



**National Commission
on Libraries and Information Science**

NCLIS COMMISSION MEETING

April 9 and 10, 1981

Chicago, Illinois

MEMBERS PRESENT: Helmut Alpers (Thursday only); Gordon Ambach; Robert Burns, Jr.; Carlos A. Cuadra; Francis Keppel; Bessie B. Moore; Frances Naftalin; Margaret Warden; William Welsh (Thursday only); and Charles Benton, Presiding

STAFF PRESENT : Toni Carbo Bearman; Douglas S. Price; Mary Alice Hedge Reszetar; Gerald J. Sophar; Ruby O. Woods-Robinson; Carl C. Thompson; and Barbara Lee Whiteleather, Recording Secretary

GUESTS/OBSERVERS: Eileen Cooke, ALA Washington Office Director; Lois Pearson, American Libraries; Jane Wilson, ALA International Relations Officer; Robert Chartrand, Congressional Research Service; Carolyn Klein, Assistant to Charles Benton; Alice Fite, American Association of Library Schools; Richard Sorenson, representing American Association of Library Schools; Robert Willard, Information Industry Association; Glenn Wilde, Community Learning and Information Centers; Richard Haycock, Community Learning and Information Centers; Beatrice Kinney, Consultant, Golden, Colorado; Lois Granick, American Psychological Association

Thursday, April 9, 1981

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. The guests and observers introduced themselves at the request of the Chairman.

Approval of Minutes

By unanimous agreement, the Minutes of the December 12-13, 1980, Commission meeting were approved. Mrs. Whiteleather, Recording Secretary, was complimented on her even-handed preparation of the minutes.

Opening Remarks

In his opening remarks, the Chairman stated, "Holding the Commission meeting at the same time as the Information Industry Association is NCLIS' first effort to bring the Commission Members together with an on-going event in the field." Mrs. Warden agreed and added that this was an historical event and should have been recorded by a photographer. Dr. Bearman noted that this action shows the integration of the library and information science portion of what NCLIS does.

Mrs. Clara Jones could not attend because she is attending the 100th anniversary of her alma mater; Mrs. Paulette Holahan is receiving an award for her work as a library trustee in Louisiana; Mr. Philip Sprague is attending a long-standing annual board meeting; Mrs. Joan Gross has just begun a new position with the Mayor's Office in New York; and Dr. Horace Tate is in the hospital. The Members and staff signed a "get-well card" for Dr. Tate wishing him a speedy recovery.

The agenda was reviewed and revised as suggested.

Mr. Benton stated, "The staff work is outstanding. Great progress has been made since the December meeting. We have rolled forward with the mandates clarified at that meeting." Mr. Benton stated that he was delighted with the appropriations hearings--contrary to misleading reports in some journals. He reported that the budget hearing in the House was "the best I have ever been involved in." The NCLIS fiscal year 1982 budget was cut a total of 6% from the original request, which we consider a victory; the net is that we have a slight increase over fiscal year 1981. Mr. Benton urged the Commissioners to read both his and Dr. Moore's statements, which have been sent to all Members. Dr. Moore agreed with Mr. Benton stating, "It was, by far, the best hearing we have ever had." Dr. Moore expressed her displeasure with the article written in LJ Hotline entitled, "NCLIS Walks a High Wire Over the Budget Abyss," dated March 2, 1981, stating, "I am absolutely amazed that some people deliberately do not tell the truth."

Futures/Planning Committee Report

Dr. Cuadra, Chair, Futures/Planning Committee, distributed a matrix entitled, "Targets for NCLIS Funds," on which the Commissioners were to spend a hypothetical sum of \$100.00 in the area of library services and/or information products and services. The result of the study was that the average was 57% for library services, and 44% for information products and services spent.

Dr. Cuadra reported that the five members of the Committee (Messrs. Alpers, Burns, Cuadra, Keppel, and Welsh) met in Washington, D.C., in February during which several agreements, both in substance and methods, were reached:

- (1) The Commission needs to identify the philosophical basis of projects undertaken. Every project approved ought to be consistent with this direction; resist impulse to respond to every crisis or opportunity.
- (2) The Commission should be more fully aware of the scope of the information field; decide on boundaries of interest, e.g., broadcasting, publishing, etc.
- (3) The Commission should not view its role as a "lobby" for libraries. The Commission should not be the spokesman for anybody else! The Commission must develop and present effectively its own views.
- (4) The Commission must be selective in choice of projects to be undertaken. Focus attention on what will do the most good for the most people.

- (5) The Commission should recognize that there are important differences between information policies and a national information policy. Trying to produce a single, comprehensive, all-inclusive national information policy is not likely to be successful. The Commission should not imagine this to be a goal.
- (6) The Commission needs to introduce a workable evaluation system into NCLIS project planning. This mechanism should include criteria agreed on and about which Members feel emotionally neutral.
- (7) The Commission needs to adopt thoughtful, workable rules for creating, reviewing and approving new work. Projects should not be presented for Commission approval without authorized staff analysis and budget. Projects which do not include a budget with staff time allocated to the project should not be approved.
- (8) The Commission should not become a research-sponsor. Sponsor research only in order to get the results to carry on NCLIS work. The Commission should not be misperceived as a grant-making agency.
- (9) The Commission should not enter the competitive marketplace by responding to Requests for Proposals issued by other government agencies.
- (10) The Commission should pay greater attention to assessing the impact of our work. It is important to know what effect NCLIS studies have had and whether the money was well spent.
- (11) The Commission should establish a mechanism for bringing present and new Commissioners "up to speed" in major aspects of the library and information environment and for keeping them in touch with important new developments. Commissioners should identify areas of presentation for all future meetings.
- (12) At the June Commission meeting, spend the first two hours discussing the alternatives and issues related to objectives.
- (13) The idea of an Education Committee was discussed; good idea, but not needed just yet. The Futures/Planning Committee can initiate these activities on a temporary basis.
- (14) The title, "Futures/Planning Committee" is not very suitable. All Committees are engaged in planning, e.g., budget planning, legislation planning, etc., and they also need to look ahead to the future. "Program Committee" may be more suitable; however, no firm decision has been made.

The Committee decided to develop a more systematic way of evaluating new projects and a copy of the proposed evaluation form (attached) was distributed. Several constructive comments were made, and Dr. Cuadra asked that the Commissioners carefully review the form and make additional comments. Mrs. Naftalin expressed

her opinion that this form would help guide discussions and serve as a good tool. Mrs. Warden added that there must be an orderly way of looking at Commission work and this seems to be the only way to do it. Mr. Ambach agreed with Mr. Burns and also complimented the Committee on its work and encouraged the continuation of the proposed evaluation form. Mrs. Moore cautioned the Commission, "This Commission will not be doing what we should be doing if we fail to respond to targets of opportunity." Mr. Welsh added, "Requests for advice from the Office of Management and Budget is a 'given,' and we must respond."

Mr. Ambach stated that the next key step would involve applying the NCLIS Project Evaluation Form to actual projects in terms of: (1) objectives and expected outcomes; and (2) method of procedure. Miss Cooke expressed her opinion that the evaluation form, when completed, would provide a rationale for decisions to undertake projects.

Dr. Bearman cautioned the Members, "Let's not draw a line between library and information science. We can go forward and assume that these two fields are automatically intermingling."

In summary, Mr. Benton stated that the Members, working with Dr. Bearman and staff, would begin to apply the evaluation form to NCLIS projects, which should result in a rational allocation of NCLIS resources. The White House Conference survey of resolutions will be discussed at the June Commission meeting, and Mr. Benton reminded the Members--who have not yet done so--to complete the survey form and return it to the NCLIS office. Dr. Bearman explained that a very detailed staff time study, allocating time to specific projects, is underway and that the results of that will be discussed at the June meeting.

American Association of School Librarians

Ms. Alice E. Fite, Executive Director of the American Association of School Librarians, and Richard Sorenson, State Department of Education, Wisconsin, and Chair of Networking Committee, AASL, presented the following proposal to the Commission.

The AASL, a division of the American Library Association, will plan and administer a two-day work session with accredited representatives from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Council of State Library Agencies, the National Association of State Educational Media Professionals, and the AASL. These representatives will develop the plans for a national workshop of State Education Agency and State Library Agency officials. The main purpose of the work session is to prepare guidelines and a planning document for the funding of a national workshop or institute on school libraries in networks. The overall purpose of the national workshop is to acquaint officials of SEA's and SLA's with the role of the school library media program in library networks and to plan for the implementation of that role. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is asked to cosponsor this two-day work session with the AASL, for a total cost of \$3,225.00. The AASL would provide one-half of Ms. Fite's time and support staff, plus approximately \$1,000.

JUNE
AGENDA
ACTION

JUNE
AGENDA

Mr. Benton expressed his opinion that cutbacks in funding of school media programs have now reached a crisis level. Mr. Ambach suggested that one approach to the objective of having a nationwide conference--the objective of discussing library networking with Chief State School Officers--might be met, at least in part, by discussion of this topic at one of the CSSO regular meetings. He further offered to contact Robert Benton, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa, and Bill Pierce, to relay this suggestion. Mr. Ambach's suggestion was accepted by the Members of the Commission, and he was encouraged to follow-up on his offer to assist. Dr. Bearman suggested, and the Members agreed, that the proposed evaluation form should be applied to this project and discussed during the June meeting.

ACTION
JUNE
AGENDA

Legislative/Public Awareness Committee Report

Mrs. Warden highlighted her recent visit to Washington, D.C., pointing out that she had visited 55 Senate and House Members on Education authorizing and appropriations committees, with an average of 26 minutes per visit. Mrs. Warden noted that she did not go as a "lobbyist" but rather as an interested individual to establish identity and to show interest in library and information services. Mrs. Warden encouraged other Commissioners to write and/or visit their Congressmen and Senators on behalf of the plight of libraries and information services' appropriations.

The Members received and reviewed a draft paper (Commission Document #81-12) prepared by Miss Deborah Hyatt to initiate thinking about the upcoming reauthorization of public library programs under the Library Services and Construction Act, as requested at the last Commission meeting. The paper suggests some major reauthorization issues. It does not analyze or resolve issues; rather it simply raises them as a point of departure for debate within the Commission. The paper was constructed in three parts: (1) Part I of the paper discusses the broad parameters of the reauthorization debate; (2) Part II notes specific issues that may be discussed in the reauthorization of the LSCA; and (3) the Appendix notes other library-related legislation the Commission may wish to monitor as the reauthorization of the LSCA proceeds. The Members of the Commission were extremely pleased with the report, considering it an excellent resource document.

Update on Washington Scene

Miss Eileen Cooke, Director, American Library Association, Washington Office, handed out a packet containing fact sheets on: Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title II-B; ESEA, Title IV-B; ALA Appropriations Recommendations; Library Services and Construction Act; Public Library Services, LSCA, Title I; College Library Resources, Higher Education Act, Title II-A; Library Training, Research and Development, HEA, Title II-B; Strengthening Research Library Resources, HEA, Title II-C; National Endowment for the Humanities; Medical Library Assistance Act; and informational material on communicating with legislators and lobbying.

National Library Week was held April 5-11, 1981, with Tuesday, April 7, designated the Seventh annual Legislative Day on Capitol Hill. A record number of people attended and participated in the event--between 225 and 250 persons from all but three states.

Miss Cooke reported that the Senate recently passed their version of the second budget resolution for fiscal year 1981 which impacts on the continuing resolution expiring on June 5. Many of the programs in that budget have been held back by 28% of their money; the rationale for this has been that June 5 represented 72% of the fiscal year. The President did not recommend a cut-back for LSCA; he did recommend rescission for ESEA, Title IV-B of 25% forward funding. "Perhaps forward-funding isn't all that great," Miss Cooke stated.

Miss Cooke urged the Members of the Commission to communicate with their legislators, especially when Congress is in session or when they are in their hometowns. She reminded the Members that, for the most part, the Senators are new, with new staffs. They need the information that tells them what a program can do, or not do, for their constituents. "A simple letter laying out the facts from the constituents to the Congressmen is worth its weight in gold," Miss Cooke urged.

The five-year review of the Copyright Act is due in January 1, 1983. At that time the Copyright Office will report its findings to Congress, Miss Cooke informed the Members. King Research is in the process of conducting a follow-up survey under the auspices of the Copyright Office. "It remains to be seen whether Congress will want to revise it again, keeping in mind it took them 25 years to revise it the last time," she said. Because of his interest and expertise in this area, Mr. Sophar offered to "track" legislation on copyright. Dr. Bearman stated that the staff would immediately inform Mrs. Warden, as Chair of the Legislative/Public Awareness Committee, of any new developments in this area, and the staff will present a brief report on copyright activities at the next Commission meeting.

ACTION

JUNE
AGENDA

Several interesting comments made by Miss Cooke included:

- LSCA has authorization of \$150 million for Title I. Senate action will require the Senate/Labor and Human Resources Committee to knock down that authorization to \$27 million. The appropriations for that fiscal year cannot go above that level. The House has not acted, however, and it is hoped that they won't go that route.
- Every 1% of unemployment costs the government \$25 billion.
- The states have lost state revenue sharing for this year.
- Maintenance of Effort. Unlike LSCA, revenue sharing does not have a matching requirement. As the states are losing revenue sharing, they will not be in a position to maintain effort and, therefore, they will forfeit Federal dollars which require maintenance of effort.

Miss Cooke urged the Commissioners to write their Congressmen and Senators. "Do not think one letter will not make a difference--it will," she said.

Mr. Benton stated, "It is survival time. We, as a National Commission, may be seen as increasingly irrelevant by the professional constituents if we do not deal with our charge of advising the President and the Congress. This is a problem with which we must deal."

Mr. Robert Willard, Information Industry Association, thanked Mr. Benton for his hospitality stating, "With our two groups getting together, it is an historical event, and it is important that we meet each other and get to know each other."

Mr. Willard talked on the topic, "Why IIA has a government-relations program. We look at it as a market-place force, as a regulator, and as a competitor. One concern, which presents extreme problems to IIA, is the role of a provider of communication services in also offering the product itself. This is a complex issue with which IIA has not been able to come to grips," Mr. Willard said. "Can Bell (AT&T) be a publisher of information? There are many arguments for and against. Copyright is another government policy which affects the flow of information--it acts as an encouragement and incentive for people to create information if they know that their investment is going to be protected by government-sanction. IIA is actively involved in the Section 108 review issue, and we have a member on the Advisory Committee," Mr. Willard stated.

IIA is also actively looking at H.R. 1957, A Bill cited as the "International Communications Reorganization Act of 1981," which establishes a Council on International Communications and Information. Another international issue IIA is considering is, "What are foreign countries doing in terms of creating non-tariff barriers to protect their own information companies and, therefore, creating a situation where our industry is disadvantaged in the world market-place."

Several other areas of concern to IIA are: (1) the role of the Postal Service, postal legislation, and the definition of second-class mail; (2) the Paperwork Reduction Act, in particular, the legislation effective 1 April setting up an Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. This particular law gives the Office of Management and Budget unequalled and unprecedented power and authority in the area of information policy; and (3) tracking activity within the Commerce Department--which IIA feels is the most important Cabinet department as far as information policy is concerned. It was reported that one recommendation of the Administration is to phase out the National Telecommunications and Information Agency within the next four years.

On behalf of the Commission Members and staff, Mr. Benton thanked Mr. Willard for his informative presentation.

In the interest of time, Dr. Bearman asked Mr. Chartrand to speak to two specific topics: (1) the international area; and (2) library and information services to people in rural areas.

- (1) International Activities--Mr. Chartrand made reference to a report prepared for the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities by the Congressional Research Service entitled, "International Information Exchange: Relevant Activities of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. "Wonderful comments, by very hard critics, have been received," he said. Copies of the report will be sent to all Commissioners as well as a massive hearings document.

Recent activities in the legislative/international area include hearings held on "International Information Flow." With Dr. Bearman's initiative and Mr. Benton's support, Mr. Chartrand has tried to look at alternative ways in which to move forward. Reference was made to a report prepared, at the request of the Commission, by Joseph Becker and Brigitte Kenney, which set forth a projected set of projects and priorities which are reasonable for the Commission to consider. "The international area is not at all quiescent." Mr. Bill Salmon, top-career official within the Department of State, has prepared a "white paper" for James Buckley of State to review and use to determine which elements of policy will fall within the traditionally science-related areas as opposed to the economic groups within the Department of State. Further, he suggested, Dr. Bearman might want to meet Mr. Salmon in the near future.

- (2) Library and Information Services to People in Rural Areas--Mr. Chartrand stated that approximately two years ago, he made a recommendation to the National Agricultural Library. Through the interest expressed on the Hill, there is now active participation of five offices (both sides of the aisle and both Houses). Mr. Chartrand has met with Congressman George Brown of California. "Mr. Brown is, probably, the foremost thinker and exponent of information policy matters. He does intend to hold hearings and to resubmit revised legislation in the 97th Congress." Another key person interested in this area is Congressman Albert Gore, Jr. of Tennessee. He is the new Chairman on the Science and Technology Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight and has requested Mr. Chartrand's assistance in working in this area of providing technology-supported information services to the farmers, ranchers, etc., of rural areas. Mr. Chartrand is also working with Congressman Charles Rose of North Carolina who has requested Mr. Chartrand's assistance.

Mr. Benton thanked Mr. Chartrand for his report.

AACR II

Mr. Welsh was asked to brief the Members on AACR II, Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, Second Edition. Librarians and users recognize a need for standardization of cataloging. The first attempt to make it an international code was in 1967, and the second attempt is AACR II. The classification is by two systems--Dewey and Library of Congress Classification Systems. The cataloging code consists of the main or author entry with guidelines for describing the author. In addition, it tells how to list a title, imprint, and bibliographic notes. The new system began at the Library of Congress on January 2, 1981, with over 350,000 entries in the authority file.

To give a brief history of the creation of this system, Mr. Welsh explained that MARC (Machine-Reable Cataloging) was established in 1967, which generated a database. "I announced that the Library of Congress was going to close its card catalog (of over 25 million cards) and that we were going to come to grips with the Machine Age," Mr. Welsh said.

Playboy in Braille

Mr. Welsh stated that the Library of Congress does produce Playboy Magazine in Braille (print material only). Congressman Chalmers P. Wylie from Ohio objected when he discovered through Scripps-Howard Paper that LC was producing Playboy in Braille. Playboy does represent some of the most distinguished authors in this country, it is well read, and LC was responding to the demand of the blind readers. LC's position is to stand firm and continue to produce the magazine in Braille.

The matter of "Freedom of Information" was discussed. Mr. Benton stated that he recently received a note from Mr. Keppel asking, "I read the daily press about attempts at censorship in this and other nations, and I become more and more concern at the risk of erosion of freedom of speech, broadcast, and publication. Might it not be time to review NCLIS public positions on this issue, to see whether they might be improved? And perhaps to reissue them as a kind of reminder to Congress and the White House." Mr. Welsh suggested that Ms. Judy Krug of the American Library Association be contacted in this matter. Dr. Keppel agreed to contact Judy Krug to discuss this topic. Mr. Price then reminded the Members that the Commission did issue a press release on Intellectual Freedom in August 1977 which stated:

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science condemns the use of "local community standards" as a threat to the national accessibility of communicative materials through both commercial and noncommercial means, and thus as a threat to each citizen's full exercise of the rights guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments."

ACTION
JUNE
AGENDA

Dr. Bearman suggested that copies of the press release be sent to each Commissioner for review; this topic will also be an agenda item for the next meeting of the Commission.

Mr. Welsh also described the new Betamax Stacker which allows up to 20 hours of recording and TeleScreen which enables use of your television screen in conjunction with a projector.

Preservation of Material

Mr. Welsh stated that, at present, the area of preservation of material is not being advanced. Because of this, the Library of Congress will assume responsibility for preserving Americana and to try to encourage an international program, which would be part of the Universal Availability of Publications (UAP) Program of IFLA, maintaining that each country has responsibility for preserving its own imprint. "This is an attempt to solve the problem of preservation. Unless we begin now to attack the problem, we will never solve it." Mr. Welsh urged. Mr. Welsh then asked Commission support in this Library of Congress project.

National Research Agenda

Dr. Cuadra briefed the Commissioners on the contract to develop a National Research Agenda for the 1980's which his company, Cuadra Associates, was awarded. The contractor is to look at past patterns of research and funding and, based on these findings, develop a framework for library and information service research. In addition, the contractor will identify 25 researchers and practitioners to attend a conference, July 21-24, 1981, at the Airlie House in Airlie, Virginia, to discuss and prioritize research needs. The developing national agenda, hopefully, will provide guidance and inspiration to other agencies as well as to the private sector. Dr. Cuadra pointed out that preservation is one of the research areas.

Executive Director's Report

Dr. Bearman explained, as a means of implementing the resolution from the previous meeting to develop a legislative work plan, that Miss Deborah L. Hyatt was commissioned to prepare a preliminary analysis of the reauthorization of the Library Services and Construction Act, working with Dr. Bearman and Mrs. Reszetar. As part of her work on this paper, Dr. Bearman identified the following eight areas as potential roles of the government in major issue areas:

- (1) research and development, including planning;
- (2) capital investment - computers, buildings
- (3) education - libraries, school curricula and continuing education
- (4) networking
- (5) demonstration programs (seed money)
- (6) dissemination of information
- (7) special needs - handicapped, etc.
- (8) preservation

The Congressional Research Service will be requested by a Congressman to apply its analysis services which, when completed, should present a framework. Dr. Bearman informed the Commissioners that the staff will be working with Congress to conduct Congressional Hearings in either late fall or early spring.

All of the above, of course, leads to the goal of the resolution which is to develop specifications for legislation, Dr. Bearman said.

All agreed that the format, structure and overview presented by Miss Hyatt in her paper were excellent and should be followed in additional "white papers."

Mr. Keppel suggested, "If we are presenting views on the legislative structure, I think we should conduct a study which assesses the present situation of state governments with regard to libraries and information science. The study should provide us with a rough measure of what we know about the capacity of the states to carry out, in effect, new enterprises by use of existing structures. I think we have enough time to do it. I specifically suggest that one of the tasks of the Commission would be an analysis of that kind of administrative-strength capacity, attitudes, etc., which might prepare us for decision-making in recommendations." Mr. Keppel further suggested that this type of study be contracted

out so that 'detachment' is assured, and that the staff consider the suggestion. Dr. Bearman agreed with Mr. Keppel stating, "I think it would be very wise for us to put some money into a good study."

Dr. Cuadra stated, in his opinion, this type of study "is a very touchy, sensitive, and difficult task." Mr. Keppel agreed. Mr. Benton suggested that Mr. Dick Hays, Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, Department of Education, be asked his advice.

Mr. Ambach stressed his concern over such a survey. "I'm not sure you need a study; perhaps careful thought might be the answer," he said.

ACTION After presenting his suggestion, Mr. Keppel recommended that the staff consider presenting a Request for Proposal to analyze the broad areas of Federal/state relations, including the capacity of various structures in relation to library and information science.

ACTION Dr. Bearman requested that each Member carefully review the Preliminary Analysis JUNE of the reauthorization of LSCA and send specific comments to her. Dr. Bearman AGENDA will report on progress at the June meeting.

International Activities

"We have got to take a much stronger role in international activities," Dr. Bearman urged. Several questions need answering, she said, such as: (1) What is the role of the Commission in the area of international activities?" (2) The Commission voted not to pay IFLA (International Federation of Library Association) dues last year; do we want to change this decision? (3) If we pay IFLA dues, should we pay FID (International Federation for Documentation) dues? Dr. Bearman informed the group that several high-level persons from the Embassy of France, including a member of the French Senate, visited the NCLIS Headquarters because they feel NCLIS is the "focal" point in the United States.

Networking Activities

ACTION NCLIS/FLC Study Progress Report--A progress report on the NCLIS/Federal Library JUNE Committee Study, entitled, "Intergovernmental Library Cooperation Project," was AGENDA distributed (Commission Document #81-6). Members requested, and Dr. Bearman agreed, that a complete and up-to-date report be requested from Mr. Trezza in time for the June meeting.

National Periodicals Center/System--Dr. Bearman informed the Members that the Association of Research Libraries is now "carrying the ball" with regard to the National Periodicals Center/System; all requests for information are being referred to them. Dr. Bearman reminded the Members that the NPC/S Task Force has never been officially disbanded.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Friday, April 10, 1981

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Update on WHCLIST Activities

Mrs. Naftalin reported that the WHCLIST steering committee recently had a very efficient meeting during which they adopted the name whcLIST. The newsletter will be called "whcLISTEN." (Note: It has since been decided that the name of the Committee would be in all capital letters: WHCLIST.)

Several decisions were made during that meeting:

- (1) The steering committee will incorporate itself;
- (2) Each regional representative will assume responsibility for follow-up activities within their region;
- (3) After regional information networks are established, they will be turned into a nationwide network called CAN (Citizen Advocacy Network);
- (4) The entire membership of 118 people will meet in September 17-19, 1981, in Detroit, Michigan, which will be their second annual meeting and the second anniversary of the first White House Conference on Library and Information Services;
- (5) Members of the Steering Committee will meet during ALA in June 1981 in San Francisco, California;
- (6) Annual meetings will be held between national White House Conferences every decade;
- (7) Relations with the National Commission must be maintained, especially continued access to Mrs. Reszetar as a resource person.

Members of the Commission agreed that the Commission was, indeed, fortunate to have the volunteer services of this ongoing grassroots group and to have their support and activities continue at a minimum cost to the Commission.

Because of the few responses received on the questionnaire concerning tasks identified from the WHC resolutions by WHCLIST, it was decided to postpone discussion on the results until the June meeting. Members were, again, encouraged to complete the questionnaire at their earliest opportunity and send responses to the NCLIS staff office.

Public Awareness Program

As part of the Commission's public awareness program, she informed the Commission that she has co-signed a letter, with Dr. Bearman, to Mrs. Barbara Bush because of her interest in library and information services. A response has been received, and follow-up is now taking place.

Mrs. Warden and Mrs. Reszetar met with Ms. Susanne Roschwalb of Ruder and Finn to discuss the publication of an NCLIS brochure which would describe Commission activities, goals, purpose, and membership. A first draft of the brochure, prepared by NCLIS staff, was distributed for Commission consideration and reaction. Immediate responses should be made, Dr. Bearman urged, as plans call for finalization of the brochure in time for the June meeting. In addition, Mrs. Warden suggested that the Commission consider carrying and handing-out "press kits." "This would give a boost to the National Commission and would provide a focus in the public eye," Mrs. Warden said. Mr. Ambach reminded the group that there are three audiences--general public (the interested user); experts in the field; and legislatures and Members of Congress, which, probably, would require three different types of "press kits."

Dr. Cuadra strongly encouraged--and recommended--that the staff consider acquiring word processors for efficiency.

Dr. Bearman informed the Members that Library Journal has requested an article on the National Commission, which she is writing. She has asked Readers' Digest to publish an article on library and information services and will keep Members informed of their decision. NCLIS will have a table-top exhibit during the Special Libraries Association meeting in June which, Dr. Bearman hopes, is the first of many.

Members were, again, encouraged to contract their Congressmen and Senators on behalf of libraries and information services. Copies of letters should be sent to Dr. Bearman. Mrs. Warden urged Members to add their "personal touch" to letters, such as using first names rather than formal salutations.

WHC Resolutions

There was considerable discussion of the resolutions emanating from the White House Conference. Dr. Bearman reminded the Members that, as yet, they have not dealt with every resolution. Mr. Ambach replied, "I do not think that the Commission needs to take up each and every resolution and act on each. I do not think it would be useful to the Congress or the President. I think it would be essential that we address the resolutions which tend to cluster toward recommendations on legislation." In addition, Mr. Ambach urged that a distinction be made between the floor resolutions and the paper resolutions. Mr. Benton agreed, stating, "This is necessary and must be done because it is the delegates' wish and desire."

After discussion, it was decided that the staff would assume responsibility for clustering resolutions, in particular, the ones addressed to Federal legislation, in time for the June meeting. Dr. Bearman agreed, stating that the ranking of the resolutions by all Commissioners would be helpful in this "clustering." It was agreed that the WHCLIST Steering Committee should be informed of this decision.

ACTION
JUNE
AGENDA

ACTION

Mrs. Warden requested that a letter be written to Senator Max S. Baucus thanking him for introducing legislation which would provide a tax deduction equal to the fair market value of artwork or manuscripts donated by the creator to a library or museum--the same deduction which is already available to collectors of such works who donate them to nonprofit institutions. This is in response to a resolution passed by the White House Conference delegates--Tax Incentives for Donations of Authors and Artists (B-5). NCLIS staff has the responsibility for preparing the thank-you letter to Senator Baucus.

ACTION

In considering all of the resolutions passed by the White House Conference delegates, Mr. Benton stated, "We are an independent agency. Our only obligation is to consider each and every resolution. If we disagree with a resolution, we state that we disagree. I am proud of this Commission. We have now taken the next major step by finally talking--and committing ourselves--about what we stand for."

Future Meeting Dates

Commission Document #81-17, suggesting meeting dates for future Commission meetings, was included in the meeting packet. After discussion, the following meeting dates and locations were suggested:

January 13-15, 1982 (Wednesday - Friday)
Austin, Texas
(Purpose: To visit the Lyndon B. Johnson Library)

April 20-22, 1982 (Tuesday - Thursday)
Washington, D.C.
(Purpose: In conjunction with ALA Library Week, April 18-24;
Legislative Day will be held on Tuesday, April 20)

August 23-25, 1982 (Monday - Wednesday)
Montreal, Quebec
(Purpose: In conjunction with IFLA to be held August 23-28)

October 13-15, 1982 (Wednesday - Friday)
Washington, D.C.
(Purpose: In conjunction with Association of Research Libraries
Meeting to be held October 13-14)

The NCLIS meeting will be held the last two days scheduled, with the first day set aside for Committee meetings. Mr. Benton agreed to make the necessary contact to visit the LBJ Library in Austin, Texas.

NCLIS Budget

Because of the press for time, it was agreed that the NCLIS budget would be presented and discussed in detail at the June meeting.

JUNE
AGENDA

Federal Dissemination of Information Programs

Dr. Bearman stated that the improvement of Federal information dissemination is one of three Commission priorities for the coming year. Mr. Sophar started his report by stating that he appreciates the Commissioner's decision to establish this area of concern as a priority for fiscal year 1982. He then reported the following information on the several programs he has been involved in.

The SEA/TIS (Science and Education Administration/Technical Information System of the Department of Agriculture) market research study is on schedule and will be completed at the end of August of this year. Papers on the study are scheduled to be presented at the ASIS Annual Meeting in October 1981.

Mr. Keppel asked if the study is agribusiness-oriented. Mr. Sophar answered, "No."

Mr. Sophar reported that the study and other indications show that despite all of Extension's efforts, the positive results of this organization's efforts are not as good as is generally believed. Dr. Cuadra expressed surprise, but deferred discussion to another time. However, Mrs. Warden pointed out that the number and kind of clients that now call on Extension for service have expanded and demand more services.

The Green Thumb Project is now being evaluated by Stanford Research Institute.

Continued funding support for Denver Public Library's Regional Energy/Environmental Center activity may be a problem in fiscal year 1982. Every effort is being made to see that it continues.

Dr. Tefko Saracevic of Case Western Reserve's School of Library Science will complete the Syllabus and Handbook, "Information for Small Enterprises" this summer. The 60 community and rural librarians who took the course gave it uniformly high ratings.

Mr. Sophar informed the Commission that he attended the First National Conference on Depository Libraries and that he was surprised and dismayed by the general negativeness of the speakers and the audience toward the system's performance, although there was also a general feeling that GPO is trying harder to improve the system.

He also talked about the boom situations that are occurring in the heavily impacted Intermountain Region because of the search for energy, resources, and expanded military activity and pointed out that the small Western towns cannot cope. The land-grant universities have joined with community leaders, the state library commissions, USDA's Extension, and others to try to revitalize the rural library as a community learning and information center as a partial answer to the new kinds of problems rapidly-expanding communities are feeling.

Mr. Sophar then introduced Dr. Glenn Wilde, Assistant Dean for Extension and Continuing Education, Utah State University, and Dr. Richard Haycock, Associate Dean for Humanities and Social Services.

Messrs. Wilde and Haycock presented a film entitled, "A View to the Future: Rural Community Learning and Information Centers," and described in detail a feasibility study to investigate the rural public library as a learning and information center in impacted Western rural communities being undertaken by the Intermountain Rural Community Learning and Information Center, headquartered at Utah State University, Logan, Utah. The participating states are: Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming. A survey of community needs and resources throughout the the region was started June 1, 1980, and will end on September 30, 1981.

The anticipated results of the research are:

- (1) The selection of at least one, possibly two, rural impacted communities in each state in which a pilot demonstration will be conducted;
- (2) The development of a delivery system capable of serving educational and cultural needs of a rural community that will be affordable to maintain;
- (3) The generation of relevant data concerning educational needs of rural community clientele, and publication of such data;
- (4) The identification of community leaders and decision-makers who can be consulted on other problems or projects affecting the community;
- (5) The utilization of the data by Cooperative Extension Services, schools, colleges and universities to develop programs to serve educational needs of rural clientele;
- (6) The preparation of at least two proposals to develop both the delivery system to the rural library and the programs available to the library.

Dr. Wilde followed-up on the survey by stating that decision to base the centers at the local libraries was that many facilities exist. Local constituencies are being encouraged to support the program and the response after a little more than a year's effort remains high.

After the presentation, Mrs. Warden asked, "What can the Commission do to help in this project?" Dr. Wilde responded, "We need moral support. We, in the Western states, do not have access to some of the foundations. We need to work with the Commission Members to see if we can open doors to get funding."

Dr. Bearman offered to issue a press release supporting this research and, further, to hand-carry it to select Senators (especially Senator Laxalt) and Congressmen, and to other interested parties. It was suggested that the film be shown when possible. It was agreed that members of the WHCLIST be informed of this program.

ACTION

Mrs. Warden promised to help the group in the state of Montana.

Mr. Benton asked: (1) How can we explore the implications of this model from the standpoint of a Commission like ourselves? (2) How can we bring about conscious-raising of this model? Dr. Bearman responded by suggesting that the Commissioners rank this program on the newly-developed NCLIS Project Evaluation Form. Further, it was suggested that Mr. Sophar and Dr. Bearman present specific recommendations for this project at the June meeting.

ACTION

JUNE
AGENDA

Personnel Committee Report

Dr. Moore reported that the Personnel Committee met over lunch and reviewed the new requirements of the Civil Service Act. A system must be established, she said, for evaluating the Executive Director's performance. The Executive Director evaluates the staff, and the Commission evaluates the Executive Director, Dr. Moore explained. The new Act requires that one person assume the responsibility for evaluating the Executive Director, according to the job elements listed. It was decided that the elected Vice Chairman would be the responsible agent for the first evaluation as Chairman of the Personnel Committee. The system to be used in evaluating the Executive Director's performance will be presented for Commission approval at the June meeting.

AGENDA

Dr. Moore also reported that the Personnel Committee will develop guidelines for determining Commissioner's travel and days of pay. Guidelines are needed, Dr. Moore explained, to help staff maintain budget allocation. Suggestions are welcome, she said.

NCLIS Staff Management Report

Dr. Bearman explained that the staff is in the process of conducting a cost study of all NCLIS projects, task forces, research studies, etc., performed by each member of the staff. The budget analysis of this study will be presented in June.

JUNE
AGENDA

Dr. Bearman agreed with Dr. Cuadra's opinion that a word processor is needed and stated that the staff has been actively inquiring into various models. In addition, the staff has been seeking to turn the office library into a "model library information center." A terminal has been acquired and on-line training has begun. The mailing list is being reviewed and updated so that it can be converted to the word processor when it is obtained. In addition, Dr. Bearman reported, a telephone log of important telephone calls is being maintained.

Staff have rewritten job descriptions and task elements and standards to conform to the new Civil Service Reform Act; a time-consuming and tedious task. Weekly staff meetings are usually held as well as meetings among the Executive Director, Deputy Director and Associate Director.

ACTION JUNE AGENDA Draft guidelines for task force chairmen are being prepared for submission for approval at the June meeting, if possible. The responsibilities of the task force chairmen must be outlined and specified, Dr. Bearman stated.

Another area of special concern to Dr. Bearman is preservation of historical material on library and information services. Dr. Bearman has held conversations with Dr. Boorstin to discuss an oral history project.

ACTION Dr. Bearman reported that she has been travelling and publicly speaking about the Commission and its activities. A list of talks presented will be sent to Commissioners and copies of the speeches are available upon request.

ACTION JUNE AGENDA The NCLIS Newsletter is being drafted and plans are to have it published by summer. A first draft will be available for Commission review at the June meeting.

The Research Associate position has not been filled and tentative plans call for the hiring of two part-time persons rather than one full-time employee. A Policy Analyst and Public Relations expert are both needed, and this seems to be the only solution.

An Editorial Committee, consisting of Dr. Cuadra, Mr. Keppel, and Dr. Moore was formed to review the 1979-80 Annual Report.

The staff has written to various library journals and magazines to request a waiver of copyright for duplication of articles for distribution to the Commission, Dr. Bearman reported.

Public/Private Sector Task Force Report

Dr. Cuadra informed the Members that the members of the Public/Private Sector Task Force plan to hold one last meeting in April. The final report will contain very important principles expected to be welcomed by the Office of Management and Budget and the Reagan Administration, Dr. Cuadra noted. A summary of the principles follow:

- (1) The Federal Government should take a leadership role in creating a framework that would facilitate the development and foster the use of information products and services.
- (2) The Federal Government should establish and enforce policies and procedures that encourage, and do not discourage, investment by the private sector in the development and use of information products and services.

- (3) The Federal Government should not provide information products and services in commerce except when there are compelling reasons to do so, and then only when it protects the private sector's every opportunity to assume the function(s) commercially.
- (4) When government agencies use, reproduce, or distribute information available from the private sector as part of an information resource, product, or service, they must assure that the property rights of the private sector sources are adequately protected.
- (5) The Federal Government should make governmentally distributable information openly available in readily reproducible form, without any constraints on subsequent use.
- (6) The pricing policies of the Federal Government for distributing an information product or service should reflect the true cost of access and/or reproduction and be subject to review by an independent authority.
- (7) The Federal Government should actively use the libraries of the country as a primary means for making government generated information available to the public.

White House Conference resolutions relating and/or pertaining to the public/private sector area should be reviewed and clustered, Mr. Ambach requested.

It was decided that a status report be presented at the June meeting with official action on the report at the October meeting.

Role of the Special Library in Nationwide Networking and Cooperative Programs

In order to strengthen the task force's expertise in the areas of standards and regional networking developments, Mr. Price reported, two additional members have been named. They are: Sandra K. Paul, President of SKP Associates, New York City, and Beth A. Hamilton, Senior Information Scientist of Triodyne Consulting Engineers, Skokie, Illinois. The third meeting of the task force is scheduled for April 27-28 in Washington, D.C.

Cultural Minorities Task Force Report

Mrs. Woods-Robinson reported that the Cultural Minorities Task Force held its second meeting on March 6-7, 1981, in Washington, D.C. The task force expects to produce its final report in June 1982, including recommendations for improvement in five broad areas: materials and resources, personnel, programming, funding, and needs.

In order to receive advice and counsel from librarians and other interested information professionals and representatives of user groups, two hearings will be held by the task force during the annual American Library Association Conference in San Francisco, California, on Saturday, June 27, 1981, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., and on Monday, June 29, 1981, from 8:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

The issue of information sources to the home (information-rich versus information poor) was raised by Mr. Keppel. Mrs. Wood-Robinson informed the Commissioners that a member of the task force is addressing this need. Dr. Cuadra recommended that a presentation be made on "resource information in the home" by outside experts at a future Commission meeting.

Dr. Moore informed the Commission that "The Cultural Minorities Task Force does not replace the Committee on American Indians; they are two different situations. Our Indian work is continuous, and we must pursue it."

Community Information and Referral Task Force Report

The last meeting of the task force was postponed, Mrs. Woods-Robinson reported, and the next meeting is scheduled for May 18-19, 1981, in Washington, D.C.

Education Commission of the States

Dr. Moore urged the Members and staff to pursue vigorously continued relationship with the Education Commission of the States. "We need to strengthen our relationships with organizations with goals which match ours," Dr. Moore stated. It was suggested that the Governors Conference is another group which the Commission should contact.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Benton praised the NCLIS staff in their preparations for the meeting. "This is the most substantive meeting of the Commission I can remember since I have been Chairman," he said.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

NCLIS PROJECT EVALUATION FORM

Project Name _____ Rated by _____

Project objectives, Method/Procedures, Expected Outcome, and Likely Benefits:

RATINGS (circle)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. <u>Breadth of User Community.</u> How large a group will benefit <u>directly</u> from the project results?</p> <p>5 = 90% of library/information users
 4 = 75% of library/information users
 3 = 50% of library/information users
 2 = 25% of library/information users
 1 = 10% of library/information users</p> <p>2. <u>Likelihood of Useful Impact.</u> How likely is it that the Project outcome will make a significant difference in the quality of life or the economic position of the U.S.?</p> <p>5 = almost a certainty
 4 = very likely
 3 = somewhat likely
 2 = somewhat doubtful
 1 = extremely doubtful</p> <p>3. <u>Degree of Urgency.</u> Must the Project be started now, or can it wait?</p> <p>5 = must be started immediately
 4 = must be started within 6 months
 3 = it could wait about one year
 2 = it could wait about two years
 1 = it could wait at least 3 years</p> | <p>4. <u>Amount of NCLIS Expertise.</u> How much substantive/technical competence is there within the Commission/Staff in the subject matter of the Project?</p> <p>5 = high; several experts on Com/Staff
 4 = moderate; 1 expert on Com/Staff
 3 = passable; 2-3 with some exposure
 2 = little; 1 person with some exposure
 1 = none</p> <p>5. <u>Availability of Other Means.</u> Are there better alternatives for project sponsorship?</p> <p>5 = NCLIS is the <u>only</u> resource
 4 = NCLIS is the best of several possible alternatives
 3 = Others could sponsor the project equally well
 2 = Others would be better sponsors
 1 = Others would be far better sponsors</p> <p>6. <u>Position on Library-Information Continuum.</u> Services/operations are:</p> <p>5 = complete traditional library
 4 = more like (1) than like (5)
 3 = equally balanced between (5) and (1)
 2 = more like (5) than like (1)
 1 = completely non-library (e.g., non-text, commercial, electronic)</p> |
|---|---|

ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>A. <u>Cost of Staff Resources,</u> including cost to the government of on-loan personnel, associated benefits, and the pro-rated cost of all headquarters overhead:</p> <p align="right">\$ _____ K</p> | <p>B. <u>Other Costs,</u> including Commission salaries and travel and funds provided to, or spent for, other parties, such as Task Force members, contractors, and consultants:</p> <p align="right">\$ _____ K</p> | <p>C. <u>Total Cost</u> (the sum of A + B)</p> <p align="right">\$ _____ K</p> <p>D. <u>Percent of Total NCLIS budget:</u></p> <p align="right">_____ %</p> |
|--|--|---|