
4. Willingness to "ride the bandwagon" rather than take the initiative.

C. Comments (In the context of the objective of the retreat, i.e. "review, assess, and agree on the purpose and future goals of NCLIS.") (Continue on reverse, if necessary)

The major problem facing the Commission in the immediate future is the virtual certainty that the attempts to fold us into the Department of Education, thus destroying our independence and principal *raison d'être*, will continue. Without strong support -- much stronger than we now have -- from the community, the Congress, LC, and the other Executive departments, and without a strong, permanent Executive Director, with the willingness -- and authority -- to provide immediate, but considered response to such efforts, the next attempt -- or the one after that -- could well succeed.

As things stand now, the financial outlook is bleak for at least the next two years, even if we survive. We are -- and will be for the foreseeable future -- hard put just to pay for the things we are already publicly committed to. Nor is there any discernible pattern or overall plan to our commitments. It is useful and necessary to be able to respond to "targets of opportunity (e.g. the National Information Policy report), but to only undertake such targets is counterproductive. This "catch-as-catch-can" approach may have contributed to our current lack of repute and our problems with trying to obtain adequate funds from OMB and Congress.

The Commission has been in (and may regain) a position to exert considerable influence in the library/information community, but has not exerted that influence effectively (See B.1 and B.2 above). A number of other shortfalls arise from the basic causes noted above, e.g. the failure to follow up on such projects as access

(Continued on reverse)

to monographs and nonprint media (funds were not available). On the other hand, the failure of the effort to establish a National Periodicals Center -- and I think that it is reasonable to assume that the NPC is dead; it has been studied to death, and neither the House or Senate bills offer much hope of any timely action -- may not have been avoidable, but nevertheless, it is a significant shortfall. However, the Commission's unwillingness to pick up the Z39 Secretariat when it was offered was, in my opinion, a serious failure of nerve, which may have contributed to our loss of standing in the community.

If I seem to be accentuating the negative, it is only because I had such high hopes for the Commission when I came aboard, and because we cannot afford to bask in the glow of our successes. I still think that the Commission can -- and should be -- a major force in the library/information field, but it is going to take a lot more imagination, sweat and nerve than we have so far exhibited.

## NCLIS STAFF COMMENTS

A. In my judgement, the four major accomplishments of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. The National Program Document which was produced as a consensus document, endorsed by all of the related professional associations and is based on very successful regional hearings held all over the United States.
2. Planning and conducting the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services.
3. The establishment of task forces which have dealt with various critical issues and the timely publication of the results of these task forces. No other agency could have done that in such a cost-effective and timely fashion.
4. The fact that NCLIS continues to exist after ten years (anniversary this July 20, 1980) as an independent agency in the Executive Branch.

B. In my judgement, the four major shortfalls of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. The lack of a design of a nationwide (not national) network so everyone would be able to discuss and chart the course of implementation based on what now exists, clearly seeing that they are not starting from scratch.

2. The lack of actively involving the former Commissioners who have the advantage of at least 5 years of Commission meetings behind them. Hindsight is usually 20/20, and the former Commissioners have all expressed their strong desire to continue to be involved.

3. The Commissioners need to go back and carefully study the National Program Document (which years ago stated it would be revised within 2 years) and also study the Final Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. This will keep from reinventing the wheel.

4. The policy role of the Commission was diluted when the Commissioners did not remain active participants in NCLIS business. Perhaps the active use of the new technology via computer terminals by each of the Commissioners would enlarge their participation and save money by holding 4 meetings a year.

C. Comments (In the context of the objective of the retreat, i.e. "review, assess, and agree on the purpose and future goals of NCLIS.") (Continue on reverse, if necessary)

I believe the Commissioners need to go back and carefully study the enabling law and possibly study the legislative history concerning the establishment of the Commission. The law is quite broad and with some creative thinking, vision, review and reassessment, NCLIS could address many facets it has not even considered but which sorely need addressing. Perhaps the first night preceding the retreat, a person (e.g., Daniel Bell caliber) could be featured to speak to the Commissioners to enlarge their vision and be a thought-stimulator. NCLIS has to be sensitive, not only to national goals and crises that form our government, but it also has to be sensitive to other government agency's needs and the Legislative Branch's needs vs. the long- and short-range user needs (the taxpayer). Perhaps a day of hearings could be added to precede each Commission meeting so the Commissioners can stay in touch with what the trends, needs, etc., are in the real world. NCLIS could also use this forum to test out policies they are considering. The Commission's good work is the best kept secret in the library/information world. NCLIS needs to get the good word out to the real world as well. NCLIS desperately needs an effective, continuing public relations program which is multifacet. Our work has the potential of touching every person in this nation and, more, internationally. It is exciting and challenging, and people need to know that their quality of life will ultimately be improved by your work--the work of our Commission.

SEE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS

Name Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar

Phone (202) 653-6252

Date 6/24/80

## ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS

- (1) I am not quite sure what the thrust of question B is as, with a small staff and budget, many things can be construed to be "short falls" when, in fact, they were due to lack of funds, time and/or staff, e.g., the White House Conference was delayed originally because it was not funded.
- (2) The national program objectives can be used as a yardstick to measure what progress has been made and what needs to be done. The Commissioners need to recognize that the White House Conference resolutions and recommendations dovetail with the objectives of the National Program Document. The National Program Document needs an update, rewrite or recasting which will take into consideration the White House Conference resolutions and how things measure out above and should include the goals for the decade of the 1980's.
- (3) The Commission should be setting the example for the rest of the country in the practical use of the new technology in library and information science/ services.

## NCLIS STAFF COMMENTS

In my judgement, the four major accomplishments of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. Issuing noteworthy publications on significant current issues (i.e., the reports on National Information Policy, Government Publications, Library Photocopying, and on Library and Information Service Needs of the Nation).
2. Providing forums for discussion of controversial topics (e.g., the ones on photocopy, network governance, the National Periodicals System/Center).
3. Conducting the White House Conference on Library and Information Services.
4. Offering opportunity for all sectors of the community to express their views through the "hearings" on the National Program Document (NPD).

B. In my judgement, the four major shortfalls of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. Its failure to perform its assigned function to advise the President and Congress on policy implementation.
2. Lack of an anticipatory, forward-looking approach in selecting/determining project commitments.
3. The narrowness of its vision - emphasis has been on (a) institutions (i.e., libraries), not functions (e.g., access to and delivery of information) and (b) primarily on certain public segments of the library and information services community (the public library and state library agency) to the exclusion of
4. the other sectors.

Its failure to identify and take initiatives (development of the draft national library act would have been an appropriate NCLIS activity, for example).

C. Comments (In the context of the objective of the retreat, i.e. "review, assess, and agree on the purpose and future goals of NCLIS.") (Continue on reverse, if necessary)

Each of the "accomplishments" above needs qualification. (1) While NCLIS has published substantive papers and reports, it has only selectively pursued their findings and recommendations; moreover, other reports it has published have been of only marginal value. (2) The forums NCLIS has conducted to date, though fruitful, have not always been structured to present all sides fully, and there have not been very many of them. (3) While the NCLIS is considered to have been a success by some, the resolutions generated by it were, in large part, neither realistic - in that they proposed massive increases in Federal funding (currently not feasible), nor were they very creative - in that they primarily proposed expanding existing programs and practices. (4) While many sectors expressed their concerns to NCLIS through the NPD drafting process, again, these have been pursued only arbitrarily and selectively (e.g., the concerns of the American Indians vs. those of the information industry).

The point is that NCLIS activities have been haphazard - lacking a sense of priority; narrow in scope - lacking in weltanschauung; and superficial. Yet NCLIS has the potential for playing a much stronger, broader role in promoting the delivery of effective library and information service throughout the country if it chooses to do so. Others will appear to fill the void if it is not assumed by NCLIS, and it is an appropriate role for NCLIS.

However, if NCLIS is to reach this potential, I believe it is critical that there be changes in the kind of activities NCLIS undertakes, and in how these are carried out. To make such changes will require a better understanding of the impact of today's developing technology on the world of tomorrow as described at some length in Toffler's new book, The Third Wave, as well as a thorough examination and broad-ranging discussion of NCLIS' role vis-a-vis that society.

The retreat offers the opportunity to take a major step in this direction. I hope it succeeds!

## NCLIS STAFF COMMENTS

In my judgement, the four major accomplishments of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. The publication "Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action" provided a firm base for the long-range planning for the Commission during the seventies, and it has been partly responsible for the successes of the Commission to date.
2. The White House Conference on Library and Information Services which has provided the Commission with greater visibility and with greater insight into the library and informational needs of the American citizenry.
3. NCLIS's role in promoting the Nationwide Network Concept. The task forces involved with networking have produced valuable reports which have played and will continue to play an important role in the implementation of effective resource sharing activities.
4. The success and influence NCLIS has had as a forum for getting individuals in the library and information science community working together and effectively communicating in order to improve services to and for the citizenry of the United States.

3. In my judgement, the four major shortfalls of NCLIS during its existence (in priority order) have been:

1. The lack of an effective long-range plan. The Commission is doing an inadequate job of planning for the future library and information needs of the citizens of the United States.
2. The lack of an adequate public awareness program. We need a better system for the dissemination of information, which includes a two-way mechanism for input into the activities about or of the Commission.
3. The need to do more model building. We have had several task forces which produced valuable reports, but the implementation of these reports have been fragmented. NCLIS should be able to provide leverage and seed money.
4. NCLIS should play a greater role in influencing the curriculum development of the various library science and information science programs.

C. Comments (in the context of the objective of the retreat, i.e. "review, assess, and agree on the purpose and future goals of NCLIS.") (Continue on reverse, if necessary)

- (1) Hopefully a true NCLIS Philosophy of Service will be developed in the near future. There is a need for the Commission to become a strong leader in the field, looked to and respected by all of the stakeholders in the library and information science community. Presently, this is not true. Many feel that NCLIS should get its "act together."
- (2) With the completion of a successful White House Conference, all eyes will be upon the Commission to produce an effective long-range plan for library and information services for the remaining twentieth century. The White House Conference recommendations and the input from the newly-established WHC Ad Hoc Committee should be used as one device for gathering input in the development of the Commission's long-range plans. For this plan to be effective, there must be built into it a mechanism for systematic and continuous revision.

Continued on Reverse

- (3) There should be an improved system for Commissioners and staff to work with Congress and the Executive Branch of the Government.
- (4) The Commission should take a good look at its budgetary priorities. Should the budget continue to support the same projects year after year such as Z39 or IFLA dues--or should it be used for model building, seed money, and planning for the future?
- (5) There is a need for study and evaluation of the organizational structure of the Commission and the staff. Redefinition of working relationships should be determined. Is it possible to have both a strong working Commission and a strong staff? Where should the division of labor and power be made?



National Commission  
on Libraries and Information Science

TO: Commissioners

FROM: Douglas S. Price *DS*  
Deputy Director

RE: Implementation of Retreat Findings

DATE: September 2, 1980

Many ideas were generated by the Retreat discussions. Before they can be put into action, however, the ideas will need to be fleshed out, a ranking or prioritization made (and the criteria to be used in doing so developed), and implementation strategies identified and developed. To accomplish this, two prior questions will need to be answered: (a) By whom, and how, will these tasks be done--by the Commissioners as a group? By one or more of the newly-established committees? A specially constituted ad hoc committee? Should staff play a role? If so, what? and (b) How and by whom (and when) will that decision be made?

To facilitate discussion of next steps, the ideas generated at the retreat have been clustered into three broad categories, with suggestions related to the same idea brought together within each category. It was decided to do this with a minimum of editing in an attempt both to retain the flavor and to maintain the integrity of the ideas expressed at the retreat. The tasks and questions identified above pertain, at least in part, to all three categories.

Time has been allocated on the agenda of the Minnesota meeting for a discussion of the retreat findings. This document has been prepared as an aid to that discussion.

CATEGORY I: COMMISSION PROJECTS, TACTICS, ETC.

- A. Funding - A felt need to increase NCLIS disposable income was frequently voiced throughout the retreat. Suggestions ranged from a simple "raise funds" to: seek increase of the NCLIS appropriation, develop fundable packages and find sponsors, consider federal sources such as OE and NSF, re-program the NCLIS budget for greater effectiveness, make a "crisp case" to OMB for re-programming \$300,000, and finally, determine the specific amount needed to perform particular projects, such as promoting CI&R, conducting R&D, and developing the "view of 1985."
- B. Legislation - A concern for legislative awareness and action was another recurrent theme. Proposals ranged from defining

legislative priorities to promoting passage of the amendment to the NCLIS law, assessing the adequacy of the National Library Act (e.g., it does not address R&D), developing legislative initiatives, and determining positions on specific acts such as the Javits bill, Title 44, the Telecommunications Act, the President's recommendations to Congress re the WHCLIS, etc., and preparing testimony in support of those positions.

- C. Specific Projects - The projects mentioned specifically are arranged alphabetically below, together with the gist of the comments made regarding each:
- ° CI&R - implement Task Force recommendations; establish multiple models
  - ° Functional illiteracy - work with library and educational agencies, with proposed Literacy Commission, develop projects
  - ° Information policy - identify involved Federal agencies and define NCLIS' role within that context, study, develop position
  - ° NCLIS - prepare paper for President on future of NCLIS; establish credibility with OMB; broaden base of power structure; make a case for survival; refocus our direction (see also "Funding" above)
  - ° National Library Act - define an NCLIS position, conduct hearings, work for passage, assess adequacy (see also "Legislation" above)
  - ° National Program Document - evaluate its currency, revise and update
  - ° 1985, view of/user needs in - develop a scenario, determine characteristics of "user," define problem and means for solution, find funding
  - ° Productivity - identify a participatory role for NCLIS in discussions on this topic
  - ° PR - develop PR program for NCLIS, for educating Congress, to promote library use, hire staff
  - ° R & D - seek funds for research on videodisk, preservation, support legislation to encourage R&D, undertake R&D
  - ° WHCLIS - test its recommendations; provide actionable material based on the WHCLIS, support President's program, identify cost of implementing resolutions.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

(FIRST 10 MINUTES)

Philip A. Sprague

- Unreasonable expectations raised by NCLIS
- \$700,000 can dent Washington, D. C.
- We have got to be smart, skillful with only \$700,000. High leverage

Bessie Moore

- Low school morale and morals (dope, shacking up).
- We don't seem to feel that we are doing the right thing. Poverty of spirit.
- Commission must call attention to how NCLIS helped, e.g., Colorado, Sweet Home.
- We must be intrepeters.
- Indoctrination of new commissioners. We use to do this. Must use money e.g., 2 days at NCLIS with tutorials by leaders and senior commissioners. We must take as our first responsibility. This is one of our problems. Programs of past - 1/2 day comments by commissioners.

Bill Welsh

- Keep in mind there are no uncommitted funds for FY 80 and FY 81 and no crease likely in FY 82.
- NCLIS lacks impact.
- Must prioritize
- Two major problems facing profession: (1) lack of leadership and (2) research and development (must stop traditional approaches to traditional problems). (LC 80 million-1.5/set)

Bill Welsh (continued)

--Must address these problems.

--Re-evaluate priorities

Clara Jones

--Equal access

--Right to information

--Impact of changing technology

--Wrestle with "two-headed monster" (e.g. library community/information community)

--Called on now. Broader challenge. Who people are.

--Librarians as information people, transformation of us.

--Information is power.

Marian Leith

--Need to decide on what we want to do. Budget must reflect this.

--Law says ADVISE, e.g. Title 44, Telecommunications Act.

--Must educate ourselves so we can advise.

--Cannot implement all WHCLIS recommendations.

--Is Program Document still valid?

--Oppose Bob's "cringing" regarding libraries

Carlos Cuadra

--NCLIS unworkable. Marriage, history. In Europe libraries vs. documentalist (now called informatics). In the United States libraries vs. documentalist (information science)

--We have blurred distinction of information science, information.

--Confused about what we are about. I am uncomfortable.

--We have been sloppy thinkers.

Margaret Warden

- Access even in remotest areas.
- Catalyst for public awareness that there is a problem.
- Catalyst for National Libraries Act (NLIS). Must get it passed.
- Let's set short/long range goals.
- No division between libraries and information science.
- Get budget increased.

Joan Gross

- Need a sense of purpose.
- Are libraries and information scientist divided?
- Must conquer this problem!
- Bringing information to people is our basic purpose.

Bob Burns

- What has NCLIS done for the working library? Real world? This needs answer
- Role: (1) central concern is "end user satisfaction"--this is ultimate criteria; (2) NCLIS broker, forum, catalyst so needs followed by action
- NCLIS overextended trying to do too much.
- No new funds likely.
- Must have accepted governance (role of Chairman, Ex Director, Commission, staff)
- Need open communication which is free and easy.
- Suggestion on meetings: (1) local briefing (60 minutes maximum at each meeting), (2) invited tutorials (progress, state of art, etc.

60 minutes maximum), (3) report from Chairman, and (4) legislative report/tracking.

--Think global. Act local.

### Charles Benton

#### Background

--Survival posture OMB

--Swept up White House Conference

--What do we want to be passionate about. What do we stand for?

--Two cultures: information science/libraries

--Process-broker.

--Deal with ideas per Andy Aines.

#### Goals

--Immediate implementation of WHC recommendations

--Review (1) Community Information, Cultural Minorities, (2) Community Information and Referral Committee, (3) SLA Task Force, Law, (4) (4) Federal libraries (new project), and (5) International Task Force.

--Overall goal is to get NLIS Act passed.

--Title I of Act is Program Document.

#### Long Range (2 to 5 years)

--Libraries and literacy. Access at most basic level not only the 3 R's (reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic), but also media-video.

--Home vs. institutions. Mediate this.

--Information and productivity. (If Japan can why can't we?)

U.S. Agriculture helps farmers. Why not Public library Production Library?

--Look at Act. This goal hits direct.

Andy Aines

--What to do

--Strategy #1: (1) elevate NCLIS with President/Congress, (2) pick up challenges that count now, major impact, (3) forget the nitpickers unless there is a political reason.

--Other thrusts:

Do it well - President and Congress. 2 year target is to sell NCLIS.

Need stronger allies. Fans are limited.

Provide true leadership.

Extend effort to all areas beyond libraries and information science.

--Members to have broad knowledge of activities in information.

--Get a list of moves who count.

--Do coordinate activities with Federal/private. "Targets of opportunity." Establish NCLIS independence of thinking.

--Augment paid staff not likely. Use students, interagency transfer.

--Newsletter to former/current commissioners.

--Fiscal responsibility. We should move to stress this to libraries/information science.

--Pick brains of wisemen/ladies in information industry. E.g. Dan Bell, Prestel. Bring them in.

--Internal Operation. Get the best commissioners. Must take stock.

Frank Keppel

--Law-Science "emphasis" shifted to services in past 10 years. Further shift to Federal Information Policy. Thus, not sure how to interpret NCLIS charge. Do we have authority? NCLIS constituted--lawyers, radio, etc.

Frank Keppel (continued)

- I don't think we have been successful in cooperation between libraries and information science.
- Might consider what changes to propose in Act in anticipation of Sunset.
- Do we want to live under this Act? Definition of words changed.
- Goals: Narrow them to make manageable.
- Dissolve NCLIS?
- NCLIS - Federal Information Policy

Fran Naftalin

- Information science is a bigger thing.
- I have been acting as if libraries and information services not science.
- Basic purpose of NCLIS is access of information to all people.
- We might play a monitoring function. (1) Get assessment, then decide what we should undertake. (2) We must get tutorials so we are informed, adequate, understanding.

Mildred Younger

- Agree with most. I am finding out about what other commissioners are thinking. We have responded to staff - not initiated.
- Carlos - Division has deterred us.
- We don't have ultimate concern. If we do, have not articulated it.
- Projects considered in haphazard fashion. Projects don't end up with ultimate concern.
- National vs. nationwide. We confuse meaning. Use interchangeably.
- We don't face value of life (richest gift in world).
- We have no clear mission.
- Don't be partisan.

## NCLIS GOALS - SHORT, INTERMEDIATE, LONG

If you had reasonable NCLIS responsibility, what would you do: 6 mos.

- 9 mos. (3/81), short (9/82), long (beyond)?

### Suggestions for intermediate range goals by 9/30/82

To 9/30/82

- Get involved in information impact on productivity.
- By 9/30/81 recommend future of NCLIS and change to existing Act.
- Need P/R expertise: consultant or permanent.
- Sizable effort to define library and information service of 1985.  
(What will world be like). Anything wrong with this? What/how to change.
- Series of meetings re what should be in a National Library Act.  
(Could include lots of things)
- Service of agencies who might be involved in the development of Federal Information Policy and then what should our role be.
- Enhance education of school age people in use of libraries and information technology (not exploiting libraries as educational resources).
- Education effort of the Congress/public/private sector on the value of information and libraries.
- Determine what will the user of 1985 "look like, do and need and behave."
- Expose NCLIS to new types of media.
- Spend lots of money on "CIR&S" to further implementation in public life.
- Missing in Act is what specifically a research and development program should look like.
- Critical need is improved education of U.S.A. young people literacy.

Suggestions for short-range goals by 3/31/81 or sooner (6 months)

- Each meeting discuss legislative activity and NCLIS action needed, accomplished.
- Newsletter
- Annual meeting, verbal report by Chair.
- NCLIS meet at time of national meeting: more visibility.
- Tutorials for Commission.
- Assure meeting with local at each meeting.
- ASAP assess current/future projects.
- Executive Director (assist by staff). Legislative briefing.
- Now, implement fund raising resolution.
- Political briefings on candidates House/Senate/President. (ongoing)
- Broaden base of power structure.
- Commission memberswork to assure public awareness.
- Define our legislative priorities flowing from President's response and in light of bill in Congress.
- Indepth discussion of our reactions regarding legislation, etc. to influence/affect the legislation.
- Get out in advance suggestions from Commissioners for agenda.
- Report from Chair to Commissioners each quarter (every meeting).
- Get staff member to write monthly report (2 page summary to Executive Director and sent to Commissioners.
- Get NCLIS position on the Act to Hill and be prepared to testify.
- Decide on cutting meeting and cut paper sent.
- Educate ourselves. Report us and staff each time we attend a meeting on government funds.

- Educate "folks out there" regarding retreat conclusions, preview of Frank's idea.
- Take steps to determine if money available for 1985 exercise.
- Explore NSF/OE availability of funds for R&D effort, e.g. video disk.
- Written task force reports.
- Director on board by 9/10.
- Test here now consensus of WHC
- Cleanup commitments (maybe get kids off of)
- Plan 9/17 to get legislation passed.
- By 9/19 report on fund/pri \$. What does it take to do it.
- Crisp case for more money and see Eisenstat/Secretary of Education to sell.
- Meet McIntyre. Cut a deal.
- Carlos/Bill net out 1985 task force.
- Net out experts. Who? How hired?
- Spend time with Executive Director.
- Executive Director meet with key Hill people.
- Report December by Executive Director on NCLIS.
- Get money, other federal/or private for implementation of task force plan for CI&R.

Long Range (10/1/82 and Beyond)

- A. Educate ourselves on what we don't know using "smart guys".
- B. Pass the Act.
- C. Address literacy by '82.
- D. Broaden power base of NCLIS.
- E. Prevent libraries.
- F. Buy a book private sector/public sector (C. Shutz).
- G. Library services, information services.  
--How does a person get informed? Radio, information retrieval service  
(newspaper), TV, publishings (books, magazines), FI.
- H. Draw bounds--too many.
- I. Appraise: conduct studies, appraise adequately.
- J. \$700,000 real. Get more money.
- K. Follow thru on rest of our responsibility to provide actionable  
material based on WHC/PD and all we have.
- L. Assist in implementation of White House Interagency Task Force.
- M. Need big success in next 7 years (something).
- N. Redo Program Document for the 80's.
- O. Save the NCLIS.

Executive: Benton, Cuadra, Jones, Moore

(Chairman of Standing Committee and Chairman and Vice Chairman)

Research: Burns, Cuadra, Leith, Sprague

Program: Helmut, Keppel, Moore, Naftalin, Welsh

Public Information: Gross, Jones, Tate, Warden, Younger

Executive Commission--keep it. Project only approved by Committee  
and Ad Hoc Committee assignments. No standing committee.

80-81

81-82

Post - 3

NPC - 7

Z39 -  $\frac{1}{11}$  saved

+Postal cost  $\frac{3}{11}$  lost

8 Net

Intl.

*Long  
MHR  
Bar -  
This is the overview  
list wdm put together  
for that abortive earlier  
retreat meeting attempt.  
MS*

ACCESS & RESOURCES

Copyright  
    Conferences  
    Photocopy study  
Westat Study  
NPC  
    ARL ILL Study  
    Task Force  
    Advisory Committee on NPS  
Project MediaBase  
IFLA UAP

ROLE IDENTIFICATION

Role of Library of Congress in a National Network  
Role of the School Library Media Center in a National Network

STANDARDS

CCNBC  
Computer Network Protocol  
LC Authority File Study  
Z-39 Standardization Activities

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

NCLIS Regional Hearings  
Program Document  
Infor Resources Policy  
National Info Policy  
American Indian Project

FUNDING

Alternatives for Financing  
Federal Funding for the Public Library  
State Funding for the Public Library  
Fed Support of L & I.S. for the 1980's

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Denver User Needs Conf & Proc  
Inventory of Library Needs

TRAINING

CLENE  
State Library Agency Training

MIXED (all of the above)

Related Papers  
Resolutions

PAST AND PRESENT RELATIONSHIPS

White House

Views on OMB regulations  
Advice on library authorizations

Congress

Views on proposed policies  
Advice on library authorizations and appropriations  
Ongoing dialogue re L & IS  
Transmit Commission positions

Other Federal Agencies

OE (NCES, OLLR, OPR)  
LC, NAL, NLM  
FLC  
NSF  
NEH  
NBS  
NTIS  
NTIA  
NIE  
.  
.  
.

Other Organizations

CCLN  
CLR  
ANSI  
COSLA  
UNESCO  
.  
.  
.

Professional Organizations and Societies

ARL  
ALA  
ASIS  
AECT  
AALL  
AAP  
CNLIA  
IIA  
IFLA  
NFAIS  
MLA  
SLA

Public

Publications  
Press Releases  
Correspondence  
Hearings  
Forums, Meetings

## CURRENT NCLIS ACTIVITIES

### NPC

- Advisory Committee on NPS
- ADL Study
- Legislative Drafting Committee

### NCLIS Support of WHC

- Staff Liaison
- Publ Relations Contract (Ruder & Finn)

### Copyright

- 5 yr Review
- Off-air taping

### Public/Private Sector Task Force

### Title 44

### LC Authority File Study

### Cultural Minorities

### Implementation of School Media recs

### Z-39 Standards Support

TO : Members  
Ad Hoc Retreat Committee

FROM : Douglas S. Price, Deputy Director  
and Staff Liaison

SUBJECT: Retreat Planning

A veritable plethora of topics has been mentioned during Commission meetings over the past year, as content for the retreat agenda. The suggestions have ranged from in-depth discussion of specifics, such as the National Library Act to the more fundamental reassessment of Commission goals and objectives. The two and one-half days set aside at Airlie House represent a unique opportunity for the Commissioners to concentrate their attention on substantive issues, but to derive maximum benefit from this opportunity, great care must be taken to develop agenda sufficiently focused to allow full, thorough and thoughtful consideration of those far-reaching questions for which there ordinarily is not time at Commission meetings.

The first question the Committee must address, then, is when, and by whom, the agenda will be set; whether it should be set by the Committee in advance of the retreat, or by the Commission as a whole after the members have arrived at Airlie House, or, perhaps, the committee should propose an agenda and format, subject to modification by the full Commission at Airlie House. In the event the Committee determines it should set or prepare the agenda, enclosed is a candidate list of topics/questions developed by staff as input to agenda development.

A perhaps even more pressing requirement--since time is of the essence here-- is the need for a decision on whether or not to use a facilitator during the retreat. The ultimate goal of a facilitator is, of course, to facilitate the group's reaching its goal. Generally, facilitators concentrate on process, and do not become involved in the substance of the discussion--they are neutral. It is ordinarily the responsibility of the facilitator to ensure that each discussant participates fully and freely in the sessions, that no one dominates or intimidates, that discussions stay focused without time-consuming digressions, and that the group satisfactorily accomplishes its desired task. Facilitators can, if desired, also suggest group process techniques to enhance the flow of the discussion.

Should the committee, to which the Commissioners referred the question, decide to make use of a facilitator, it is suggested that the staff at Airlie House be contacted as the first step. It will be difficult to find a good, independent facilitator on such short notice, but Airlie House appears to maintain such skill on its staff and, presumably, their staff is both skilled and experienced.

A decision should also be made by the committee regarding logistic arrangements at Airlie House: should staff take responsibility for all meal, transportation and meeting room arrangements, or will the committee take these on?

Staff is compiling a list of the documents that were distributed in preparation for last year's scheduled "retreat" as a reference aid in preparation for this one. Should the committee wish additional items added to the list, or distributed to the Commissioners, the committee should identify these and notify staff fairly soon/<sup>so</sup>that appropriate steps can be taken to do so.

I will be on leave from June 25 through July 6. During my absence, you can, of course, contact Andy Aines (after July 1) or on matters relating to the retreat.

## QUESTIONS FOR COMMISSION RETREAT

1. Where is the Commission coming from?
2. Where should it be going?
3. White House Conference considerations:
  - a. WHC Resolutions outside of the scope of NCLIS.
  - b. WHC Resolutions within the scope of NCLIS.
  - c. NCLIS responsibilities outside of scope of WHC Resolutions.
4. How should Commission determine:  
(Reference P.L. 91-345, Program Document, WHC Resolutions, Cross-Reference List)
  - a. Goals (broad, long-range)
  - b. Objectives
  - c. Priorities
  - d. Tactics (specific actions, immediate)
5. Assuming Question 4 is answered, what should the Commission's goals, objectives, priorities and tactics be for the 1980's? Consider in the process the following:
  - a. What should be the Commission's role vis-a-vis the library/information community? Should it provide leadership and initiative (i.e. pull the community in the appropriate direction); or simply assist the community in going wherever it wants to (i.e., ride the bandwagon)?
  - b. Should there be an operational body? If so, what kind? A research and development institute? A grant-making organization? Something else?
  - c. Should the Commission confine its activity to studies, acting as an "honest broker," and providing fora for discussions as in past, or should it be more active in initiating action and taking positions which may not be popular?
  - d. What should be the Commission's role vis-a-vis the Executive Branch and Congress? Should it act as a pipeline for policy recommendations arising in the community, or should it try to develop its recommendations independently?
  - e. Should the Commission stress libraries as institutions or information services, including all of those provided by libraries as well as other organizations?
  - f. What means can be developed to enable the Commission to develop informed, intelligent positions on current issues and do it promptly enough to be useful? Specific issues for which such positions should be developed promptly include:

- (1) Revision of Title 44 (National Publications Act, e.g., GPO and Superintendent of Documents.
  - (2) The National Library Act (Kennedy/Javits Bill; WHC outline).
  - (3) Revision of the National Program Document.
  - (4) Commission Role in the International Arena.
  - (5) Commission Position on WHC Resolutions.
6. Define relationships between and among: the Commission as a whole; the Executive Committee; other committees; the Chairman of the Commission; staff (Executive Director; rest of staff).
7. How should the Commission itself be organized for most effective action? Specifically, what kind of committee structure should it have?
- a. What should be the criteria for serving on committees?
    - (1) Expertise in subject area?
    - (2) Interest?
    - (3) Distribution of participation?
    - (4) Time available?
    - (5) Geographic proximity?
    - (6) Other?
  - b. There are three classes of committees. For each, the following questions must be answered:
    - (1) How are committee members selected?
    - (2) How is the committee chairman selected?
    - (3) What is the responsibility and authority of the committee?
  - c. Classes of committees:
    - (1) Executive Committee--In a class by itself.
    - (2) Other Permanent Committees - Organizational texts generally recommend that permanent committees be kept as few as possible, with as many functions as practical being performed by ad hoc committees. Two absolutely necessary functions which should be covered by permanent committees are:
 

Financial - overseeing the preparation of budgets and budget proposals and monitoring the execution of approved or appropriated budgets.

Planning - developing, within the policies determined in Question 5 responses, the specific steps to be taken to implement those policies.

A third function which has been suggested as calling for a permanent committee because of its continuing nature is:

Public Information

(3) Ad Hoc Committees - constituted as the need arises.

8. What information is required for initiating a new undertaking?
  - a. Charge. What is to be accomplished?
  - b. Impact. How will it advance goals?
  - c. Tactics, How will it be done?
  - d. Duration. How much time? How many meetings?
  - e. Cost. How much? What level of confidence in estimates?
9. What--if any--rules should the Commission adopt for its own functioning?
10. How can the Commission maintain its participation and still provide flexibility necessary to take advantage of targets of opportunity?
11. What can/should the Commission or staff do to forestall attempts by OMB or other bodies to destroy or denigrate the Commission?
12. What action should be taken--and when--to remove the five-year limitation on the Commission's Authorization of Appropriations, assuming that the bill is passed as submitted?
13. What can/should the Commission do to increase substantially the available funding? Via Congress? Via solicitation of contributions, grants, etc.?
14. What kind of staff does the Commission need? Number? Professional capabilities? Support functions?
15. What kind of Commissioners are needed for maximum strength and effectiveness? Should the Commission recommend categories to the White House? How does the present make-up conform to the requirements in P.L. 91-345?

## FROM THE NCLIS RETREAT

Thursday p.m.:

Suggestions - if you had unlimited resources:

- do a scenario of the world in 1985 (Carlos)
- do hearings toward the content of the NLA (Marion)
- survey of agencies involved in the development & establishment of federal info policy, and identification of role of NCLIS (Fran)
- what will user look like in 1985
- expose Commissioners to all types of media, their eventual use, etc (Margaret)
- do R & D (Frank)
- improve education, functional illiteracy, continuing education (Mildred)
- help school kids use libs & info technology (Margaret)

SPECIFIC suggestions

- restructure Commission meetings to provide in depth discussion
- raise funds immediately
- newsletter
- annual report to ALA
- tutorials for Commissioners
- meet with locals at each meeting
- develop framework, context, for looking at all projects. Requirement that we know what others are doing in area
- regular analysis from staff on problems/what's coming (like legislative analysis) factual, with "options"
- never take on new program without considering existing ones
- political briefings of national and presidential candidates now, to broaden power structure base
- define legislative priorities: bills now in Congress, and from President's response to the WHCLIS
- in-depth discussion of legislation: NLA, WHCLIS, OMB circular, Ti 44
- involve NCLIS in productivity discussions
- get agenda out in time for Commissioner's input
- discuss legislation with a purpose i.e., towards revision
- cut number of meetings; reduce paperwork
- make recommendations on future of NCLIS to President and Congress by 9/30/81
- enforce written report on meetings attended by staff & Commissioners at NCLIS expense
- mini White Paper
- determine availability of external \$\$ for study of 1985
- explore OE & NSF for funds for R & D - preservation, videodisks
- need for PR expertise on staff
- receive reports from Task Forces in writing
- get Director on board
- test WHCLIS recommendations - e.g., literacy, international relations: in or out?
- pin down cost of WHCLIS lobbying
- be specific about funding sources: when, what, from whom, what does it take
- crisp case for reprogramming \$300,000 to OMB in '81
- meet McIntyre, "take his temperature"
- define '85 problem, means of accomplishment
- spend time with Exec. Director, introduce him, instruct him to cut paperwork by 75%, etc.
- get funds to get CI&R started

FROM THE NCLIS RETREAT

Friday a.m. (this was supposed to be a distillation and reformatting of the previous day's suggestions. I think the original list is more useful - has more content!)

Meeting format

- legislation

recent NCLIS score

be prepared to testify

- one tutorial per meeting
- local presentations
- get agenda in advance so Commission can input (one month in advance, incumbent on Commissioners)
- report from Chairman
- fewer meetings
- less paper (check mailing lists)
- all reports in written form, in advance
- provide reason for distribution of mailings, comment on content
- use action stamp as appropriate
- provide review of Executive Committee discussions, log of contacts

OTHER

- newsletter - mail to whom?
- staff activity reports monthly
- report of meeting attendance, staff & Commissioners (what, where, when, why)  
include presentations made on behalf of Commission
- determine list of tutorials: Bell, Schultz, Prestel
- get list of "movers"

miscellanea of note:

comments made by Frank Keppel on the NLA:

- are state libraries competent to deal with information service?
- if the NLA defines public libraries as providing free services, that in itself constitutes a public policy statement
- construction funds do not provide for computer-ware
- contrast between construction money (150 million) and interlibrary cooperation money (20 million)
- research language is inadequate
- the definition of R & D money will set policy (since funding will come from the Feds)

NCLIS Meeting minutes, Friday, June 18, 2:00 PM to 5:30 PM

The Chairman opened ~~the meeting~~ with a discussion of the background of the suggested outline of a National Library and Information Services Act as contained in the WHC ~~Summary~~ Summary Report and the actual legislation (S. 2859) submitted by Senator Javits. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that the Commission would split into two groups, of their own selection to discuss:

1. Input to the Interagency Task Force on the WHC
2. The Ad Hoc Committee meeting in Minneapolis

"NET OUT" OF KEY IDEAS AT RETREAT

1. Commission is National Commission on Library and Information Services.
2. Libraries deal with packages. Information sciences deal with bits of information.
3. Appraise - Promote/Develop - Advise.
4. "Sense of purpose." Bring information to people!
5. Equal access.
6. Two heads--information/libraries.
7. End is to satisfy user.
- OPS 8. Tutorials.
9. Think global/act local.
10. Sense of purpose, rallying point.
11. Be smart. Only \$700,000.
12. Catalyst for public awareness.
13. Keep abreast of change.
14. Mission - unworkable marriage.
15. Is Program Document valid?
16. Decide on mission.
17. Our ultimate concern must be articulated.

18. Extremely valuable product.
19. Need creative posture to get attention of White House and Congress.
20. Might play monitoring role?
21. Strategy Document #1.
22. Provide true leadership.
23. NCLIS lacks impact.
24. Lack of leadership in profession.
25. Research and development effort to address new era.
26. Survival.
27. Lead with ideas.
28. Be interpreters.

### Future Meeting Format Suggestions

- Briefing on legislative activity. Discuss activity, i.e., inform Commissioners. Determine NCLIS action. Recent past NCLIS success/failures. Comm. be prepared to testify.
- One tutorial per meeting.
- Local presentation (1 hour max.)
- Get Commissioners input to agenda 1 month.
- Report from Chairman on his activities since last meeting.
- Fewer meetings; less paper (preamble?)
- Executive Committee
- Examine new techniques for meetings.

### Suggestions for Commissioners/Staff

- Implement fund raising resolution. (C)
- Political - brief candidates House/Senate/President ongoing. (C/S)
- Broaden base-power structure. (C/S)
- Work to assure public awareness. (C/S)
- Take steps to see if money for 1985 view are available. (C/S)
- Explore NSF/OE availability of funds for R&D effort, e.g. video disk. (C/S). Do we handle project?
- Crisp case for more money: now (CI&R); based on reaction to Interagency Task Force.
- Chairman presents to as many annual/key association meetings as possible. At least to one major association/year (PR, visibility)
- New Director:
  - Executive Director meeting with key Hill people
  - Spend time with Executive Director
  - Report by December
- Get the best Director. Commission must take stock.

Suggestions for Staff Action

- Newsletter: get the word out on NCLIS activity, positions (??); mail to whom? work involved?
- Each staff member expected to write monthly report (1 page maximum) to Executive Director (copy mailed to Commissioners)
- Comm. must report if use NCLIS or speak as Comm. funds for meeting. What, when, why, how much?
- Determine list of experts for tutorials: Schultz, Bell, Prestel.
- Get list of movers that count.
- Augment staff thru students, interagency transfers.
- Prepare indoctrination (2 day) and budget for new Commissioners.

# NCLIS - ITS GENESIS AND EARLY YEARS

W. A. Aines

Remarks for Delivery at Retreat of the  
U.S. National Commission on Libraries and  
Information Science, Airlie House, Va.  
16 July 1980

Before I begin, I wish to express my appreciation to Helmut and the other commissioners who are the moving force behind this retreat for the opportunity to talk about NCLIS and its early years. I promise you that I will not bore you with a rendition of micro-history and dates that might illustrate conscientious poring over the annals of the Commission, but will lull you to sleep. I would rather talk about the forces and trends that coalesced to bring the Commission into existence and select a few things that happened or did not happen during our adolescent days that contributed to what the Commission is today. Helmut has agreed that I might make a few comments later in the proceedings about what I see will be helpful to achieve progress for the Commission. Hence, I will refrain making any recommendations for action in this presentation.

By an odd coincidence, the coming Saturday, the 19th of July, will mark the 10th anniversary of the National Commission. Public Law 91-345 which established the Commission was passed on 19 July 1970. This retreat is not only a time for reflection, planning and rededication, it is also a time to celebrate 10 years of service and for me a chance to congratulate you for the opportunity you have to advance the goals and objectives of the Commission in the next decade.

According to the Commission's Annual Report of 1978-1979, the origin of the Commission can be traced directly to the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, which was established for a one-year period by President Lyndon Johnson in September of 1966 by Executive Order Number 11301.

It is also historically true that the recommendation for something like the Commission was made by individuals several years earlier, just as individuals have for many years called on Congress to make the Library of Congress the National Library.

It should be noted however that there are similarities and dissimilarities in objective between the 1966-1967 Advisory Commission on Libraries and the present National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. For example, the Advisory Commission focused almost exclusively on libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the evolving national information systems. The Advisory Commission was directed to make studies; appraise policies, programs and practices of public agencies and private organizations which have a bearing on the role and utilization of libraries; to appraise library funding, including Federal support, to determine how funds available for construction and support of libraries and library services can be more effectively and efficiently utilized; and to make recommendations for action by Government and the private sector to ensure an effective library system for the Nation.

When the Advisory Commission delivered its recommendations to the President on October 3, 1968, they included a call for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency, also the formation of

Federal Institute of Library and Information Science as a principal center for basic and applied research in all relevant areas. The three other recommendations asked that the Library of Congress be recognized as the National Library of the United States, that the Office of Education be recognized for its critical role in meeting needs for library services, and strengthening State library agencies. It was necessary to overcome deficiencies in fulfilling their current functions.

Public Law 91-345, the legislation that created the National Commission, embraced most of these recommendations, but also called for recommendation of plans by the President, the Congress, the Federal agencies, as well as State, local and private agencies. The focus on libraries and their progress was expanded with a statement of policy which affirmed "that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services." The law told the Commission to promote research and development activities which will extend and improve the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the national communications networks. More than that, the Commission was told to develop overall plans for meeting national library and information needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State and local levels. The Commission was authorized to contract with Federal agencies and groups in the private sector to carry out some of its functions. It also directed heads of all Federal agencies to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this

act. The inclusion of this direction has at least on one occasion turned out to be valuable to the Commission.

Whoever wrote the last Annual Report of the Commission was quite perceptive when he or she wrote, "It took but two short years to move through both houses of Congress, and to the President for signature, an Act establishing the permanent Commission recommended by the Advisory Commission." Two years is a relatively short time to push through a brand new piece of legislation, even if encouraged by library associations and other groups. There were a number of other contributing forces and trends that coalesced to bring NCLIS into being. Let me mention a few of them.

First, there were two organizations in the Executive Office of the President that were concerned about the developing information revolution and the need to meet it, use it, and cushion its negative effects. I refer to the Office of Science and Technology and to the National Goals Office under Len Garment. The Science Adviser, who headed the Office of Science and Technology, was Donald Hornig. He was also the Chairman of the Federal Committee on Science and Technology, which was the parent group of the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, COSATI. In the sixties, COSATI was the powerful force in the White House family that focused on information and library programs. At one point in its life, it had as many as 14 subgroups, ad hoc and permanent, that were involved in coordination, cooperative efforts, standards-making, policy formulation, and the like. Hundreds of research libraries were involved along with documentation centers, information analysis centers and other groups in the Executive Branch that were involved in science, technology and knowledge pursuits.

COSATI was one of the first groups in the government that saw the need for national as well as Federal planning. It also recognized the need for stronger, more consistent Federal and national postures and policies in order to assure a wise and viable international information posture. Its importance was recognized throughout the civilized world and increasingly during its existence by developing countries. It was amusing to some of us when a number of countries created groups that they also called COSATI to play a similar role. I have described COSATI because it no longer exists, largely as a result, I believe, of the lack of understanding of its role by newcomers in a new administration, and because some of its functions have not been picked up by other organizations. The importance of the OST and the Goals Offices came into sight when the NCLIS law was passed and no action was being taken to implement it by the Executive Office of the President. The two offices worked as a team to help select the Commissioners and arrange for funding support. The process took about one year. But there were other forces at work which are worth noting.

to Apes. 9/15  
S. 2000

Ferment for better information programs started in the fifties and early sixties in Congress. My nomination of a leader in this thrust was Hubert Humphrey, who deserves more than a footnote in history for how he almost single-handed took on the Federal agencies and literally forced them to strengthen their information and library programs. I hope that the U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences will in the relatively near future find a good way to memorialize the man and his deeds, who said at a hearing held in 1962:

"Let it be clear that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has been prodding the agencies of Government since 1957 in attempt to get information services improved...I went to the World's Fair in Seattle recently and found the ALA had a splendid exhibit on electronic machines - through UNIVAC, I refer to one of these electronic devices whereby you go in, punch a button - after you have listed a topic on which you want information - and get a sizable list of citations of documents on that particular topic very promptly...Why in the name of common sense can't the Government do it? Let me tell you of my experience at Offutt Air Base. Let me just lay it on the line. Mr. Gilpatric, you are putting in an entirely new information system there. The old one was pretty good, but a new one is going in. There is no lack of money for that. You could collate all the intelligence information you need with one of the new or the old systems. But if you go to the Food and Drug Administration you can't find a modern information system, even though it involves the lives of children. We simply don't have such a system. One of the reasons I am aroused about it is because despite the thalidomide tragedy, despite the other things that have happened with respect to hazardous drugs, very little is being done to improve the medical systems - for all intents and purposes. I am going to look now at the agency budgets for information. I am on the Appropriations Committee, and I am holding this particular meeting because in all candor, I am displeased with what is being done and has been done.. The agencies are putting their money in only the most tangible items such as research projects; they are not putting adequate money into library and information services. This matter of balanced allocation happens to be one of the subjects that is very close to my heart, as you can see, and I must say I am disturbed, distraught, disgusted over the failure to get things done..."

Humphrey said these and more things and the Agencies paid attention. The philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel once said: "We may affirm absolutely that nothing great in the World has been accomplished without passion." I often think of what Hegel said and what Humphrey did and rejoice that he was here and brought some passion to a business that needs it from time to time. Believe it or not, the OMB maintained a line item in the Federal budget for several years covering scientific and technical information. The

National Science Foundation did the same in its statistical annual, Federal Funds for Science and Technology. I am not sure if it has continued the project, which stems from the applied power of but one man.

It is important, I believe, to understand what was happening during the sixties and the seventies, so that we will better understand what we have to do in the eighties and nineties. The onslaught of the information explosion and the Age of the Computer were becoming visible. Marshall McLuhan burst onto the scene. His notion that the Medium is the Message startled the literate world and rapidly became a commonplace. More specifically, he said, "The medium, or process of our time - electric technology - is reshaping and restructuring patterns of social interdependence and every aspect of our personal life. It is forcing us to reconsider and reevaluate practically every thought, every action, and every institution formerly taken for granted. Everything is changing - you, your family, your neighborhood, your education, your job, your government, your relation to "the other." And they are changing dramatically..."

The Congress and the White House began to realize that the Federal agencies as then constituted were not well prepared to study the phenomena of an information revolution and information explosion, emerged as they were in what was happening. NCLIS is then one of several advisory, policy and action groups that had to be formed to fill the vacuum. Even the Federal Communications Commission was floundering. Surely this powerful Commission which came into being as a result of the Communications Act of 1934 should have been considered as a candidate to pick up the NCLIS program or some variant of it. This did not happen because FCC lacked the flexibility and

versatility to do so. When computers made their dramatic entrance FCC did little to take the time to learn what computers married to the communications medium might portend. We should recognize that FCC is largely made up of lawyers who, for the most part, are experts in communications law. FCC did not have a scientific and technical staff until recently, actually only a few people. Like courts of law, FCC created dockets and asked experts, usually involved in litigation, to testify. Unlike other agencies, FCC did not budget for research and development. Independent studies and analyses had to be done by others. Congress has recognized the need of reform in this agency and is now taking on the task of re-writing the Communications Act.

Congress and the Executive Branch set up a number of Commissions to make recommendations on paperwork, on protecting privacy for individuals, on freedom of information and disclosure, on electronic fund transfer, on protection of intellectual property (copyrights and patents), on intelligence-gathering, and on government reorganization. Of course, we include the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science with this family of organizations, some in being and some terminated. It is an unfortunate truth, but virtually all Federal agencies are set up for accomplishment of one or more unique missions. They organize for this purpose and are not very good at mediating change or responding to the need of change. This makes it easy to understand why the subject of "sunset" laws is popular in Washington. NCLIS should understand this Darwinian reality and take whatever steps are needed so that it will not ever be put on a "hit" list for elimination or be gobbled up by some other group more capable of coping with the swirling winds of change.

for Sept 5: BESIC - FILE 1 Ann 61  
-9- Andy's comments on 5/16  
PLEASE RETURN

Up to this point, I think all of you have comprehended what I have put before you and recognized the realities that brought the Commission into being. But there is another one that has not been brought out into the open, but was discussed before NCLIS became a reality. One reason for forming the Commission was to seek out a formula to bring two important information cultures together, the large, rapidly growing, brash information sector, the progeny of the newer information technology revolution, and the large, highly respected library community, the product of earlier breakthroughs of information technology and techniques. There were people on the Hill, as well as in the Executive Office of the President, who were quietly expressing concern that they were being asked to increase budgets for the information sector and for the library sector - and they could not figure out what was a reasonable slice of the budget for these two groups, both of whom were seeking more capital-intensive information technology to cope with the explosion of information and data. They expected the Commission to accomplish its mission as expressed in the law that created it, but also that it would contribute to something akin to fiscal advice that would better rationalize convergence of the two sectors and maximizing information services for users in the public and private communities. To my knowledge, I do not believe that anybody expected that it would be easy to accomplish this nigh impossible task.

Those of us who were trying to prepare the first slate of names to nominate as members of the Commission recognized what was expected of the Commission, so we sought nomination of people who would bring a fine balance of talents and backgrounds as called for

in P.L. 91-345. We knew what a tough job these Commissioners would have in starting the Commission and gearing up quickly for action. Fortunately, we were able to bring in the outstanding members of the Advisory Commission and one of the staff members who did much to make the Advisory Commission a success. In September of 1971, the first meeting of the Commission took place and the first executive director was brought aboard in December, 1971. The Commission was on its way.

It is not my intention to give you a blow by blow account of what took place during the early years, but I would like to give you the flavor of what happened the first year.

The Commission logically took a number of actions to find out what was going on and what needs for information people felt most urgent. Six committees were formed to study such matters as: applications of new technology, copyright information, current library/information services and their adequacies and deficiencies, Library Congress, needs of users, and public information. Meetings were held with Federal agencies, private and public funding groups, and professional societies. Several regional hearings took place under the auspices of Bessie Moore's Regional Hearings Committee. Even though the Commission's budget was just over \$400,000 a year at that time, several contracts were awarded for four studies on funding sources, requirements for library and information services, present and future library and information service needs, and centralized and regionalized inter-library loan centers. It was a busy year and we made good progress in launching the Commission.

In 1973, a decision was made to prepare a broad outline of a National Program for Library and Information Services. Two years

later, in 1975, the report was completed and issued. In its preparation, the Commission had received the input of literally thousands of individuals and groups in seminars, open forums, Commission hearings, and through correspondence. The report focused on users of information and on how to increase each person's access to the abundant information resources of the nation. It was one of the early studies prepared in the United States that consciously examined the early indicators of the information revolution underway, how people perceived their information needs, and mapped a course for future initiatives. When it was being prepared, the Commission was fully aware that the product had to be considered as an initial effort and that it would have to be updated as time and circumstances dictated.

It was the hope of the Commission, perhaps a naive hope, that the National Program would provide the basis for new Federal legislation; that it would focus public and professional society attention on the critical library and information problems the country faced; and that it would provide the foundation for the major upgrading of library and information activities, including an expansion of cooperative services throughout the nation. Any belief that the Commission was taking a complacent attitude about the

situation was dispelled by one comment made in the report that: "If we continue traditional practices much longer, within the span of only a few years, America will be faced with information chaos that will work against the country's best interests." (p.77) The report urged the American people to support a nationwide program of library and information service as a high priority national goal, and called on Congress to designate their library as the National

Library.

As I prepare to close the curtains on this roundup, let me briefly summarize what I have said.

There were a number of factors that coalesced to produce the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science: the advice of dedicated people, gathering clouds that indicated trouble ahead, the proliferation of knowledge in every form, the appearance and growth of new information technology, the expansion of the so-called knowledge industry as a major component of the service industries, the possible collision of two information cultures, the recognition that the Federal government was not properly organized to cope with the changing information scene, the need for rudimentary planning and prioritizing, the requirement for coordination and sharing within the Federal government and between the Federal government, other governments and the private sector, the need for access to all citizens who require knowledge to live and prosper, and concern about increasing costs of information delivery and the conduits that carry it.

Ten years later, we are at this Retreat to review where we are and where and how we should go tomorrow. We know that we have made some progress during the decade, but on sober reflection we can agree that we have barely crossed the threshold and there is so much more we can accomplish <sup>if</sup> we are wise and work hard.

ROBERT BURNS, Jr.

## Comments

I'd like to suggest as a base for our discussions a very practical question that I've been getting from some of my colleagues. "What has the Commission done for my library?" This is a question from the real world and requires a real world answer. The question is especially provocative when one reviews the answers provided by staff to the question, "In my judgement, the four major accomplishments of NCLIS during its existence have been:" This is not to suggest that their answers were casual, poorly thought-out or in any way incorrect. I believe them to be correct perceptions of what the NCLIS has accomplished. I would suggest, however, that these answers do not respond to the question I'm hearing from my colleagues. I would like to see the energy of the next 2½ days devoted to preparing a program which will answer that question.

Let me attempt to answer this question by discussing my view of the role of the NCLIS. In one sense this as a discussion of goals, in another equally valid sense its a discussion of roles. I won't quibble over words as long as we are agreed that the search for roles or goals is a search for those outcomes which will provide demonstrable proof of the Commission's contribution to the real world of libraries, information, and users.

Let me share with you then some thoughts on the role of the NCLIS.

First, it is neither sugar daddy nor earth mother. It is rather one means to an end, that end being a more responsive library and information transfer apparatus whose central ~~function~~<sup>concern</sup> is end user satisfaction. I've heard this called "serving the public good" by some of my fellow Commissioners. This phrase leaves me uncomfortable because it can be defined by the bestower in any way he chooses, while benefits to the end user can only be defined by the receiver of such good deeds. As you can see I am emphasizing end user needs and their satisfaction as the ultimate criterion of our success in accomplishing the goals of the NCLIS.

Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the NCLIS to develop a rationale of service for meeting these needs by bringing together and reconciling the differing interests of various stakeholders. NCLIS has responsibilities as an intermediary (broker), as a forum, and as a catalyst to see that needs are followed by action.

Let me be more specific and since the first order of business is for NCLIS to get its own house in order let me share with you some of my concerns on how best to do this:

- 1) NCLIS has clearly over extended itself - its resources, and its programs. Our current inventory of programs is overly ambitious and needs to be revised within the limits of our available - not anticipated - resources. We are trying to do too much, too fast, with too few resources. Furthermore, requests for new funding (i.e. additional) to the Congress at this time are naive and untimely. As a result, some NCLIS programs must be postponed.
- 2) Let us get straight once and for all the decision making process within the NCLIS. An accepted governance document is a must. Basic to such a document are agreed upon definitions for the roles of the Chairman, the Executive Director, the Commissioners, and the staff.
- 3) My third concern is that we put in place as quickly as possible a set of mechanisms which will enable us to communicate openly, easily, and naturally with one another in a congenial atmosphere where ideas flow freely and smoothly with a minimum of false starts, butterfly chasing, soap-box oratory and other non-productive behavior. Our meetings need to be tightened up and to proceed on schedule.\*\*

We are both blessed and cursed with a tolerant Chairman. I suggest that we give him a big stick and a long arm so that we can get on with the business at hand and not find ourselves with 15 minutes left in which to discuss what could have been one of the most important issues on our agenda - the National Libraries & Information Services Act - as happened at our last meeting.

While we are on the subject of our meetings let me add some specific suggestions:

- a) I like the system we now have of inviting local participation in our meetings. Some explanation of grass roots programs is beneficial to all concerned. It opens windows into the NCLIS for the practitioners and it gives the NCLIS a direct view of where the action is. Whether these are hearings, short briefings, or whatever I don't care, but 45 minutes is long enough for this activity including both presentation and questions. Supplementing this I would like to see a program of invited tutorials given for Commissioners by experts in the field. These can be progress reports, state-of-the art summaries or simply invited position papers, but in each case their goal is the education of Commissioners and their limit should be 45 minutes.
- b) Each meeting should include, a summary of activities (reports of Committees in which Commissioners participate) and a report of activities by the Chairman. In addition, I would include a legislative report to cover the progress of legislation in which the Commission has a known interest as well as the review of new bills or proposed legislation which could be of interest to the NCLIS - a kind of legislative tracking service if you will whose purpose is to keep the NCLIS sensitive to new or proposed legislation which touches its mission. An example of the latter is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, or so-called Brooks Bill to restructure

Federal information policy making. Its also called HR 6410.

- c) Let's invite former Commissioners to participate in Commission functions and to share some of the tasks we have set for ourselves.
- d) Pro and con statements are a useful device <sup>for Commissioners</sup> in reviewing an agenda item. I'd like to see more use of this especially by staff in the preparation of discussion documents for meetings.

Let me conclude with some general observations regarding the NCLIS and its goals or roles.

- 1) The decade of the 80's will be one of expanding demands for service with decreasing resources to meet these needs. The trick will be to balance expectations and delivery in a way that is most satisfactory to the most end users without an expanding Federal presence. There are several ways to do this. Let me share some of them with you:

- 1) In a review of Rene Dubos' new book The Wooing of Earth the author speaks of a "...general formula of management for the future might be, think globally and act locally..."
- 2) I suggest that we work toward improving rather than equalizing information services.



National Commission  
on Libraries and Information Science

FORMAL MOTIONS AND ACTIONS  
Atlanta, Georgia  
June 5-6, 1980

- (1) It was MOVED by William Welsh, seconded by Frances Naftalin, that the Minutes of the March 8-9, 1980, meeting be accepted as corrected. Passed unanimously.
- (2) It was MOVED by Clara Jones, seconded by Robert Burns, Jr., that the Commission accept the offer from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to place Gerald Sophar on detail to the National Commission for an indefinite period of time. Passed unanimously.
- (3) It was agreed that the Commission invite South Dakota to participate in the September meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on WHC Follow-Up and Implementation as official observers.
- (4) It was MOVED by Carlos Cuadra, seconded by William Welsh, to accept the proposed party platform statements on library and information services, as drafted by Commissioners Burns, Moore, Tate and Warden. Passed unanimously.
- (5) It was MOVED by Clara Jones, seconded by Helmut Alpers, to authorize the Chairman to send a letter to the appropriate Federal departments and agencies endorsing the concept of developing three to four community information center models, as proposed and outlined by Marilyn Gell. Passed unanimously.
- (6) It was MOVED by Marian Leith, seconded by William Welsh, that the Commission name Andrew Aines, former NCLIS Member and currently Director, Office of Scientific and Technical Information, Department of Energy, to serve as Interim Executive Director. Passed unanimously.
- (7) The Commission agreed to establish an NCLIS Task Force on International Cooperation in Library and Information Services.
- (8) It was MOVED by Horace Tate, seconded by Robert Burns, Jr., that the Commission accept the report of the International Relations Planning Group; but, that further planning for the Task Force would be tabled until after the retreat. Passed unanimously.

- (9) It was MOVED by Frances Naftalin, seconded by Horace Tate, that the Commission accept the membership proposed by the Special Libraries Association for the NCLIS Task Force on the Role of the Special Libraries in the National Program. (Funding of the Task Force would be shared with SLA assuming the cost of the Task Force members and NCLIS the cost for Commissioners and staff.) The first meeting is scheduled for October 22, 1980, in New York. Passed unanimously.
- (10) It was MOVED by Horace Tate, seconded by Joan Gross, that the Commission approve the membership of the Cultural Minority Task Force as agreed to by the Commissioners. Passed unanimously.
- (11) It was MOVED by Bessie Moore, seconded by Clara Jones, that the Commission accept the fiscal year 1980 budget with the two "caveats" as discussed. Passed unanimously.
- (12) It was MOVED by Horace Tate, seconded by Marian Leith, that the fiscal year 1981 budget be accepted as presented. Passed unanimously.
- (13) It was MOVED by Frances Naftalin, seconded by William Welsh, that the fiscal year 1982 budget be accepted as presented with the understanding that changes may be necessary as a result of the July meeting. Passed unanimously.
- (14) It was MOVED by Carlos Cuadra, seconded by William Welsh, to schedule an Executive Session, on July 16, 1980, for the purpose of discussing personnel. Passed unanimously.
- (15) An Ad Hoc Committee for Law Libraries was established. Messrs. Alpers, Tate and Benton agreed to serve as members.
- (16) By general agreement, the Chairman established two committees and their membership, as follows:
- Retreat Committee
- Helmut Alpers, Chair; Philip Sprague; William Welsh
- WHC Ad Hoc Committee on WHC Follow-Up and Implementation
- Frances Naftalin, Chair; Marian Leith; Margaret Warden
- (17) By general agreement, it was decided that the NCLIS staff would attend the retreat as resource persons. The Retreat Committee was instructed to develop the agenda, the meeting format, and to decide whether a facilitator would be needed during the retreat.

23 June 1980