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The problem considered by this research project was:

What effects have federal funds from the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) had upon state and local public libraries in Louisiana, 1956 through 1973?

The specific objectives of this study included:

1. Identification of those public library programs and services on the state and local levels in Louisiana partially or totally supported with LSA or LSCA funds during the period 1956 through 1973.

2. Identification of the planning procedures and considerations involved in the use of the federal funds in Louisiana under the LSA and LSCA.


4. Identification of short and long-range planning considerations in the establishment and support of public library programs and services in Louisiana with LSA and LSCA funds.

The technique for accumulating the data pertinent to this study was a combination of documentary and historical. The annual program plans and annual reports submitted by the Louisiana State Library under the LSA and the LSCA were reviewed and reported in summary fashion. Related correspondence and memoranda were examined and interviews were conducted with the appropriate State Library staff members.
The Louisiana State Library emphasized the use of public library demonstrations under the LSA and LSCA between fiscal 1957 and 1969 as the best means for establishing public libraries in parishes previously without such. Under the LSCA, the State Library turned its attention to the improvement of established public libraries through a centralized processing center and cooperative library systems. Emphasis was also placed upon the evaluation LSCA funded projects and the provision of library services to special groups like the blind, physically handicapped, aged, and residents of state health and penal institutions.

The Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library services and Construction Act (LSCA) had no direct effect upon local public library funding effort, local public library budget procedures, and local public library service planning. LSA and LSCA money had a negative effect upon state legislative support for public libraries in Louisiana, specifically the State Library. Additional state support was generated for institutional libraries. There was no apparent effect upon the State Library's budget procedures. LSA and LSCA funds did provide the impetus for more substantial planning for library development by the State Library. Federal funds were employed by the State Library on a long-term availability basis, although the federal legislation was terminal.

The recommendations made included:

1. The Louisiana State Library should formulate a contingency plan in the event of possible fiscal crises caused by a termination of the federal funds.
2. The Louisiana State Library should begin weaning the cooperative library systems of their dependence upon federal money.

3. The Louisiana State Library should allow and encourage critical participation of persons outside of its organization in public library planning.

4. Future federal legislation for public libraries should include incremental matching requirements for maintenance of fiscal effort.

5. Future federal legislation for public libraries should employ advance funding procedures.

6. Further research in the fiscal effects of federal money upon public library funding, planning, and budgeting should be done in Louisiana and other states.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Public library services have been a vital segment of the educational picture in the United States. The learning process does not cease when a person leaves the formal classroom but continues on an informal basis throughout life. The public library is the basic element in the informal education process beyond the formal school years and is increasing in importance within the scheme of formal education.

American education has evolved into an instrument employed for the strengthening, perpetuating, and safeguarding of the American way of life. The public library is in a unique position to furnish much of the necessary informational resources required for our educational and socio-political systems to function. To accomplish this purpose, the public library must be adequately supported not just in rhetoric, but also in money.

The federal government formally recognized the significance of American public libraries with the enactment of the Library Services Act (see Appendix B) in 1956 for the extension of public library services to previously unserved and rural areas. This recognition was further strengthened by the Library Services and Construction Act (see Appendix C) of 1964 which provided assistance to urban public libraries as well as rural. While signing the Library Services and Construction Act on February 11, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson stated (Bowker, 64:163):
This nation needs a larger and more diversified collection of books. We need better housing for these books. We sorely need libraries closer to the people, whether through more centrally located libraries, or through bookmobiles and branch locations. The central fact of our times is this: books and ideas are the most effective weapons against intolerance and ignorance.

The federal government is justified in sharing significantly in financing the cost of the American educational system, because the federal government is in an even better position than the states in obtaining funds from the two major sources of government, personal and corporate income (Morphet, 521). Yet, relatively little research has been done in an attempt to record the uses of funds under the various federal education acts. This has been especially true in relation to the Library Services Act (LSA) and the subsequent Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA).

Certainly, it is imperative that the spending of public funds be constantly scrutinized concerning the needs for such spending and the results of the application of these funds to specific areas of concern in our societal fabric.

THE PROBLEM

The problem considered by this research project was:

What effects have federal funds from the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) had upon state and local public libraries in Louisiana from 1956 through 1973?

This study specifically dealt with identification of the following points:

1. Those public library programs and services on the state and local levels in Louisiana partially or totally supported with Library Services Act (LSA) or Library Services and

2. The planning procedures and considerations for determining the applications of ISA and LSCA funds in public library programs and services on the state and local levels in Louisiana during the period of the study.

3. The budgetary concepts and techniques for distributing ISA and LSCA funds among public library programs and services on the state and local levels in Louisiana during the period of the study.

4. The short and long-range concerns affecting the uses of ISA and LSCA funds for public library programs and services on the state and local levels in Louisiana during the period of the study.

5. The rationale for developing those specific public library programs and services partially or totally supported with ISA or LSCA funds on the state and local levels in Louisiana during the period of the study.

6. The operational objectives of those specific public library programs and services partially or totally supported with ISA or LSCA funds on the state and local levels in Louisiana during the period of the study.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

According to Robert Ellis Lee (1967:121), education is a process by which an individual, either through his own efforts or the help of another individual or group purposely develops competencies, acquires desirable attitudes, and new knowledge. This process is based upon purposeful learning experiences which are distinct from random or incidental learning experiences. The educational process within the library context is concerned with intellectual, vocational, cultural, aesthetic, personal, and community development. The ultimate educational aim, then, of the public library is the advancement of continuing education that is manifested in such specific objectives as increasing self-realization and personal awareness, improving the social
and economic environment, increasing civic enlightenment, extending community awareness, and providing a basis for collective and personal decisions and actions.

According to Lee (1967:1), the public library was the first tax-supported public agency established in the United States for the informal education of adults. It was specifically organized to provide an opportunity for mature persons to continue to further their education through their own efforts.

Public library services are a vital segment of the educational picture in the United States. To neglect public library services is certain to weaken the educational foundation of our democratic society. The necessity of providing the public with as many different ideas and experiences through the written word was well expressed by Ruth Ann Davies (1969:3) in the following statement:

Democratic concern for education is predicated on the assumption that an educated citizenry will be competent to act intelligently and thereby preserve its freedom. Conversely, an uneducated electorate not perceiving dangers inherent in unwise decisions will enforce false doctrines and as a result lose its freedom.

The public library can only become a force for educational excellence when it begins to function as an integral and compatible component of the total educational program of a community. The elements must be brought together as a whole and be better coordinated than in the past (Davies, 1969:3).

The public library and the formal educational programs complement one another in their educational work with the virtue of each being that it is not the other. The educational work of the public library should
not be merely an imitation of the formal practices of the schools for such would impair the effectiveness of the public library's educational services (Lee, 1966:122).

The major function of schools and colleges is to provide formal instruction, while the function of the public library is to provide materials, assistance, stimulation, group services and activities, and special services and programs. Thus, the public librarian is a helper, advisor, and stimulator with the public library user being aware of his responsibility for his own education (Lee, 1966:122).

To insure students and those outside of the formal school structure the best possible education, they must be provided with access to the largest possible reservoir of knowledge in the community. This encompasses the total education system: schools, colleges, and universities, and public libraries (Humphry, 1968:v).

A public library has had two major and unique functions. First, it makes possible for meetings of the mind with ideas which are not limited by ones normal boundaries of time, space, and social or economic level. Second, it is the institution in our society which allows and encourages the development and extension of ideas, not merely their absorption but their active generation. The public librarian is "a teacher whose subject is learning itself, and his class has no limits on age, field of study, or degree of competence" (Knight, 1969:496).

The public library has been in a unique position to furnish much of the necessary knowledge required for our system to function. As part of the vast educational network of the nation, the public library has had a responsibility to be a primary source of information and knowledge for millions of Americans of all ages. To accomplish these lofty goals,
the public library must be adequately supported, not just in rhetoric, but in financial support (Frantz, Sept. 1966:544).

An Overview of the Library and Construction Act—Title I by Jules Mersel and others (1969:3) was intended as a comprehensive analysis of the effects of Federal funds under the LSA and ISCA on public library services in the United States. The study was done under contract for the U.S. Office of Education with a team from System Development Corporation of Santa Monica, California, visiting the following eleven states: Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas, Arkansas, Utah, California, and Washington (Mersel, 1969:3). Because of the superficiality of the study and the diversity of programs from state to state, the authors in their suggestions for future related research stated that their project clearly demonstrated the necessity for a broader and more systematic analysis of the overall impact of federal funds upon state and local expenditures for public libraries in each state. Specific recommendations for further studies were the corresponding decreases or increases in state and local support as generated by LSA and ISCA programs, the impact of federal funds upon long-range planning, the effects of Federal monies upon budgeting procedures, and the political implications of public library services on the state and local levels (Mersel, 1969:334).

This research project has attempted to summarily combine a number of federally funded programs into a manageable document that would permit a ready examination of the pertinent facts on the use of federal money in the public libraries of Louisiana. This study was also intended to provide a means for the evaluation of the effects of federal funds upon public libraries and to provide a basis for determining the
significance of federal funds in supporting and providing public library services to the citizens of Louisiana. It was also intended to serve as a reference source concerning what library programs and services have been employed and how they have been implemented, and in some cases why their function ceased. Additionally, the study was to supplement and to answer questions raised by other research concerning the effect of federal programs.

Finally, this study augments the historical material already available on the development of public library services in Louisiana by providing information on the uses of federal funds under the LSA and LSCA in Louisiana which has not been considered in depth by other researchers.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of the study were the following:

1. Selectivity was employed in restricting the research for this study to the Library Services Act and the Library Services and Construction Act in support of public library services and programs in Louisiana during the period 1956-1973.

2. Only public library programs and services in Louisiana were examined.

3. Only federally funded services established and coordinated by the Louisiana State Library and contained in its budget, including parish demonstrations, institutional demonstrations services, centralized processing, etc., during the period of this study were identified and described.

4. Only federally funded services established and coordinated by parish and municipal public libraries in Louisiana and contained in their budgets during the period of the study were identified and described.

5. The rationale and procedures of library budgeting were scrutinized only in relation to those programs and services fully or partially funded by the LSA or LSCA in Louisiana.

6. The sources of local and state funds, though mentioned, were not analyzed.
7. Analysis of the total amounts of federal, state, and local funds and the fluctuations in these amounts during and between each year of the study was accomplished by inspection of comparative tables.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study the following terms will be defined:

1. Federal - Activities under the direct control and authority of one or more of the three branches of the central government of the United States.

2. Fiscal year - The financial year beginning on July 1 and ending June 30 of the next calendar year. The numerical designation of a fiscal year was the calendar year of its termination.

3. Local - One or more of the constituent parts of a state government which serve the needs of a particular and limited district, such as a county, parish, or municipality.

4. ISA - An abbreviation for Library Services Act.


6. Program - A library activity in indirect contact with the public, such as cooperative purchasing arrangements, centralized processing, or cooperative planning.

7. Public Library - A library open to use by the general public. A public library was distinguished from school libraries, college and university libraries, and special libraries like business or law that are limited in use to a specific clientele. Public library programs or services provided and controlled by a public library or libraries.

8. Service - A library activity in direct contact with the public, such as the circulation of materials or reference services.

9. State - The government of one of the fifty constituent units of the United States, such as Louisiana.
PROCEDURE

The technique for accumulating data pertinent to this study was a combination of documentary and historical. While similar to the historical approach, documentary research was different in that it excluded "remains" or artifacts as sources and included contemporary documents. From the accumulated documents, interpretations of the significance of the facts contained were made (Mouley, 1970:288).

The preliminary phase of the research was a review of the literature available on similar studies, budgetary theory, and budgetary procedures related to public library services and programs. This material was obtained from an examination of monographs, published articles in journals, and unpublished theses and dissertations.

The initial phase of the study involved obtaining the necessary information related to the specific objectives of the study.

Public library programs and services receiving LSA and ISCA funding were identified through the examination of written program proposals, annual financial and narrative reports, state-wide plans, local plans, budget records, and surveys. The sources and LSA and ISCA funds providing support to public libraries in Louisiana were generally ascertained by scrutiny of the same records.

The planning procedures and considerations for determining the applications of LSA and ISCA funds were identified by locating and examining written program proposals, state-wide plans, local plans, memoranda, and by conducting interviews with the professional library personnel involved. Consideration was given to the decisionmaking process and how it may have been influenced by the availability of federal funds. Identification of the general budgetary concepts and
techniques for distributing ISA and LSCA funds was accomplished by examining budget proposals and reports and interviewing the Louisiana State Library finance officer.

The identification of short and long-range concerns affecting the uses of ISA and LSCA funds in Louisiana was accomplished by examining the written program proposals, correspondence, state-wide plans, local plans, and through interviews with Louisiana State Library personnel as to the reasons for their decisions, personal reactions, and unreported considerations. The rationale for establishing public library programs and services supported by ISA and LSCA funds was determined through examination of state-wide plans, correspondence, memoranda, local plans, written program proposals, and also by interviewing those Louisiana State Library personnel involved in the development of these programs and services.

State and local plans, program proposals, and projected budgets were compared with the subsequent annual reports and surveys to determine the operational objectives of the public library programs and services financed with ISA or LSCA funds.

The data for the study were collected chronologically beginning with the year 1956. As it was accumulated, the information was topically categorized according to the source, whether program proposals, annual narrative reports, reports of actual expenditures, correspondence, or memoranda.

The subsequent phase of the study was the analysis and evaluation of the data to determine the effect of federal money under the ISA and LSCA upon public libraries in Louisiana. This was accomplished by comparing the uses of these federal funds in Louisiana with the inten-
tion of the legislation which was to provide "seed" money to generate increased support from state and local sources during a specified period of time (Mersel, 1969:30-31).

A table was devised indicating the effort index score of each parish library in Louisiana for eleven years of the sixteen year period. The effort index score was used for comparisons and was obtained by dividing the total personal income of a parish into the total amount of local funds expended by the parish or regional library for operational costs, exclusive of capital outlay (Mersel, 1969:109). Information about the total personal income of Louisiana parishes was available for only the eleven years presented (Coleman, 1974).

The total local, state, and federal expenditures for public library services on the state and local levels in Louisiana in each of the years of the study were adjusted from nominal to deflated or real values to provide a clearer picture of actual variations in financial support. Adjustment in dollar values was computed using the Consumer Price Index (see Appendix F) with the base year of 1967 (Willis, Nov. 7, 1974). This, along with the other data collected, indicated the effects of federal funding via the LSA and ISCA upon public library financing in Louisiana.

The specific analysis of the data and the formulation of inferences was made by inspection of the prepared tables and was subjective in nature since the material to be reviewed could not be readily reduced to strictly quantitative form. Recommendations were based upon the inferences and were comprehensive in terms of how past applications of federal monies might be considered for future long-range planning for public library services in Louisiana. Finally, an attempt was made to develop a statement on the dependency of Louisiana public
libraries upon the availability of federal funds and whether the services and programs during the period 1956-1973 could have been developed and maintained without LSA and LSCA support.
Chapter 2

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

There was a relative paucity of literature published specifically about the effects that federal monies have had upon public library funding and budgeting during the period of the Library Services Act and the subsequent Library Services and Construction Act. More material was available directly dealing with public library funding, budget development, budgetary objectives, and short versus longrange objectives.

In order to establish a knowledge base by which the data relating to federal funding of public libraries in Louisiana during the period could be more readily grasped, the available literature regarding public library organization, funding, and planning was examined and discussed. Additional background material concerning the purposes, objectives, and handling of federal public library funds was presented to further assist one in understanding the data and the subsequent analyses.

In order to locate related research and literature of value as pertinent background material the following reference sources were examined: for periodical and monograph literature, the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature and Library Literature; for dissertations, Dissertation Abstracts; and for research sponsored by the Bureau of Research, the United Office of Education, and materials collected by the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) clearinghouses, Research in Education and the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications. Additional material was obtained through sources cited in
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

There was a surprising lack of studies evaluating the impact of federal funds upon public library services and programs under the Library Services Act and the Library Services and Construction Act. Titles of numerous articles giving the impression of exhaustive analyses were, after examination, mainly reviews of the purposes of the legislation, general rationalizations for more money, or general statistics of librarians added to staffs and the number of books and bookmobiles purchased. These studies were very broad in scope with interpretations based upon superficial research.

Probably the major study on the impact of LSA or LSCA programs upon public libraries was that headed by Jules Mersel (1969) which dealt mainly with LSCA Title I funding in the period July 1964 to June 1968. This was a survey done by System Development Corporation of Santa Monica, California under contract with the United States Office of Education. The study was presented in final form in March 1969. A team of investigators visited public library agencies in eleven states selected on a regional basis: Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas, Arkansas, Utah, California, and Washington.

The survey team employed a case study approach and spent two weeks interviewing state library agency and local public library personnel in each of the eleven states. The study focused on projects supported by the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964 as amended with only superficial consideration of the LSCA's predecessor,
the Library Services Act (LSA) of 1956.

The objective of the LSCA Title I programs in each of the eleven states considered was to extend public library services to areas "without such services or with inadequate services" (Mersel, 1969: 313). The state administrative agencies chose a number of strategies to achieve their objectives for improved public library services. Nine of the states studied decided to use LSCA moneys to stimulate additional local tax support for public library services. Two methods were used. One was the demonstration grant by which the state funded, partially or entirely, a new library service in a community with the understanding that the community would assume at a later date the financial support of the service or have it removed by the state agency. The second policy was to make LSCA support contingent upon the amount of local support provided.

Another developmental strategy identified by Mersel was the formation of new public library systems for cooperative endeavors. Nine of the states used LSCA Title I funds to induce public libraries to join systems so that individual libraries could increase their services by sharing professional resources and materials. This concept was attractive because each library was supposedly able to augment its strength at only moderate additional cost.

A third use of LSCA Title I funds cited was that of attracting professional librarians by offering scholarships with contracts to serve in the state, supplementing salaries of public libraries to make employment in them more attractive, and supporting programs that would cause undergraduate college students to select librarianship as their field of graduate study.
The last two strategies for the application of federal funds under Title I of the LSCA, as revealed by the study, were the improvement of centralized material collections within the state agency and the development of library networks. All of the states in the study made their holdings available as a resource upon which smaller library organizations could draw. Five of the states created networks with LSCA Title I funds and sometimes with Title III money so that local libraries had a larger data base upon which to operate.

Ten of the eleven states included in the study used federal funds to establish continuing education programs for the professional development of staffs. Five of the states provided LSCA money for surveys of library needs of local communities. Ten of the states made direct grants to libraries for the improvement of book collections, reference services, and audiovisual resources. Six states attempted to extend public library services to those groups labeled as "disadvantaged" by employing LSCA money to fund outreach programs. Two states had LSCA programs that gave grants for cooperation with schools so that better library services could be made available to students. Six of the states financed public relations programs with LSCA funds.

All of the eleven states offered consultant services to local libraries as augmentation of the local libraries' ability to extend services. Also, all of the state agencies provided centralized processing services for local libraries. The unit cost of technical processing decreased as the volume of materials increased, and the centralized processing programs of the states funded with LSCA money allowed volume discounts for the participating libraries.

A major consideration of the states included in the study was short-range versus long-range planning in relation to the duration of
the LSCA funding programs. Many of the states operated on the basis that the federal funds would continue to flow indefinitely and made long-range plans accordingly. Other states, such as New York, were more conservative and operated as if the terminal date of LSCA would not be extended. New York used its federal funds mainly for activities of a terminal nature. The state of Washington strictly emphasized demonstration projects that could be continued with funds from state or local sources.

The study identified several major problem areas related to the use of funds under the Library Services Construction Act (LSCA). These problems supposedly did not arise because of the administration of LSCA programs by the states but were due to more general circumstances that were not alterable by better management of the federal public library programs. The major problem was that of insufficient funds available for public library operation. None of the fifty states at the time of the study had the five dollar per capita expenditure specified by the American Library Association as the minimum necessary for adequate public library service.

The eleven states differed so much in their handling and uses of LSCA monies that the System Development Corporation research team had to be very cautious in making unrestricted generalizations. It was evident that the eleven states in the sample could not even be considered typical of their regions. Furthermore, singling out any state within any region as typical of all or even most in that region was an impossible task.

S. Janice Kee's (1974) unpublished study of the impact of LSA and LSCA funds on public libraries in Texas from 1956 through 1972 was similar in its objectives to the present research project but was not as
exhaustive. The Kee paper was merely a general review of annual reports and other issuances of the Texas State Library along with a report of a broad, non-scientific opinion survey of nearly a hundred public librarians in the state. Also, the impressions of the author were based upon her active participation in the federal aid programs under the LSA and the LSCA. Kee stated that little was known about the extent of influence on public libraries in specific areas or states as a result of the federal library legislation in recent years.

The Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr., study (1960) merely discussed the basic forms of state-aid to public libraries which were aid in the form of services and leadership and aid in the form of financial grants to local libraries or library systems. Different types of financial grants-in-aid were defined in broad terms. General mention of the Library Services Act (LSA) was made in terms of increased processing of materials for LSA projects and that short-term demonstration programs increased in number during the period.

A paper from the same period by Charles F. Gosnell (1960) merely alluded to possible influences of the LSA upon state-aid programs for support and improvement of local library services. Though the title contained "Evaluation", the discussion was only in broad terms with little relevance to this study. Lawrence L. Durisch's (1960) discussion of the relationship between local, state, and federal agencies was again only superficial and mainly philosophical.

PUBLIC LIBRARY LAWS

The public library has traditionally been a local political institution responding effectively or ineffectively to the needs of a rather compact community. The role of the public library began to move
in what many people considered a drastically new direction. In the
sixties society demanded that the public library broaden its services
and share its resources and accept funds and leadership from two or more
governmental levels. Library boards were persuaded that library
cooperation was a virtue and that the local-state-federal type of
partnership was something very remote from federal control. To include
educational and library benefits under the cloak of the constitutional
phrase "for the common defense and general welfare" was difficult for
many people to accept. This negative attitude caused very slow progress
in the development of improved public library programs and services, but
this position has been greatly eroded by federal funds (Kee, 1967: 9).

Library legislation, or the more encompassing phrase "library
law", has had three connotations that correspond to the three basic
areas of law: constitutional law, statutory law, and administration
law. Library law, though having a firm legal foundation, has not been
static but constantly changing, adjusting, and evolving. Library
legislation has often been enacted to put what already has been worked
out in experience into the form of formalized legal precepts (Ladenson,
1970: 175).

Public Library Funding

Traditionally, the sources of public library revenues were direct
appropriations, library taxes, endowment funds and gifts, and more
recently federal funds. A fairly common procedure was the direct
appropriation which involved submitting a budget request for public
review and open discussion before the appropriating body of a local
government, usually the city council or county board (Bowler, 1964: 123-
124).
Another common procedure for accumulating public library revenue was the library tax on real or personal property and in some cases sales taxes. Fixed library tax rates often changed by upward revision. In 1964 it was reported that the majority of libraries receiving primary support from fixed library taxes on local property were not yet using the maximum rate authorized by law. Only one state reported using as much as ninety percent of the maximum public library tax rate (Bowler, 1964: 125).

Of the less important sources of money were endowment funds which were more common in the northeastern states, especially New York. In 1964 state funds accounted for less than ten per cent of total public library funds with federal funds probably less. Self-generated money such as rental collections, overdue fines, payments for lost or damaged materials, and nonresident fees were inconsequential (Bowler, 1964: 126).

According to Hannis S. Smith (1970: 273) there was almost total inflexibility regarding library financing in contrast to the flexibility in public library management. Only fourteen of thirty-six states studied had no specified limit on the rate of taxation permitted for public library support. In 1969-1970 Vermont permitted a tax rate equivalent to three dollars and Virginia permitted an amount sufficient to fulfill the minimum standards set by the state agency. In all other states there was a specified maximum on the permissive mill rate. In nine states the maximum rate was one mill and in only five of the thirty-six states with a maximum levy was the rate higher than three mills. It was not unusual to find that states varied millage according to cities, villages, and counties with the county rates allowable usually being the lowest (Smith, 1973: 274).
With the Library Services Act (LSA) as a catalyst, the Board of Library Commissioners, the Bureau of Library Extension, and library leaders throughout the state of Massachusetts succeeded in having the state legislature pass the State Aid to Public Libraries law in 1960. This law was amended in 1963 and authorized the establishment of a state-wide program of regional public library support and service and direct grants to municipalities whose libraries met certain minimum standards. Massachusetts used its state-aid money as matching funds to qualify for LSA and Library Service and Construction Act (ISCA) funds (Mersel, 1969: 48).

The 1963 amendment to the Massachusetts' State Aid to Libraries Act of 1960 provided that the source of funds for state grants to local cities and towns would come from the general fund of the state government. Local governing bodies were obligated to use these state funds for public libraries. Under this arrangement, Massachusetts had a true state-aid to public libraries law, and state appropriated public library funds were available to fully earn the LSA allocations (Mersel, 1969: 49).

In addition to specific tax laws and governmental administrative regulations, those laws granting local authorities power to issue construction bonds for public buildings have vitally affected public libraries. This authority to issue construction bonds varied widely among and within governmental units, even within the same state, and was not usually found in public library laws. It did appear in the Alabama law governing independent public library law which provided the means for financing the erection of public building without recourse to the difficulties and hazards of a bond election (Smith, 1970: 276).
Library Agencies

Walter Brahm (1970: 273) in his study of legislation relating to state libraries found that state library legislation was far from uniform, but that the powers of library boards in a large number of states were quite similar. The most uniform legal provision regarding the management of public libraries was that the library board may hire a librarian who was responsible either to a library board or other governing authority which hired him, and that in consultation with such authorities the librarian could hire other personnel to operate the library and its programs and services. The board, or whatever term was applied, was the identifiable policymaking body, and in most cases, the librarian was required to operate within that policy. In the area of public library management, as opposed to that of library finance, most public library laws were so flexible that it was possible for librarians to adopt the most up-to-date library practices without having to amend the law.

John Humphry and James Humphry III (1968: 89) in their study of Louisiana libraries wrote that state-aid to libraries was recognized by most states as a legitimate public expense. Many communities, small in area or thinly populated, were not and probably never would be in a position to support by themselves a library that met any acceptable standards.

According to the Humphry study (1968: 90), the Louisiana state government was not assuming its fair share of support for public library services. The state legislature only appropriated for the Louisiana State Library the minimum required funds that assured maximum allotment of federal funds under the LSA and LSCA between fiscal years 1957 and 1967. During this period the state increased its funds for State
Library programs and services by only $6,146 while in the same period the federal government increased its support from $40,000 to $631,904. It was obvious, according to the Humphry study, that a major increase of support in the future should be from the state government since funds from the local parishes and the federal government were already substantial (Humphry, 1968: 90).

Hannis S. Smith (1970: 278) indicated that those elements of library law which librarians believed to require the most change were in the financing of public libraries in the area of state aid to local public libraries. Another area of major concern was the improvement in laws providing for larger units of service whether they were named regional libraries, multi-county libraries, or library systems. Present laws were considered weak in providing for adequate involvement of smaller public libraries already in existence in regional library participation. Also, refusals by local agencies to join these larger service units created problems in duplication of services and programs and future growth.

STATE LIBRARIES

In 1955, Robert D. Leigh in an appearance before a committee of the United States House of Representatives stated that the development of strong state library agencies ought to be a high priority in the public library program for the years immediately ahead. This objective was considered a part of the general movement at the time to revitalize state government in the best interest of basic representative federalism. Leigh believed that the state governments must be able to plan broadly and assume leadership in many fields, some of which were traditional and well-accepted and others, such as public libraries,
which were just emerging as governmental responsibilities (Durisch, 1960: 109).

Organization

The general trend in state government toward more uniform and more central management of the administrative procedures common to all agencies has had a significant impact on state level public library agencies. This trend toward centralization was manifested in purchasing, the control of office space, records management, and the control of data-processing equipment, as well as in the more traditional areas of budgeting, accounting, and personnel management. As usually the case in centralization, the decision-making process was switched to or at least shared with the staff of the central agencies and with the political authority to whom the smaller units reported, whether governor, legislature or both. The library agencies least subject to this trend were those controlled by a strong elected executive officer such as a secretary of state or a chief school officer. The budgetary control of such agencies was less stringent than that applied to agencies directly or indirectly under the governor's power of appointment. The reduced severity of budget review also applied to those library agencies within the offices of elected officers and was a reflection of their independent influence with the state legislature (Monypenny, 1966: 137).

Most state public library agencies, though employing different titles for departments, were similar in overall organization. The general pattern of organization, according to a study by Phillip Monypenny and Guy Garrison (1966: 9), was of two major types. The first integrated administrative responsibility for library functions
with all or most of the functions concentrated in one or not more than two agencies. The other organizational pattern diffused administrative responsibility for public library functions with all or most of the functions handled by separate agencies.

Functions

The term "public library" usually included county libraries serving townships without libraries, or with inadequate ones, and state libraries. State libraries supported the public library systems in their respective states and did in some cases provide assistance to school libraries. The state public library agencies often were entrusted with the planning of public library systems on a regional and state basis and with administering state and federal aid to local public libraries. In many instances the state agency was responsible for legal collections and resources important to the operation of the general state government (Library Services for the Nation's Needs, 1969: 81).

Monypenny and Garrison (1966: 11) stated that the types of library activities carried on by the states were very similar in spite of the appearance of diversity in administrative structure. The most striking single difference was the presence or absence of an agency designated "State Library." Although the activities of such an agency varied widely, it was usually characterized by a comprehensive general collection of books and other published informational materials and a relatively large specialized staff. The "State Library" was found to normally circulate materials directly to persons in areas without local library service and provided supplementary circulating materials and reference items to libraries. In its traditional form this agency was responsible for public library extension and development.
A representative organizational structure for a state library agency was that of the Washington State Library. The Library Development Division of the Washington State Library had primary responsibility for projects under the LSCA Title I. Consultants in the division worked with library boards, government officials at the municipal levels, lay groups and individuals generally interested in establishing, extending and improving public library services in their areas. The Administration Division had direct supervision of the state plan for library development and the general operation of the state library, and coordination of all its programs and services. The Reader Services Division of the Washington State Library provided mail service to areas without public library services, interlibrary loan, institutional library service, distribution of Washington state documents to depositories, supervision of the federal and state documents depository system, service to governmental departments, and supplementary reference service to libraries requesting assistance. The Technical Processes Division had responsibility for acquisitions, cataloging and processing of all state library materials, centralized processing and cataloging for a regional library system, and book catalog production for two regional library systems. Consultants from this division also provided advice on automation, cataloging, processing, and various other library activities (Mersel, 1969: 298).

Walter Brahm (1970: 266) stated that integration of public library services into one agency of the state, a factor that was lacking in many states, could prove to be a major step in the strengthening of state level public library agencies. Grants-in-aid, advisory services, interlibrary loans, supplementary collection support, reference assistance, and library development were so interrelated that, if
divided, they invariably reduced the ability of the state to supervise, control, and coordinate total public library services of an effective sort.

Roberta Bowler (1964: 132) indicated that state library functions were usually of two general types, general service and extension. These two general service areas were based upon four common programs which were administration, loan service, advisory and consultant programs, and public library demonstration services mainly of a regional sort.

In their study, Phillip Monypenny and Guy Garrison (1966: 9) identified seven functions of state library agencies that were concentrated into a single or into several different agencies. These seven functions of state libraries included: the maintenance of a general circulating collection, the operation of a general reference collection, the provision of a library consultant or development service, the management of an archives and record program, the provision of a legislative reference and research service, the maintenance of a law collection, and the maintenance of a historical collection.

According to Monypenny and Garrison (1966: 10), Connecticut had a dual organization which provided for all seven of the state library functions; Vermont and Massachusetts provided for six in dual agencies. In these three states there was a library extension agency which had the sole responsibility for the state-wide development of public library services and a separate state library that provided a variety of library type services. The state libraries were primarily for official use and concentrated on law and legislative reference materials and services. In Connecticut the state library managed the archives and the state records program and had a large historical collection. Each of the library extension agencies tended to have rather small general and
reference collections supplementing the resources of local libraries.

In a number of states there was a central agency that provided a general collection for circulation, reference, and library extension, together with some of the specialized areas of service such as law archives, or history. In Virginia, Florida, Indiana, and Tennessee the state agencies provided the standard library services as well as historical and archival programs. There also were separate law and legislative reference agencies within the state governments (Monypenny, 1966: 10).

Walter Brahm (1970: 261) noted that the American Library Association listed fourteen activities carried on by various state library agencies. These included: general library service, genealogy and history, archives and record management, legislative reference, law library, federal document depository, state document depository, library extension, service to the blind and physically handicapped, service to correctional and custodial institutions, service to local schools, processing for local libraries, newsletters, and professional publications.

In 1956 the National Association of State Libraries (NASL) recommended that for the best performance of public library functions, a state library agency should be organized as a separate unit of government with a governing board composed of interested lay citizens. Brahm's (1970: 265) study indicated that more than half of the states used this organizational form.

Brahm (1970: 265) suggested that factors more important than the impact of organization of effectiveness were the state library agency's ability to recruit and retain quality personnel, freedom from political change of personnel, freedom for the agency to plan and execute a course
of action, and adequate funds for operating programs and services. Freedom to establish a course of action without political influence was emphasized as basic to a state library's ability to function effectively and efficiently.

An article by Ernest E. Doerschuk and David C. Palmer (1960: 41) showed that leadership in library development was an intangible but very important service to public libraries for which state libraries have accepted responsibility. Such devices as the publication of administrative manuals, workshops for library staff, conferences for trustees and librarians, surveys of library collections and services, development of statewide library standards and library service plans, formulation of library legislation, close cooperation with state library professional associations, and provisions of vigorous consultant programs were almost universally practiced by state public library agencies. The concept of state responsibility for leadership in public library development was almost totally accepted and was one that called "for imagination, consummate skill and tireless effort on the part of state library personnel."

Ralph Blasingame (1970: 257) indicated that library agencies have generally operated in advisory capacities. Theoretically, they should become regulatory agencies when they have assumed responsibility for paying state-aid, but tradition has made change in the function of state agencies very difficult.

The study by Monypenny and Garrison (1966: 10-11) noted that some fifteen states had a high degree of unification. In most of the states there was a legislative research agency that was merely supplemented by the work of the state library in the field of legislative reference and research. This contrasted with the states
where library extension activities were carried on separately from the work of a reference library as was the case in Massachusetts, Vermont, Georgia, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. Also, there was a definite contrast with states in which the library agency itself had a limited range of functions and in which there were strong history and archives programs quite apart from the library. In other states with no strong predominant state agency, only North Carolina and Ohio were identified as having had large, well-rounded library collections. In other state agencies with responsibility for general library functions there were small collections and staffs which were mainly library development agencies with reference and circulating collections that had grown to support their work with the smaller libraries of the state.

LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES

In their survey of Louisiana libraries John A. Humphry and James Humphry III (1968: 20) asked the question, "What is the unique role of the public library?" The responses from professional librarians emphasized a few basic functions: free service to all persons without question of user purpose or intention, provision of the widest possible range of resources for information and for decision making, as a repository of man's recorded past, and provision of resources for educational purposes, formal and informal. Also frequently mentioned were recreational and group services, motivation and interpretation of the use of library materials, and service to adults. State library staff members stressed service to all but the "student in school" and service in response to demand. Library school faculty members mentioned the "neutrality" of the public libraries and their responsibility for coordinating the services among all types of libraries and compensating
for any omissions in the total framework of services provided by all libraries.

Functions

Libraries at Large (Knight, 1969: 18) listed five library responsibilities that were emerging. These responsibilities or functions were aimed at libraries of all types but were consistent with those functions for public libraries and were more selective. These responsibilities focused on the following priorities: to support formal education from pre-kindergarten through graduate and professional studies, to sustain the increasingly complex operations of all levels of government and the economy of the country, to provide opportunities for continuing self-education and vocational training, to play a role in the reintegration into society of ethnic and social groups that were largely isolated and excluded by deficiencies in formal education and vocational training, and to provide resources necessary for an informed public opinion and for personal, cultural, and intellectual growth and individualization.

Library Systems

The report of the National Advisory Commission of Libraries of 1968 (Library Services for the Nation's Needs, 1969: 72) asserted that libraries were in dire need of establishing new means of intercommunication and cooperation. The report further suggested that only after sufficient support of existing library agencies had been established could the role of these broad service units be formulated in terms of an evolving national information system.

In 1969 Emerson Greenaway proposed that all public libraries, regardless of size or level of service, organize into state systems of
libraries to be financed, administered, and operated on a state-wide basis. This would mean direct public library service by the state, by-passing the traditional hierarchy of library services (Brahm, 1970: 264). The report by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries criticized the cooperative library arrangements of the period because the handling of materials was slow, inefficient, and costly to the then relatively small number of libraries involved in providing the bulk of services without any increased financial assistance (Library Services for the Nation's Needs, 1969: 83).

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries felt that hard national, regional, and state planning was needed to facilitate acceptable physical access to the bulk of published material by utilizing any organizational structures and technological aids feasible. Such planning, according to the Commission, would of necessity involve support from federal, state, and other sources for improvement of interlibrary loan and copying services which libraries could no longer gratuitously provide. Also, the establishment of regional library networks would be necessary along with resource libraries to support them. Finally, federal support for agencies like the Center for Research Libraries would of necessity be increased (Library Services for the Nation's Needs, 1969: 83).

Robert R.McClenan (1970: 237) identified four types of public library systems. The single jurisdiction system involved a library organization that was responsible to only one authority and provided general purpose library service from multiple points to the constituents of the authority. The oldest form of the single jurisdiction library system was the Boston Public Library that established its first branch in 1870.
The second type of public library system identified by McClaren (1970: 238) was the multiple jurisdiction system. This system involved a library organization operated by one authority singularly or by two or more jointly under a contract. General purpose library services from multiple service points was provided to the constituents of the two or more contracting authorities.

McClaren's (1970: 238) third system was the cooperative system in which a library organization was created and governed by two or more authorities operating their own libraries. The purpose of this system was to provide the governing authorities with one or more special purpose library services, and where appropriate, to assure the provisions of general purpose library services to an area for which the system had responsibility.

The fourth type of public system identified by McClaren (1970: 239) was that of the statewide hierarchical system. This state-sponsored arrangement provided library services to meet the needs of every resident" by incorporating the libraries in the state into a hierarchy with each level having increased capacity as a library resource center.

Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr., and David C. Palmer (1960: 41) suggested that the idea of extending state library services through state operated regional offices or centers was not new. In 1931 an experiment in regionalization of services was begun in Vermont with the Billings Library of the University of Vermont serving as the headquarters and a Carnegie Foundation grant covering the costs. In 1937 the Vermont legislature passed a bill which set up state-wide regional service under the state library agency and by 1958 there were five regional libraries functioning.
Charles Cosnell (1960: 118) stated that because of the growth of library systems certain state services previously provided had been withdrawn. No longer were traveling library collections available to study clubs or in areas otherwise unserved. Reference services were channeled through the systems rather than being sent directly to the state agency. Teletype (TWX) and other forms of rapid communications were established to speed up requests and interlibrary loans.

Public Library Standards

Standards, quantitative and qualitative, of a national sort for each type of library have had a dramatic impact on library improvement throughout the country. Librarians, public library trustees, educators, political leaders, and civic and community groups have used published standards to upgrade public libraries and library services everywhere. Increased federal and state support of libraries has made possible the implementation of many standards that were at one time thought unachievable (Humphry, 1968: 53).

Walter Brahm (1970: 263) stated that authority granted by state legislatures to state public library agencies for establishing recommended standards for local public libraries typically failed to provide for enforcement of such standards. Brahm considered local public library standards overly permissive because the public libraries were free to meet them or not without any form of penalty.

PUBLIC LIBRARY PLANNING

S. Janice Kee (1967: 16) asserted that public planning was an important force in producing change in public librarianship. All kinds of communities, small and large, were now engaged in detailed planning
activities as a means of preparing for change. It was granted that all state library agencies were still learning the process of state-wide library planning and had progressed to a large degree toward mastery of such planning. The direction and purpose provided in a state plan were recognized as important factors in library improvement and development.

In a survey by Kee (1967: 16) more than half of the states gave a high rating to the benefits of surveys, research reports, and state plans as effective means of advancing library goals. Many state librarians believed that one of the greatest benefits of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) was in-depth planning.

The Mersel study (1969:331) presented three major factors with implications for planning: flexible funding, publicity, and interfaces with non-public libraries. With regard to flexible funding, Mersel suggested that state level administrative agencies should work toward a change in the type of funding that public libraries receive. Long-term budgetary allocations prevented libraries from increasing their services beyond that which the budget allows. Budgets that could be easily adjusted to meet larger demands would possibly reduce the present tendency to continue giving only a little more to public libraries than had previously been offered.

The Mersel study (1969: 331) also suggested that more vigorous public relations work was required to inform the public of the larger number of services that could be provided by public libraries. Such public relations should be coupled with the provision of immediate services. Also, greater interaction between public libraries and other libraries within a state should be fostered by state library administrators. In those where the state library agency was part of the state educational agency, such increased cooperation was already within
the administrative framework.

According to Libraries at Large (Knight, 1969: 5) developments in society have had a direct influence upon the services of public libraries. For example, population shifts by which millions of displaced people found themselves in urban centers required the establishment of new institutions to serve them. These institutions of necessity were new and innovative in location, physical facilities, resources, staff, and often radically new in orientation and purpose. Public library planning was had to adjust and respond to the major forces reshaping our society.

Winifred Ladley (1967: 60-61) suggested several basic considerations for the implementation of new programs through a program proposal or program plan arrangement. A basic element in any plan for change and improvement of public library services was the mechanics. Different agencies required somewhat different formats regarding program proposals submitted to them. Essentially, a program proposal or plan described the work to be undertaken, why it was to be undertaken, and how the work was to be accomplished along with cost estimates, starting and completion dates, and appropriate approval by the authority under whose name the work was to be done.

A second factor or element for consideration in a program proposal was that of relating new programs or services to the mission of the agency. The relationship between the proposed activities and the interests and objectives of the mission were to be established. A third factor was that of specific program objectives. Related to this was the necessity of pinning down the specific kind of support necessary, whether long or short term. Another consideration was the extension of established services or the development of new and unconventional kinds
of services of an experimental nature that were not previously offered (Ladley, 1967: 62-63).

Two other considerations in a program proposal or plan cited by Ladley (1967: 63-64) were the establishment of background competence and load sharing arrangements. In proposing a program the applicants had to show a familiarity with the background material available on similar programs. This was especially true of research and experimental activities in order to provide a clear overall view of what was to be done and the rationality involved. Load sharing was a necessary consideration since local self-sufficiency was emphatically a dead issue and "cooperation" was the key word.

Ladley (1967: 6) stated that a proposed program should be articulated in such a way as to have meaning and understanding at both national and local levels. Federal funding provided the opportunity for cooperation among various political elements in the extension, development, and enrichment of American public libraries as social and educational institutions. Along with opportunity federal support for libraries brought constraints and program guidelines that resulted in increased time and effort spent on the planning and coordination required to assure communication and program review at local and higher levels.

Carma Russell Leigh's (1962: 51-52) survey showed that state library agencies had to decide whether to use Library Services Act (LSA) funds in areas with little or no local services or in the improvement of existing programs and services. For demonstration programs in areas with little or no services, a number of factors were considered: expression of local interest, strength and determination of local leadership, type and strength of whatever library endeavor existed, and
acceptance of consolidation between local and larger units after the end of the demonstration.

A basic consideration in planning and evaluation of programs and services by librarians identified by Ray M. Fry (1970: 230) was that of library statistics. Going back to the early days of the LSA and ISCA legislation, state library agencies relied heavily on straight statistical reporting for original needs and for determination of progress under the federal programs. Great weight was placed on the library statistics collected and published by the Office of Education with the American Library Association (ALA) standards for public libraries serving as the basis for identifying and evaluating needs. The fundamental flaw in such a policy of planning was that the ALA standards, geared to individual libraries, were applied to the national picture of public library services by the federal government.

Ralph Blasingame (1970: 255), in his study of state-aid formulas, noted that library statistics, despite the attention given to them, were notoriously unreliable and incomplete. Library statistics were generally unamenable to analysis and were not of substantial value in the planning of public library services. The statistical record of a specific public library was of little value without an understanding of that library's general purposes and such purposes were not readily quantifiable and subject to objective scientific scrutiny.

A major problem in the planning of a public library services was the lack of coordination between public libraries and school, university, and other institutional libraries, even in states that had state public library agencies within the state departments of education. Another problem was a lack of understanding of how to provide service to those persons who did not use the public library. Many projects funded
under Title I of the ISCA included in their titles the word "disadvantaged" and were located in the ghetto areas of larger cities (Mersel, 1969: 324).

Also affecting library planning and service development was the inability of public libraries to react quickly to demands for more services. Budgets often had to be devised so far in advance that large increases in services prematurely exhausted available funds. Another major difficulty or obstacle was a lack of suitable measures of library performance. Circulation statistics, which were the usual measure of library performance, were generally viewed as inadequate by professional librarians because circulation statistics alone were not sufficient to determine the needs of a community or the library's degree of effectiveness in meeting them (Mersel, 1969: 325).

A necessary element in planning was evaluation of previously established programs and services. Charles F. Gosnell (1960: 114) pointed out that a successful evaluation project should show some continuity over an extended period of time and should have been well planned in advance of the beginning date. A good evaluation ought to have a high degree of specificity, yet be more than just a counting or audit. Evaluation should be a determination of the worth, of the success, or of the failure in the achievement of set objectives and the extent of acceptance a clientele has for a program or service. Public relations were cited as having great importance in the evaluative process because it increased confidence and acceptance, extended involvement and participation, and quite often provided ideas for correction and future improvement.

Lloyd J. House's (1967: 1) doctoral dissertation on the development of indices of effectiveness and their relation to financial
support for determining the effectiveness of public library services defined "effectiveness" as simply the impact the public library makes upon its community as measured in terms of registrants. Public library service was defined in the broadest sense as the library in its entirety. This included the library board, director and staff, facilities, collection, access in terms of location and hours open to the public, and individual services designed for all or parts of the municipality. This broad definition was used because the study was concerned with the total impact of the library on the whole community rather than on any single aspect of service to any particular segment of the community or any combination of such, and because financial support by municipal taxes supported the whole of the library for the presumed good of the whole community.

According to Houser (1967: 1), the number of registrants as a measure of the effectiveness of public libraries had significance mainly because of the quantity of resources and materials required by a public library for meeting the demands of the total community population. The number of registrants or the library population in relation to the total community population was suggested as a clear measure of the impact that a public library had upon its community.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries in its 1958 final report stated that one of its responsibilities was to appraise library funding, including federal support of libraries, to determine how funds available for the construction and support of libraries and library services could be more effectively and efficiently utilized. Attention was focused on whether citizens were getting their money's worth in libraries. The report noted that library statistics were pitifully incomplete and tardy and had a distinct lack of comparability which made
it impossible to give specific quantitative responses to specific questions. No one knew with preciseness, or even with close approximation, what were the total present library expenditures or the federal contributions to these expenditures. The report also emphasized that no reliable approximation or estimate could be made of the costs for remedying "the serious deficiencies in library service that we all know existed" (Library Services for the Nation's Needs, 1969: 74).

A study by the Public Library Association (1972: 26) identified twelve major problems that confronted public libraries. In order of their emphasis the problems were those relating to finance, public relations, staff inflexibility and lack of service orientation, problems of society, management patterns and rigidity, failure to formulate objectives, failure to serve all publics, continuing education for librarianship, book selection policies, inability to measure performance, application of technology to public libraries, and lack of interlibrary cooperation. Financial problems were rated first and failure to formulate objectives was rated sixth. All of these problem areas realistically affected the public library's ability to fulfill its role and indicated areas in serious need of study and research.

PUBLIC LIBRARY FUNDING

Roberta Bowler (1964: 119) wrote that the federal government was the principal collector of all taxes with the role of both state and local governments declining in relation to that of the federal government. Related to this was the shift from the reliance on property taxes to income taxes as a major source of governmental revenue. Intergovernmental revenue transfers were cited by Bowler (1964: 120) as
having accounted for an ever-increasing percentage of all local non-tax revenue.

Lowell Martin at the St. Louis American Library Association Conference of 1964 recommended a 50-30-20 ratio of public library support from state, local, and federal sources. In reality, many public libraries had a far greater proportion of their financing coming from the federal government. The nineteen-seventies brought not only financial crises to many public libraries but also more sophisticated approaches to financial management and planning as public libraries began to follow the lead of business management, industry, and federal agencies. The impression of authorities in 1972 was that inflation would keep public libraries of the future running harder just to remain in the same place in funding support. Like other public services, public libraries may find it necessary to re-evaluate their objectives and reassess their goals in terms of the kinds of services and the types of clientele to be served (Public Library Association, 1972: 26).

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries (Library Services for the Nation's Needs, 1968: 75) noted that the principal reason for the steady increase through the sixties in the cost of library services was the increased affluence of the country. Because of this affluence, the costs of library services ought to be met from sources of public income that have risen in direct relation to increases in the gross national product. Public libraries and school libraries at the time of this report were financed mainly from local real estate taxes that were "inelastic" and responded very slowly to increases in societal wealth. Even state income responded relatively slowly to increases in the general level of productivity and was critically low in
just those states in the greatest need of large-scale expansion of library services.

According to the study of the Public Library Association (1972: 26) emphasis upon public library financing as a concern of respondents to a questionnaire increased during the three-month period, July through September 1971. Earlier replies focused on services and the need for more effective public relations, but later responses overwhelmingly were concerned with monetary matters, specifically the financial base of public libraries. The future of the ad valorem tax as a prime source of income for library service was questioned.

Walter Brahm (1970: 262) noted that state-aid or grants-in-aid, a major element of the state library extension function, was a perennial subject of legislation relating to state library agencies. The state agency was usually found to be the budgeting, certifying, and distributing agency for state funds. The authority and responsibility of the state agency ranged from mere check-writing to planning, allocating, and approving of grants, dependent upon the formula or formulas established by a state legislature.

The Humphry survey (1968: 90) of Louisiana libraries noted that recognized leaders in librarianship and the American Library Association stressed the need for adequate operating budgets for libraries and library systems, not merely an established figure of per capita expenditure. A high per capita expenditure did not necessarily provide an adequate library budget. Funds for public support of libraries ought to come from the combined resources of federal, state, and local governments. The Humphry report also stressed that a per capita figure was to be used in instituting such financial support, and any formula used ought to be continuously reviewed, evaluated, and adjusted based
upon accomplishments and circumstances.

Charles Gosnell (1960: 118) indicated that incentive grants were often used by state library agencies in supplementing the funding of local public library services and that properly conceived incentives usually worked. Incentives had to be clear and reasonable and have some continuity. The most common forms were identified as matching funds. Other forms of incentives were: grants-in-aid to systems for establishment of services and purchase of bookmobiles, grants-in-aid for expansion of local or regional library services based on total population or square mileage covered, and matching book expenditures.

Ralph Blasingame's analysis (1970:255) of state-aid formulas suggested that the basic purpose of such formulas was the stimulation of local support which would appear to be at odds with the purpose of relieving the local real estate tax load. The reason for this not being a contradiction was the incorporation of a "floor" of local support into the aid formula. Blasingame believed that a more realistic course of action might have been the inclusion of equalization factors and extra rewards for serving large load areas as well as large populations.

Blasingame (1970: 252-253) identified six specific purposes of state aid to public libraries which could serve as tentative principles in the development of state-aid formulas. These were: to stimulate local support for public library services, to equalize opportunity for residents of relatively poor areas, to relieve the local real estate tax load, to bring certain benefits to local libraries which could not have been available with other funds, to permit established libraries to continue to exist in their past patterns despite erosion of the economic bases that have been traditional sources of funds, and to recognize the responsibility of the state government for satisfying the information
needs of persons not having contact with institutions.

Charles Gosnell (1960: 117) identified three basic purposes of the principle of state-aid to public libraries in New York which summarized the six listed by Blasingame. State-aid in New York was conceived with the purposes of promoting efficiency and economy of service, providing incentives for local effort, and equalizing costs and spreading the tax burden.

Mersel (1969: 63) observed that New York provided the matching funds required for LSCA funds entirely from the state-aid money appropriated by the legislature. None of the local money used for public library support was identified to the United States Office of Education as matching funds. In New York the state-aid funds were far greater than the funds from the federal government, with local funds, as in most states, being far more than the combined amount of state and federal funds for public libraries. In 1966 total local tax funds for public libraries in New York was $19,770,295, the state-aid appropriation for the year was $13,325,000, and the LSCA appropriation under Title I was $2,848,719.

Ralph Blasingame (1970: 250-251) asserted that the results of a state-aid formula for funding public libraries would be better if such a formula was the result of a flexible long-range and open-ended process of planning. Most formulas were established after a relatively short period of study and for a variety of reasons became very difficult to change. Planners of formulas were usually more concerned with a plan of action possessing some built-in short-term political acceptability rather than long-term value. A general tendency, according to Blasingame, was to orient the end result of a plan for a state-aid formula to the existing institutions and established service patterns.
Blasingame (1973: 258) suggested that a state-aid formula for support of local public libraries be suited to the population distribution of the economic structure of the area or areas. Because of the usual variation between the population and economic factors there ought to be more than one formula. The basic formula, as Blasingame noted, could be modifiable by introducing one or more factors depending on the area to which the state-aid formula was applied. Feedback systems would be provided and implemented either with the inception of a new formula or very soon afterward. The authority to apply adjustment mechanisms would be included in the enabling legislation and the intent of that authority ought to be very clearly stated.

Apart from grants to local units, Phillip Monypenny and Guy Garrison (1966: 145) stated that the great bulk of expenditures with state-aid formulas was for salaries, books, and periodicals. The proportions varied according to the extent to which a library was building its own collection or collections for local and regional units. Heavy book purchasing implied heavy expenditures on cataloging and processing.

Robert McClaren (1973: 242) reported that several states provided financial incentives as inducements to consolidation and cooperation between small units of public library service. As an example, California gave $10,000 to each consolidated library jurisdiction for two consecutive years. Connecticut provided that libraries serving a population of ten thousand or more would receive an additional grant from the state government with the intention of encouraging small town libraries to combine into larger service units.

In the eleven states included in the Mersel study (1969: 316-317), the legally designated state library agencies chose different ways
of identifying recipients of LSCA Title I funds and allocating the money. Some states chose to use the federal funds to augment state appropriations for the implementation of state master plans that were developed earlier. Other states authorized the state public library agency to develop specific LSCA program plans for the state, while two states utilized the guidance of committees of librarians in formulating their original LSCA plans. Some of the eleven states chose to have local public libraries propose projects for the use of federal funds upon approval by the state administrative agency. Other states used set formulas for the disbursement of the LSCA funds. Utah created a state library that was in effect the local library for most of the state with most of the available Title I funds being used to support its activities.

An example of the handling of funds available to the states under the Library Services and Construction Act Title I was North Carolina. According to Mersel, the North Carolina State Library provided certain services to local public libraries: supplementary bibliographical and reference services consultant services on administration and building planning; services to children and young people as well as adults; and audiovisual materials. These services were provided on request to library boards and individual trustees (Mersel, 1969: 109).

The North Carolina State Library gave grants to county and regional libraries that were inadequate. Since it considered all public libraries in the state to be inadequate, a basic annual grant was provided to each county in the state. A per capita grant based upon an effort index score was provided to counties as an incentive for increased funding of county libraries. Personnel grants were paid to help the counties provide salaries that would attract professional
librarians and retain them. Salary grants were on an incentive basis because they were only available to counties in which the pay of professionals met or exceeded the "Professional Librarians' Salary Scale" of the State Personnel Department. A fourth type of grant was made with the purpose of encouraging the creation of multi-county units of public library service. These regional grants were based upon the number of counties in a region, the population served, and the amount of per capita support from local governments for public libraries. Many North Carolina counties were considered too small to provide even marginally acceptable public library services (Mersel, 1969: 109).

Joseph L. Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor's textbook (1962: 118) on the administration of public libraries made the assertion that public libraries were neglecting programs for securing gift and endowment funds, a policy that state universities often followed, for special purposes. It was suggested that a continuous program might include the soliciting of book funds and money for special purchases, finding individuals and organizations willing to give money on a regular basis to build collections in their special field of interest, and identifying special equipment items that might be donated by businesses or individuals. A final idea was the persuading of a few discerning persons who could easily afford and were willing to contribute salary supplements in order to retain outstanding staff members.

In outlining the functions of public library trustees, Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 114-115) pointed out that the prevalence of poor public library support had no sound or logical cause except for the failure of the trustees to compel better support. Tax money often went to meet those needs that the public officials, and not the people, considered important. Indifference of voters to the public library was
due in part to their lack of understanding of public library services and largely to the unwillingness of public officials to take a firm position of support for public library programs and services.

PUBLIC LIBRARY BUDGETING

Preparation of the budget, reflecting not only costs of daily operation but also projected expansion of the library's services from year to year, was the duty of the public librarian. Fiscal responsibility for a public library in most states was set by law in the library board and could not be delegated to any person or other body of officials (Young, 1962: 41).

Dorothy Sinclair (1965: 26-27) indicated that the most important part of library business in which the librarian and board worked together was the preparation of the library budget. The budget, like most other managerial activities, was made easier with careful planning. If the librarian and the library trustees agreed on the objectives and worked out a long-range plan for anticipated library growth and development, the budget preparation became a matter of determining how much of the program could be attempted financially in any particular year. If the long-range plan was approved at least in principle by the appropriating or taxing body or by planning officials in addition to the library board, preparation of the budget and securing of approval was much easier.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 123) noted that a public library budget was almost universally prepared under the direction of the librarian. The librarian was generally present to defend the budget before his own board of trustees and before the governing authority of the local government. Together with department heads the librarian
studied the present year's budget as it affected each department and prepared a schedule of added items, increases, omissions, and decreases with notations of needs in the order of importance. Most libraries began eight to ten months or longer ahead in directing attention toward the preparation of the next budget. Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 121) emphasized that a budget was not a hastily concocted series of numbers guessed at in a smoke filled room or juggled to appear fairly logical in their arrangement and relation to allotments for the previous year. A budget was and ought to be a carefully arranged presentation of present and needed activities, services, materials, and maintenance programs.

Frederick Mosher (1968: 229) stated that the budget process permitted, and to a degree compelled, objectivity in the perception of information. This was accomplished by standardization of the categories of information that were too be considered. The budget process prescribed specifically against the introduction of certain types of personal and institutional consideration.

Mosher (1968: 230) asserted that the information necessary and appropriate to the kinds of decisions at different levels in the public library organization differed not only in extent and detail but also in kind. Budgetary classification always assumed an important role in financial planning and, in a sense, was the essence of the rationale for development of recent techniques in "performance budgeting."

Mosher (1968: 230) described the budget process as primarily a system of communications, regularized, and cyclical. The purposes of the budget process fell into two logical categories: first, the bringing of information to the proper level for decision making that was classified as policy; and second, the providing of information both upward and downward in the organizational structure so that decisions
made could be properly carried out, a category roughly classified as administrative.

According to Mosher (1968: 233), budgeting was the only device invented in democratic governmental systems which did all of the following in the policy category: brought about regular, periodic reconsideration and reevaluation of government purposes and objectives; facilitated a comparative evaluation of different purposes and programs in relation to one another and in relation to relative costs; provided a basis for examining the total role of the government and its cost in relation to the private sector of the economy; and finally, provided a periodic link among the various administrative organizations and segments of the society, thus forming a basis for democratic information and discussion and for democratic control of governmental activities.

Mosher also suggested that the following were elements of the administrative function of budgeting: provided a legal basis for the expenditure of funds; provided a framework for public accounts and fiscal accountability; made possible a systematic re-examination of internal operations from the standpoint of efficiency and economy; and facilitated the delegation of operating as well as financial authority and responsibility while establishing a basis for centralized controls. Probably the largest part of budgetary theory and budgetary philosophy was dedicated to this administrative function.

An important element cited by Mosher (1968: 232-233) that affected budgetary decision making was time. The fiscal year was a convenient and necessary device for administrative, accounting, and public control purposes. The fiscal year was deceptive in that it encouraged thinking of each year as an "autonomous" unit of time, independent of the preceding year and the following year. The most
important effect of "fiscal year thinking" was its encouragement of the feeling that the administrative and legislative powers in a particular year had complete authority over and responsibility for the fiscal year budget as such. This resulted in treating the budget of the fiscal year as a clear and distinct entity. Emphasis placed on funding totals for a fiscal year under consideration detracted from any interest in and understanding of the longer termed implications, impact, and decisions made at that time.

An interesting assertion by Frederick C. Mosher (1968: 235) was that the ambitions, professional interests, pride, and even pet foibles and prejudices of individuals found their way into estimates for budgets as well as into the applications of the appropriated funds. The prevalence and impact of the human factor was very significant. One could assume that most administrators tended to identify their personal progress and welfare with that of their programs and organization. To some extent, the strength and security of an organization was associated with its size, the rank or status of its personnel, and the amount of funds available to it.

Mosher (1968: 236) felt that the impact of an individual's personality upon a budget was frequently substantial. An example provided was the "Patton" type administrator who was dominant, aggressive, and prone to crash decisions. The opposite example of an administrative personality affecting budgeting was the passive administrator who was frustrated, bewildered, or in many cases fascinated by red tape which made the program subordinate to process.

Budgeting was viewed by Mosher (1968: 235) as a system of orderly competition occurring in the councils of higher authority and not in the market place. Each administrator was in competition with his associates
for his share of the budget "pie." The observation was made that strong unitary agencies, such as state library agencies, could develop such a solid budgetary position that internal competition could be stifled in order to present a united front. This tendency was strengthened when the administrative personnel within the unit were strongly bound together by a common core of doctrine, professionalism, and career identification. Mosher (1968: 236) stressed the fact that such restraints to free internal competition were a major obstacle in public budgeting.

Mosher (1968: 236) suggested that the budget process tended to accentuate and dramatize conflicts and antagonisms between individuals and groups and often generated stress. Differences and conflicting objectives between organizations, professional groups, field and headquarters personnel, and staff and line personnel were probably a normal and constructive part of the governmental environment.

Mosher (1968: 235) identified a common but controversial phenomenon in budgeting which was the "law of anticipated reactions." According to this budgetary principle, an administrator that expected higher echelons to cut his estimates of funding needs would insure against serious damage to his budget by inflating proposed figures to the maximum and sometimes beyond. To outside observers this might appear to be "padding" and "empire building" but the perpetrator usually was able to rationalize it as only common sense and protection of necessary services and programs. "Padding" of budgets was accepted in public administration as a favor to reviewing bodies in order for them to make and proclaim cuts without real damage to any agency. The very expectation of budget review may encourage budget padding.
Roberta Bowler (1964: 132) indicated that local public libraries often divided their budgetary programs into the categories of administration, processing, public service, and buildings and grounds. For libraries attempting to expand their programs, Dorothy Sinclair (1965: 31) suggested the following three points of consideration: the prior acceptance of a long-range plan by officials so that the budget would be recognized as the initial step toward agreed-upon improvements; full and freely expressed board approval and support of the program; and finally, evidence of citizen support expressed by written endorsements or the presence of community leaders.

Sinclair (1965: 31) stated that librarians under the stimulus of growing library use, often made the plea for a larger budget solely on the basis of circulation increases. When circulation leveled off, it was discovered by these librarians that though a budget increase was still needed, there was no acceptable groundwork laid for it.

Goldhor and Wheeler (1962: 546) stated that an annual financial report was almost always required by law of all government agencies with the form and details often specified. This annual financial report was often used as the basis of an audit made by a private accounting firm or more often by a local government auditor or finance officer. This audit reviewed the accuracy of entries and the conformity of the library to applicable laws and regulations.

Sinclair (1965: 27) emphasized that long-range budget planning was one of the most important duties of public library administrations. It was often very easy under daily pressures to operate the library on a year-to-year basis. A careful, detailed, and imaginative plan for anticipating needs and financial requirements in the future should take into account the availability of information from local and state
sources as to population projections and movements; community advances in educational and other facilities; any proposed major highways or thoroughfares, or industries; and potential revenue from state and federal sources. It was not usually possible to budget in detail on a long-range basis, but it was deemed wise to estimate costs and to take into account the probable increases in salaries and the prices of major items involved.

Dorothy Sinclair (1965: 27) reported that public libraries usually operated on a line-item type budget that indicated how much money was available for salaries, how much for equipment, and so forth. The line-item type budget may be extremely detailed or somewhat general. Each position and the exact salary attached to it may be listed in the budget or a lump sum for all salaries may be indicated. Similarly, a single sum of money may be allocated for all equipment, or the budget may specify so much money for a typewriter, so much for a book truck, and so on. The major divisions usually included in a line-item type budget were salaries, capital outlay, and operating expenditures. The exact terms may vary but they generally cover the same types of data.

Anne E. Prentice (1973: 121) stated that little indication of the activities of an agency or its services was apparent in a line-item budget. Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 123) suggested that line-item or line-by-line budgeting implied a rigid enumeration, especially of individual salaries, often with the rule that no changes in allocations could be made without permission of the final governing authority. The theoretical justification of this traditional budgetary format was that it deterred informal shifts and increases of funds during the year.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 123) asserted that great injustices arose from use of this budgetary device. Many local authorities found
it necessary to transfer funds from one item or category to another which was against local and state regulations and gave the impression of behind the scenes financial "juggling."

Ann E. Prentice (1973: 122) noted that one major reason for the continued use of line-by-line or line-item budget formats by public libraries was that local governing bodies often established an overall budgetary procedure which all departments, including the library, were required to follow. In addition to local requirements, state law often required the formulation and presentation of traditional line-by-line or line-item budgets.

Ray M. Fry (1970: 233) indicated that the federal Bureau of the Budget instituted PPBS (program planning budgetary system) for all departments of the executive branch because of the increased number and complexity of federal programs in the fifties and sixties. Under PPBS specific program objectives were identified and alternate means of meeting these objectives were subjected to a systematic comparison and evaluation as part of a regular yearly cycle of review. A problem in the evaluation of library programs was a distinct lack of specific measurement criteria, especially for programs involving disadvantaged groups.

Roberta Bowler (1964: 125) defined performance budgeting as a system of work measurement based on cost accounting and measurable work units. According to Wheeler and Goldhor's text (1962: 121-122), the basic elements of a performance budget included some measuring device for judging present costs in terms of work units or service units and a series of departmental or activity headings usually comparable to a diagram of the library organization. This series of headings included a list of estimated cost items under each activity for the coming year.
contrasted with previous allotments, all of which showed why the programs or proposals were justified. The theory behind this procedure was that in scrutinizing such a budget, public officials and library trustees could see rather easily what was and had been occurring and the measured, evaluated, and justified basis for increases or other readjustments in the budget.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 122) distinguished program budgeting from that of performance budgeting. They stated that a program budget had a similar division of elements, first into major departments or activities and then into six or eight major cost items. This format did not require the expensive cost measurement studies implicit in performance budgeting. The program budget was a setting forth of policies and a "plan of work" in terms of dollars. It was prepared, studied, acted upon, and referred back to as a sort of chart and compass. The program budget, in a sense, served as a reference document, not merely a financial statement, and was more a policymaking tool. The performance budget was not very applicable to public libraries because of the difficulty in establishing unit costs and the misleading nature of such library "output" figures as the old standby, circulation totals.

Dorothy Sinclair (1965: 28) asserted that the performance budget was increasing in use. The purpose of the performance format was to break down expenditures so that the budget reflected the total cost of each major part of the library program and particular library services. An example was that cataloging costs would include personnel, a share of administration, supplies, equipment, and overhead. The total figure, divided by the number of items to be cataloged, would provide a unit cost of cataloging per book.
The value of the performance method was that it gave an objective measure against which to assess program and service needs. A problem in using the performance format was that it was often easier to get increased funds for more work than it was to get more money for better work because unit costs could reflect substandard work (Sinclair, 1965: 28-29).

In a performance budget the cost of equipment, staff, books, and upkeep were presented under one heading, such as "Bookmobile", to indicate just how much bookmobile services cost. While considering the total cost of the entire program, with performance budgeting a public library administrator had to think in terms of the cost of each operation of the library's service and the proportional relation among budgetary elements (Sinclair, 1965: 29).

Ann Prentice (1973: 122) suggested that the slowness of public libraries to adopt program budgeting or some other format other than the traditional line-item variety was due to a lack of understanding on the part of trustees and head librarians concerning the different budgetary formats and their relative merits. In her study, one trustee had never heard of program budgeting and several indicated that they knew little about budgeting formats but wished they knew more. Along with the desire of some trustees to find out more about budgeting, 14.7 percent of the trustees queried stated that they knew nothing about budgets, had never seen a budget, and felt that budgets were not a concern of public library trustees.

In ordering the responses to the questionnaire of her study, Prentice (1973: 132) found that none of the most active boards included trustees who stated that budgeting was not an aspect of the trustees' responsibility. In three of the four libraries at the low end of the
rank order scale, one or more trustees did indicate that they did not consider budgeting a trustee activity. One very explicit characteristic of "active" trustees was their belief that they had a part to play in budgeting as one phase of planning and policymaking.

Sinclair (1965: 30) asserted that, regardless of the type of budget format considered, the philosophy of the performance budget was closest to the concerns of the librarian and the trustees. With a performance budget the public library staff and trustees were more able to readily express in financial amounts what they hoped to accomplish for the coming year. The library did not merely request a lump sum but had to explain what was to be done with the money, why the program was worth the money, and how it fitted into the total library picture and the needs of the community.

The financial records universally required by law to show how funds were spent were essential to assign and control expenditures. In public library administration the temptation should had to be resisted to keep these accounts in greater detail than was clearly required. It was often not necessary for a public library to keep a duplicate set of books when all necessary financial records were maintained by the local government. Public libraries did not need double bookkeeping or more than one book of financial records. Usually, only a ledger account by date of all revenues and expenditures and a simple monthly sheet to record each day's overdue fines and other cash receipts as well as petty cash expenditures was all that was needed. The local situation sometimes required that all revenues and all expenditures of the library appear in its financial record book, whether or not the revenues were from tax funds, gifts, transfers from other government bodies, cash receipts, or from any other source (Wheeler, 1962: 540-541).
Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 118-119) reported that the two largest items in the operating budget of every public library were salaries and reading materials. Other items in the budget were minor and self-explanatory in relation to these elements. Amounts for salaries and reading materials comprised a larger proportion of the budgets for smaller libraries than larger libraries. There were a number of public libraries where salaries, including janitorial services, were absorbing 70 percent or more of the total budget, largely due to the compulsion of having sufficient personnel and paying enough salary to retain the competent.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962-123) suggested the use of a monthly budget summary to assist the librarian and trustees in planning and scrutinizing the flow of expended funds through the twelve months of the budgetary period. This monthly financial statement showed the trustees where the library stood money wise. The simple assumption that one-twelfth of the year's allotment in each budget category should be spent each month was unrealistic for most libraries. However, this was a useful guide for the librarian to be conscious of and to follow roughly toward the end of the year. Public use of libraries followed a seasonal pattern, with increases in the colder long-evening months and declines in the summer, outdoor, and non-school months. The months during the school year were often the busiest. An increasingly popular practice was to provide part-time, peak-season clerical helpers at less cost than to employ unnecessary permanent staff members to handle certain duties.

According to the "Manual for Administrative Librarians of Parish Library Systems in Louisiana" (Manual Committee, 1956: 91), spending the entirety of a public library's income during the year was wise. Superficially, a balance may have seemed to be indicative of good management
but in reality proved the contrary. If the money was not needed, it should not have been requested; if it was needed, failure to use it indicated that the need remained unresolved. Few libraries ever received so much money that could not be spent wisely to insure better services for more patrons.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 123-124) supported the principle of avoiding budget balances at the end of the year. In most budgets, any substantial balance carried over from the preceding year was often present because of a difference between library and governmental fiscal periods or related receipts beyond the proportionate monthly expenditures. A surplus, whatever the reason, was more indicative of depriving services of funds rather than of "commendable watchful thrift." Many library programs were penalized by the resulting impression that the library could get along with that much less money for the coming year.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 124) stated that a balance may have to be carried over as encumbered funds, following the local regulations and practices. When encumbered funds are carried over, such should be clearly labeled and shown as the last item in the revenue schedule with a parenthetical statement that a real surplus is not present.

Wheeler and Goldhor (1962: 546) identified the best accounting system for public libraries as the one which gave only the essential information about money received and spent in the simplest form possible. Where municipal regulations compelled elaborate systems for other governmental departments spending ten or fifty times as much as the library, some simpler procedure ought to be sought to minimize the paper work and resulting delays in service.
The relationship of expenditure to accomplishment, whether in terms of the work performed, the volume of services extended to patrons, or the evaluation of library services provided was not considered by Monypenny and Garrison (1966: 139) to be relevant information. They stated that such information could not easily be provided as a basis for budget review because it could not be collected and analyzed due to the tedious work of compiling the history of previous object expenditures.

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT AND THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

According to Lawrence L. Durisch (1960: 111) intergovernmental relations in public library development were very complex and were of special significance where the center of decision remained with the individual citizen and his local government. The importance of intergovernmental relations in this field was noted as being shared with other functions of government on the local, state, and federal levels.

John Humphry and James Humphry III (1968: 90) stated that recognized authorities in the library profession and the American Library Association emphasized the necessity for adequate operating budgets for public libraries and cooperative systems, not just as established figure of per capita income. Support for library services ought to come from a combination of local, state, and federal sources. S. Janice Kee (1967: 11) emphasized the fact that until the Library Services Act was signed into law by President Eisenhower on June 19, 1956, the American Library Association had been on record as favoring federal assistance to public libraries for thirty years.

The Library Services Act (LSA) of 1956 marked an important step forward in American library development. The LSA represented an effort
to stimulate the states and local communities to increase library services, particularly those services available to residents of rural areas. This legislation was based upon the concept of complementary local, state, and federal responsibility (Durisch, 1960: 105).

The LSA authorized annual appropriations of $7,500,000 for five successive years. The amount actually appropriated in the first fiscal year was only a little over two million dollars with the appropriation for each succeeding year less than the amount authorized. To put the amount of the LSA funds in perspective, federal aid to state and local governments from the federal budget and trust funds reached a total of 6.8 billion dollars in the year 1959 (Durisch, 1960: 108).

The purpose of the LSA of 1956 was to extend public library services to rural people who had very meager or no services. The emphasis of the law was on "coverage" with books and materials for all citizens. The LSA introduced the concept of a state plan to state library extension agencies as a requirement for receipt of federal funds. As a whole state library staffs with extension responsibilities were not experienced planners (Kee, 1967: 12).

The Library Services Act, Public Law 597 of the 84th Congress (see Appendix B), was designed as a five-year program for demonstrating improved public library services in areas of less than ten thousand population which had no public library service or only had inadequate services. The original act was amended in 1960 to extend the program for five years through 1966. In 1964 the LSA was amended and renamed the Library Services and Construction Act, Public Law 88-269 (see Appendix C). The LSCA extended benefits to urban as well as rural areas lacking public library services or having only inadequate services. Also, the LSCA established a new title that provided for construction of
public libraries in those areas lacking the necessary facilities for
development of such services (Bowker, 1965: 163).

In 1966 the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) was
amended with the addition of titles III, IV-A, and IV-B, and was
extended for five years (see Appendix D). Title III provided for
interlibrary cooperation, and Title IV-A made funds available for the
development of state institutional library services for prisons, medical
hospitals, mental institutions, etc. Title IV-B of the LSCA provided
financial support for public library services to those persons that were
certified as having a physical disability (Bowker, 1968: 208).

The LSCA was amended in 1970 and extended for five more years
through fiscal 1976 (see Appendix E). Title IV-A and IV-B were
consolidated under Title I and the administrative requirements were
simplified by streamlining the requirements for state plans and removing
the necessity of matching funds for Title III that dealt with
interlibrary cooperation (Bowker, 1973: 363).

Also, the three advisory councils, one each for Title III and
Title IV-A and IV-B, previously required were combined into a single
state-wide council. Emphasis under the 1970 LSCA amendments emphasized
the provision of services to disadvantaged groups in rural and urban
areas, reinforcement of large urban libraries as national regional
centers, extension of services to state institutions and to physically
handicapped persons, and the reinforcement of state library agencies'
ability to provide support services to regional and local public
libraries. A significant feature of the 1970 amendments was the
requirement of a comprehensive five-year state plan, designated a Long-
Range Program, as a condition of payment of funds to the states (Kee,
1974: 5).
Kee (1974: 5) suggested that broadening of the scope of the original LSA was accomplished by promotion of the idea that the nationally accepted public library system concept did not exclude federal aid to larger library resource centers. The rural aid program of the LSA rejected one of the basic principles upon which the national standards for public library service had been devised, that of building on strength.

**Administration of Federal Funds**

According to Durisch (1960: 107) the Library Services Act (LSA) established a system of conditional grants-in-aid. Both unconditional and conditional grants were used by the federal government to reduce the disparagement between state functions and revenues, but the primary motive of conditional grants was to stimulate state action about matters of national interest.

Under the LSA the determination of the best use of funds, the administration of public libraries, and the selection of personnel and library materials was reserved to the states and their local subdivisions as long as these activities were consistent with the purposes of the act. State plans were required from the state library administrative agencies in each of the states. The state plans were submitted to the United States Commissioner of Education for review and approval. Funds were used to provide public library service only in places defined in the act as being rural which was based upon a population of ten thousand people or less according to the most recent U. S. Census data. Money was also available to urban libraries for extending public library services to rural areas (Durisch, 1960: 107).

In order for a state to maintain its eligibility under the LSA, state expenditures for all public library services had to be maintained
at least at the same level as in fiscal 1956. Also, state and local expenditures for rural public library services had to be maintained at the 1956 level. LSA funds had to be matched with state or local money in those programs in which the federal government paid only a part of the cost (Durisch, 1960: 107).

The prohibitions in the Library Services Act were few but very definite. Federal funds could not be used for the purchase of land or construction of buildings. In general the provisions of the LSA were positive and evidenced careful planning for the encouragement of "action on a wide front" (Durisch, 1960: 107).

The administrative procedures of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) were quite similar to those of the Library Service Act from which the LSCA evolved. The formal assignment of responsibility for the LSCA program in each state was the head of the state library agency. In reality, the authority was exercised at two levels: the state library agency and the local library organization which received grants from the state agency. In states with a small population, such as Arkansas or Utah, the head of the state library agency retained actual responsibility. In more populous states, such as California or North Carolina, the responsibility for LSCA programs was delegated to a lower level within the state administrative library agency. Continuing eligibility for local libraries to receive grants was based upon the operation of the local libraries according to standards created at the state level. These standards differed among the states and were not usually very harsh (Mersel, 1969: 320).

Under the LSCA the United States Commissioner of Education had the responsibility for determining whether state plans complied with the requirements of the law, but he did not have power of designating what
plans a state might adopt. If a state was dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final decision on the status of a submitted plan, the state had the right to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals whose decision was reviewable only by the U. S. Supreme Court (Mersel, 1969: 325).

In order to receive funds under the LSA or the LSCA a state library agency had only to do three things. The first was to submit acceptable plans and programs to the United States Office of Education. Next, the state library agency had to show matching funds. The last requirement was to make annual progress and expenditure reports (Kee, 1974: 5).

Mersel (1969: 318) reported that a variety or resources were available for carrying out LSCA service projects. In addition to the federal money, there were state and local funds which often were directly used in the same program. Some states required the expenditure of local funds, although this money was not always accounted as a local contribution.

Mersel (1969: 319) showed that funds identified as matching were not always used as part of the LSCA programs by the states. The ability of the states to show non-project library expenditures as matching funds rendered meaningless the requirement of matching funds according to a percentum formula. Any state could show sufficient public library expenditures in that state which were more than equal to the matching fund requirement set for it. Because of this, LSCA Title I funds were distributed, after the base amount of 100,000 dollars was allocated, to each state according to the population of the particular state and not according to its wealth.
In North Carolina the state government appropriated more than enough money to meet the matching fund requirements imposed by the LSCA formula. This money mingled with ISCA Title I funds was then distributed by the state library of North Carolina according to its state plan. In New York state money used for matching purposes was not intermingled with the federal funds in individual projects but was listed as a separate project. Utah used all state funds appropriated to its state library for matching with LSCA Title I money and the state money was combined with the federal to finance the services of the Utah State Library. California met the matching requirements by adding the budget of a bi-county library to a part of the California State Library's budget with the state's own support for public libraries not being identified for matching. Because Kansas originally used only state appropriations as matching funds, it was not entitled to the full LSCA appropriation. Therefore, the budget of the Wichita Public Library was included with the state funds. As a result, the additional LSCA money obtained was used to stimulate library activity sufficiently so that the state of Kansas was later able to identify as matching funds that money from regional libraries established under the LSCA (Mersel, 1969: 319).

Wisconsin, Washington, and Massachusetts provided other examples of the ways that states handled the matching funds as required under Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act. Wisconsin used as matching funds state appropriations and monies from local libraries that benefited from LSCA support. Washington and Massachusetts used state-aid money for matching purposes and both states combined federal and state funds for the allocation and support of programs and services (Mersel, 1969: 320).
The administration of state programs for handling federal funds under LSCA Title I varied in each state included in the Mersel (1969: 235-236) study. The Arkansas Library Commission made use of a system of various kinds of grants to the local and regional library agencies. These grants included a basic establishment grant, continuation of service grants, multi-county grants, demonstration grants, equalization grants, and personnel grants. According to Mersel (1969: 239), LSCA money in Arkansas continued, as under the earlier LSA, to support and supplement what could be considered traditional library activities, such as the purchase of new books and materials. The basic need in Arkansas was to upgrade primary library services with available LSCA funds.

The New York State Library's policy for the management of LSCA Title I funds contained three desirable features. One was emphasis on strengthening rural public library programs where service was the weakest. Another feature was the financing of studies and planning to aid non-metropolitan library systems in improving their library service. The third feature was that of making funds available to metropolitan library systems for use in experimental programs for the disadvantaged (Mersel, 1969: 81).

The organizational location of the Division of Library Development within the large and important State Education Department in New York was a distinct advantage when the vote of the state legislature was sought for state-aid to public libraries. Also, requests for funds for public libraries was only a small part of the total budget that the New York State Education Department submitted to the state legislature (Mersel, 1969: 81).

Because of the terminal date of the Library Services and Construction Act, the Division of Library Development of New York felt
it prudent to avoid projects with goals attainable with only long-term programs. A two-year limitation was set for providing LSCA Title I funds in support of projects. This self-imposed regulation was difficult to maintain and limited the range of operations of the Division of Library Development (Mersel, 1969: 82).

The Illinois State Library budget was completely funded by the state with federal funds under the LSCA being merely supplementary. All staff positions, the total book budget, equipment, binding, and other expenses were supported with state funds. The federal funds were used to develop ideas and to establish the feasibility of these ideas and to initiate programs and services based on them. When public library systems were mapped out, the general understanding was that federal funds would be employed only to get them started following a schedule by which the federal funds were to be cut to a zero amount. As the federal funds were reduced, state support for the library systems was increased. This formula was applied to all federally supported projects. An initial grant for establishing and operating a program or service for a one or two year period was made after which no additional funds were provided and other sources of support had to be used (Outlook, 1973: 477).

Planning for Federal Funds

According to Mersel (1969: 328), state library agencies had well managed the federal funds entrusted to them. The point was stressed that good management alone did not call for a continuation of federal support; it merely implied that management could not be used as a reason for discontinuing that support.

Mersel (1969: 329) suggested that a formula be developed through which federal money would be used to match state expenditures rather
than the traditional formula of states matching federal support. As state and local support increased, federal funds for intrastate and local library programs and services would be reduced.

A negative aspect of the Library Services and Construction Act, as in most federal legislation, was the uncertainty of the amount of each year's LSCA appropriations and the fact that federal appropriations were not often made until months after the start of a new fiscal year. This situation frequently caused significant problems within the state library agencies in terms of planning, anticipating staff needs, and committing funds for purchase of equipment and materials (Mersel, 1969: 82).

**Uses of Federal Funds**

The uses of funds for public libraries under the Library Services Act and the Library Services and Construction Act varied greatly among the states. Roger H. McDonough (1962: 40) found the LSA monies being used widely for increasing and improving the quality of staffs with 115 field workers or consultants being added to state library agencies between 1957 and 1960. A total of 285 other professional librarians were added to state library staffs. Fifteen states used LSA funds to establish or strengthen regional or extension offices. Thirty centralized processing centers were established and were serving over five hundred small local libraries by 1960.

California chose to utilize its LSCA funds in achieving two main goals: to reduce the number of counties without public library service and to encourage the formation of systems joining areas that already had library service (Mersel, 1969: 315). Within the framework of these two goals was emphasis on establishing or extending library services to residents of rural depressed communities and farm labor camps in
agricultural regions such as the San Joaquin Valley (Mersel, 1969: 263).

Kansas began with local demonstrations under the LSA and progressed to the development of regional systems under the LSCA (Mersel, 1969: 318). Kansas also developed the Kansas Information Circuit (KIC), an information network that provided citizens throughout the state with access to the major public library collections (Mersel, 1969: 220).

North Carolina used its federal public library money to augment a state grant-in-aid program that already existed. New York used its federal funds for competitive grants to its twenty-two system libraries on the basis of project proposals submitted from these public libraries. Utah used LSA funds to establish its state library and to provide library services to the vast areas of the state without any public library activities. Massachusetts, which had long-established public libraries, used LSCA funds to enrich its libraries with special purpose grants, to develop coordinated interlibrary loan and reference services, and to support regional public library systems (Mersel, 1969: 317).

The state of Washington elected to use its federal public library funds to accelerate the Washington State Library's demonstration program that had been established before the passage of the LSA. In Wisconsin LSA and LSCA money was used to develop systems linking each local library user to a larger source and array of library materials and professional services. The Ohio State Library Board allocated LSCA funds for three general categories: state library-directed programs for the extension and supplementation of library service in rural areas, projects that fostered intra-county and multi-county cooperative
endeavors, and special projects that included programs for economically disadvantaged in urban areas (Mersel, 1969: 318).

The Arkansas Library Commission used its LSCA funds to strengthen the state library agency activities that served participating libraries. Some of these activities were workshops for staffs, centralized technical processing and cataloging, and consultant assistance. LSCA money in Arkansas were also used to strengthen multi-county libraries by financing additional personnel, books, equipment, and supplies. In South Carolina the state library agency chose to augment its own grant-in-aid program with LSCA funds. This money was used to strengthen local library capabilities on an incentive basis that required certain minimum standards of local services and support (Mersel, 1969: 318).

The Texas State Library emphasized four general purposes in its use of federal public library funds under the LSA and the LSCA in the period 1956-1957. The first purpose was the extension and improvement of library service to areas without such service or with inadequate service and to the blind, physically handicapped, institutionalized, and disadvantaged. The second purpose was to improve and strengthen the state library's capacity to provide services of a complementary and supportive nature. The third purpose was the remodelling and constructing of public library buildings in communities with poor facilities. Finally, the Texas State Library used its federal money to establish and maintain cooperative networks for coordination of the resources of all types of libraries in a region and over the entire state (Kee, 1974: 6).

Effects of Federal Funds

Monypenny (1962: 98) stressed the point that the sums made
available under the LSA were only a trickle in relation to the whole scale of the federal budget. Monypenny (1962: 101) also noted that the eventual cost of operating LSA programs beyond the expiration date of the legislation was concealed. Staffs, equipment, and book collections were provided to people in various areas of states with no realistic idea of what the upkeep of these enterprises were likely to be on a long-term basis. With LSA aid combined with state funds, state library agencies were able to operate impressive programs with the citizenry of the states clearly not supporting the programs in any direct manner. Neither governors, budget officers, nor legislators faced up to what these programs actually cost. Critical decisions of who was going to "pick up the tab" over the long term the amount of the costs and for what the money available was to pay were avoided.

Walter Brahm (1970: 262) considered the advent of the LSA in 1957 as providing impetus for the development of the pattern of state-wide surveys followed by development plans with this trend continuing through 1969. Hannis S. Smith (1962: 68) asserted that the LSA was most significant in overcoming the economic element of the social climate surrounding the establishment of public libraries in rural areas.

Lovell A. Martin (1962: 3-4) suggested that several advances were made in public library services in rural areas under the LSA. Local rural areas lacking public library services were given a start in the right direction though only modest numbers of people were affected, slightly under two million of the twenty million in rural areas at the time. Moderate, not spectacular, numbers of new county libraries and multi-county library systems to a lesser extent were created under the LSA. Guidance and training of local library personnel by state agencies was increased. Interlibrary loan and reference services of state
library agencies were strengthened by the addition of several million volumes. Also, the LSA stimulated increased public library appropriations at the state level. The LSA was the primary factor in the initiation of state-aid programs in six states.

Carma Russell Leigh (1962: 56) stated that the LSA stimulated stronger interest among small libraries in coordinating their programs and services. This was especially true in book purchasing but many coordinated efforts distinctively lacked emphasis on reference and information services.

Hannis S. Smith (1962: 73) felt that the LSA substantially increased the services and raised the quality of public libraries in rural areas. Local funds did not increase rapidly by percentages but there were slight gains; substantial gains occurred in amounts of state funds appropriated and allocated for public library services.

Phillip Monypenny and Guy Garrison (1956: 144) stated that the Library Services Act brought about a very share increase in book expenditures for many state library extension agencies. This was partly due to the previous neglect of many headquarters collections and partly because books were one way to spend money rapidly and usefully in the absence of more specific programs and staff to initiate them. Many agencies concentrated heavily on increasing book collections to be circulated throughout the state, either by local libraries or by state-operated bookmobiles.

Monypenny (1962: 110) reported that under the LSA the state of New York was able to establish regional library systems as an organizational layer between state and local units. The need for increased library staffs and resources was met with reorganization of state public library services rather than by drastic changes in the
local units. State library control in New York over the regional library systems resulted in greater influence over the local libraries.

Monypenny (1962: 100) also reported that a definite result of the LSA was the significant development of bookmobile service as a vital addition to local public library services. He further stated that the LSA resulted in heavier emphasis upon demonstrations financed with federal funds as a means of spreading public library services to areas previously unserved and giving greater attention to children's materials and services.

According to Harold Lancour (1962: 114-115), as a result of LSA programs some thirty-six million people had library service for the first time or had greatly improved library services by 1961. Lancour's statistics further showed that fifteen hundred counties across the nation had benefited from LSA funds and eight hundred new personnel were added to public library staffs. Also, a total of 268 new bookmobiles had been purchased up through 1961. Furthermore, numerous people were made aware of the importance of public libraries and formerly weak state agencies were made viable.

Lancour (1962: 116) was critical of the impact of the LSA. He criticized the emphasis given to bookmobiles because bookmobiles were used to bring substandard library service to people. Lancour felt that more consideration should have been made for providing improved roads to carry people to quality libraries. Another criticism by Lancour (1962: 117) was that the LSA continued a policy of "fragmentation and convenience" which meant that library service was made convenient to those fortunate enough to live near each fragment.

Lancour (1962: 117) emphasized that while larger units of library service were created, these were little more than a combination of a few
relatively weak local libraries. Weakness plus weakness equaled weakness and the LSA did little to provide something basically strong and vital. Many demonstration libraries did not continue to operate with local funds after the end of the demonstration periods because the people of the communities involved were not willing to spend their own money to continue the public libraries.

Lancour (1962: 118) went on to say that federally supported demonstrations did not show realistically what was possible to the people of a community and, as a result, many demonstrations failed. State libraries also continued to encourage numerous small units that should not have been continued with any good reason.

Martin (1962: 14) stated that the LSA resulted in new patterns of library service and strengthened the county unit. Also, the availability of services was broadened through bookmobiles and state level centralized processing programs were established relieving local staffs for involvement in direct public services.

A substantial result of LSA was the promotion of planning because money was made available based upon approved plans. Thus, public library agencies were motivated to plan for the future because planning was rewarded. The LSA provided state and local libraries with the financing necessary to incorporate technology into their operations in the form of teletypewriters, multiliths, electronic copiers, and direct telephone systems (Leigh, 1962: 59-60).

Mersel (1969: 221) commented that the LSA and LSCA were very successful in Kansas in creating seven regional library systems and the Kansas Information Circuit. Increased support resulted in strengthened local public library service as well.
The effect of LSA and LSCA funds on public library development in Massachusetts was the arousal of additional support and the passage of legislation for the state-aid program to local public libraries. The LSCA accelerated these developments beginning in 1964 (Mersel, 1969: 52).

The LSCA had a major impact on the libraries of the poorer areas of North Carolina. Small local libraries had their collections improved and could operate in systems. Yet, even with LSCA support most of the public libraries of North Carolina were woefully underfinanced. LSCA funds possibly did not generate increased state support for public libraries in North Carolina (Mersel, 1969: 118).

Mersel (1969: 154) suggested that the LSCA did not appear to have significantly increased the amount or level of financial support previously available for Ohio public libraries but merely supplemented those funds. What effect the federal funds did seem to have, according to Mersel (1969: 151), was in motivating a reorganization of the service patterns of the state library agency in Ohio. Program planning and administration for some of the rural areas with inadequate services and finances was centralized within the Ohio State Library. Also, the Ohio State Library established two regional library service agencies and several bookmobile programs.

The general improvement in public library services in South Carolina between 1959 and 1969 was impressive and largely due to the availability of federal funds under the LSA and LSCA. New buildings replaced obsolete facilities, library buildings were erected where there had previously been none, book and non-book collections were strengthened, and a wider variety of library services were made available to the public. Local library staffs were extremely grateful
for LSA and LSCA funds and the South Carolina State Library Board and its director were highly respected for their handling of the federal funds. The marked effect of federal funds on South Carolina public libraries was probably due to the sensitive stewardship of a state library agency that knew intimately the economic and political realities of each region in the state (Mersel, 1969: 142).

In Kee's study (1974:20) of the impact of federal funding upon public libraries in Texas, the librarians who responded to the opinion questionnaire stated that federal funding imposed standards of performance upon local public library agencies and the LSCA monies applied the necessary pressure on local governing bodies to increase their financial support of public libraries. The guidelines established for LSCA programs in Texas provided leverage for increasing public concern and tax-based support for those public libraries operating with below standard incomes. Kee (1974: 17) stated that the greatest effects of the federal programs were probably those that defy measurement: change of attitudes, greatly increased public interest in public library development, and the enrichment of the lives of people who had their first opportunity to borrow books from a bookmobile or from a newly opened public library.

Another development in public library services in Texas which was attributed to federal funds included an increase in the total appropriations from city governments for public library purposes. County support for public libraries increased significantly along with book stocks and the number of bookmobiles. These occurrences and their relationship to the Library Services Act and the Library Services and Construction Act could not be accurately measured (Kee, 1974: 13).
Kee (1967: 14) noted that as essential as the federal funds were in producing concrete improvements in public library programs and services, there were important intangible "by-products." Two examples were that public librarians and trustees were given hope and librarians were made to think in terms of larger service units such as public library systems and rapid communications networks.

Mopyenny and Garrison (1966: 142) stated that the increased paperwork associated with federal public library programs led many state library agencies to add administrative assistants with responsibility for internal administration. These assistants were often involved in producing necessary reports and documents and keeping the library agencies abreast of governmental laws and regulations affecting the affairs of the state public library agency. Supposedly, these added staff members freed administrators from troublesome detail and increased the ability of the state level library agencies to comply with the various governmental regulations imposed on them while at the same time maintaining their ability to meet program and service objectives in a flexible and energetic manner.

Based upon a query of state librarians by the American Library Association in 1965, Kee (1967: 13) stated that without exception the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) definitely had positive effects on public library programs and services. The most significant achievements were cited as being more and better books, increased numbers of trained staff members, improved physical facilities, development of larger and more functional units of service, development of public library systems, increased utilization of bookmobiles, and added strength of state library agencies. About half of the state librarians reported major emphasis on cooperative programs and services.
such as interlibrary cooperation in book purchasing, cooperative processing centers, and services that crossed county and municipal lines.

There was the possibility that the greatest impact of federal legislation on public libraries would not come from the LSA or the LSCA, but from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and other similar domestic legislative measures that encouraged the use of public libraries by new and different types of users. The community programs under these laws compelled public librarians to turn their attention on themselves in order to re-examine the purposes of public libraries, to evaluate existing programs and services, to find improved ways of coordinating library services, and to adjust to the original purposes of public libraries which were based on the principles of equal chance and continuing education (Kee, 1967: 110).

PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN LOUISIANA

The Louisiana State Library exerted a significant influence on public library development in the state throughout the forty-eight year history of the agency. After the completion of its library demonstration program in 1969, when the last of the local parish public libraries was established, the State Library began moving in new directions by initiating various types of programs designed to emphasize the benefits of regional and state-wide cooperative and coordinated public library services (Louisiana Advisory Council on Libraries, 1972: 5).

Louisiana State Library

The governor appointed, with the confirmation of the state
senate, the five members of the Louisiana State Library Board of Commissioners. Two of the five members had to be women. Members of the Board of Commissioners served without compensation, except for travel expenses to meetings, for staggered terms of five years each. The function of the Board of Commissioners was to set policy for the Louisiana State Library with the advice of the chief administrator, the Louisiana State Librarian (Humphry, 1968: 18).

Organization. The Louisiana State Library was organized by function and consisted of four main departments which were Administration, Readers' Services, Library Technical Operations, and Library Development. Administration included the Louisiana State Librarian and her staff and was concerned with the coordination of all programs and services of the Louisiana State Library and the interpretation of the needs and objectives of the agency to the legislature. Readers' Services dealt with such services as information and interlibrary loan, and programs for the blind and physically handicapped. Library Technical Operations handled centralized book processing for participating local public libraries, institutional libraries, and the State Library. Library Development involved regional library system development, consultant services, development of libraries in health and correctional institutions, and programs of interlibrary cooperation (Louisiana State Library Budget Request, FY 1974: 2).

Planning. The most important function of the Louisiana State Library over the years was its influence on the establishment of the parish public libraries through demonstrations. The demonstration plan provided a more permanent and effective means of library development in areas previously without public libraries than could have been achieved
with traveling libraries or bookmobiles operated by the state. The Louisiana State Library generally was able to resist attempts by local communities to establish small, relatively weak units of public library service. On the other hand, it was able to encourage, guide, and help finance a coordinated plan of local public library development that spanned a period of more than forty-five years (Humphry, 1968: 19).

The intelligent planning of library growth in Louisiana under the Louisiana State Library logically suggested the next step for future planning, a system concept of interlibrary cooperation. This overall program of coordination would necessarily involve all types of libraries with emphasis on strengthening the services available to any citizen of Louisiana (Humphry, 1968: 53).

The emphasis by the Louisiana State Library upon the parish programs of public library services was developed in an attempt to reach and serve all residents of the state. Public library service, as constituted in 1968, provided a firm foundation upon which to build a comprehensive plan for library and information services (Humphry, 1968: 52).

The functions of the Louisiana State Library were prescribed by law. The State Library was authorized to provide schools, colleges, and universities with interlibrary loan; to work toward a coordinated system of parish and regional libraries throughout the state; to conduct courses of study and institutes for the professional development of library staffs and trustees; to organize and operate a legislative reference library for the legislature and public officials in particular and the public in general; to provide special services to the blind and physically handicapped of the state under guidelines of the Library of
Congress; and to provide consultant and advisory services at the request
of local libraries (Louisiana State Library Budget Request, FY 1974: 2).

**Funding.** According to the comprehensive study of libraries in Louisiana
by Humphry (1968: 93), the Louisiana State Library had been operating
with state funds that had virtually remained constant for the ten-year
period 1957-1967. This situation was described as an "absurdity" when
the responsibilities of the State Library were considered.

While state-aid to public libraries was recognized by the
majority of states as a legitimate public expense, public libraries in
Louisiana received little in the way of state funds. At the time of the
Humphry (1968: 89) report, the total of local funds and federal money
had increased substantially, while state support remained at a fairly
low and constant amount. It was apparent in 1968 that the state of
Louisiana was not assuming its fair share in supporting public library
programs and services.

**Budgeting.** The Louisiana State Library in 1973 was employing a program
budget format as required by state regulations under the Division of
Administration. The budget forms and instructions for the next fiscal
year were usually received in October by the Executive Assistant in
charge of the State Library's business office. The budget had to be
completed and submitted to the Budget Committee of the state legislature
in January of the next calendar year. Hearings on the agency budgets
then commenced in March or April. At these hearings the State Librarian
or her representative could appear for justification of funding requests
and explanation of any points that needed clarifying. After the
approval of the Budget Committee, the legislature then made the actual
appropriation (Stringfield, 1974).
The general budget of the State Library covered a three-year period. The actual expenditures for the previous fiscal year were noted, the amounts for the new budget were indicated, and estimates of funds for the following fiscal year were made. The uses of federal funds were detailed in the budget with the difference shown between that requested and that actually received in the previous fiscal year. This format was also followed for state funds (Stringfield, 1974).

The first part of the budget was a summary of all pertinent fiscal information and was in a line-item format. This was followed by adjusted current operating levels and needed funds for proposed operating levels and needed funds for proposed expansion of already established services or new services. The need for expansion of service or new services had to be justified in narrative fashion by identifying the needs for additional services and how they were to be procured. A detailed description of the different departments and services of the Louisiana State Library were next (Stringfield, 1974).

Following the program outline section was a description of the sources of funds other than state monies that were included in the budget. Next was a summary of operating costs within each department of the State Library, followed by a breakdown of salaries of full-time staff members, travel for board members, student labor, wages of clericals and other nonprofessional employees, retirement system contributions, F.I.C.A. Tax, group insurance contributions, etc. After the breakdown of personnel services and benefits was a summary sheet of those figures. This was followed by a form for justifying funds for new positions (Stringfield, 1974).

The rest of the State Library budget itemized such things as compensation for the State Library Board of Trustees, professional
services provided to the State Library, contractual services, travel expenses for State Library staff members, materials and supplies, employer's contributions to retirement and group insurance programs, expenditures for public assistance and grants to other library agencies and programs, equipment purchases, major repairs, and mileage and maintenance for automobiles and other vehicles owned by the State Library. These additional sections were in a line-item format with brief statements in support of the proposed expenditures when necessary. Also, the actual funds expended in the previous fiscal period and the amounts requested and anticipated for the next fiscal year were provided (Stringfield, 1974).

Work load data for each department of the State Library was included in the budget. This data consisted of the productivity of each department measured in units that represented the departmental functions. This information was included in the narrative detailing the operations of each department in the section of agency program outlines (Stringfield, 1974).

Separate budget forms for federal funds had to be forwarded to the United States Office of Education (USOE) by July 1 of each year. Program memorandums were provided by the USOE to the State Library explaining the federal regulations and any changes that were made in them. The forms were usually received early in the spring. Submission of federally funded budgets could be extended beyond the beginning of the fiscal year. The State Library operated on the assumption that it would receive at least the same amount as in the previous year. Continuing resolutions by Congress provided funds to the states until the appropriations package bill for the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for that fiscal year received
Congressional approval (Stringfield, 1974).

Whenever the federal funds were appropriated, the State Library had to submit amendments to its program budgets previously forwarded to the United States Office of Education (USOE). Also, any change in the State Library's general budget required the submission of a request for change in allotment to the budget department of the Louisiana Division of Administration. Final approval for a change in the state budget was made by the legislature's Budget Committee (Stringfield, 1974).

Federal, state, and other monies were combined in developing the budget for each separate program. No programs and services of the Louisiana State Library were necessarily funded totally by the state or by federal money. The budget of the Louisiana State Library included the cost of janitorial services and building, although such was provided by the State Department of Buildings and Grounds. The costs of these services were reported originally to the federal government in order to meet the matching funds requirement of the federal legislation for public libraries (Stringfield, 1974).

Effects of Federal Funds. According to the Humphry (1968: 90) study, the effect of federal legislation under the LSA and the LSCA upon state support for public libraries in Louisiana was negligible. During the period 1956-1967, the state of Louisiana increased its financial support of the Louisiana State Library by a total of $6,146. During the same span of time the federal government increased its aid to programs and services of the Louisiana State Library from $40,000 to $631,904. Though the basic intent of the federal funds provided by the LSA and then the LSCA for public libraries was to generate increased interest and financial support by states and localities, such was not the case in Louisiana.
Local Public Libraries

With some exceptions local public libraries in Louisiana were parish agencies funded by the parishes and providing all residents of the parish with public library services. While the State Library had no direct control over their functions, it was hoped that the State Library did exert some positive influence over the nature of their activities. Also, a number of the public libraries of smaller parishes were begun as demonstration libraries by the Louisiana State Library (Farrell, 1974).

Organization. The administrative manual for heads of parish public libraries was prepared and kept up-dated by the Manual Committee of the Public Library Section of the Louisianna Library Association. This manual and its amendments were printed and distributed by the Louisiana State Library (Manual, 1955: I).

In 1926 the Louisiana State Legislature passed Act 36 which provided that the police jury, as the governing body of a parish, had authority to own parish library buildings and sites. A site was purchased in the name of the parish police jury from library allocated funds (Manual, 1956: 92). Most parish libraries had a five-member board of trustees appointed by the police jury. Board members served staggered terms of five years with the president of the police jury as an ex-officio member (Cazayoux, 1974).

While the main organizational pattern of the Louisiana public libraries was along parish lines, there were exceptions. The city of New Orleans and Orleans Parish were coterminous. The residents of Caddo Parish were served by the Caddo Parish Extension, which operated out of the municipal library of Shreveport, the Shreve Memorial Library. The residents of Lake Charles were assessed twice for public library
service, once for the parish and again for the municipal library (Humphry, 1969: 24). Another major exception was the bi-cities' library that served specifically the towns of Eunice and Opelousas but which was also open to use by residents of the parish who were not taxed for library support (Humphry, 1969: 27).

The usual sources of library funds in Louisiana were from local appropriations from parish and city governments and from special library taxes, usually a property tax voted at a set millage for a specified number of years. This income could be supplemented by severance tax allotments, money received for contractual service to schools, collection of fines, payment for lost or damaged books, and gifts and endowments (Manual, 1956: 92).

Taxes voted for service and upkeep for local public libraries in Louisiana could not be legally switched to construction or renovation of buildings. Funds for construction had to be raised either by a special tax or bond issue dedicated for library construction by the local governing authority, or from a memorial gift (Manual, 1956: 98).

Budgeting. Making the budget was the responsibility of the librarian and was usually done in the fall of each year for the next calendar year. The librarian could use as a guide in budget preparation the library expenditures of the previous year, the library's present objectives, anticipated yield of financial sources, and national standards for public library services. Also, the probable deductions for the collection of library taxes by the sheriff and tax assessor had to be established. While the collection fee of the sheriff's office might vary, the amount due the local assessment office was a set sum (Manual, 1956: 89).
Severance tax income and money from fines were preferably not included in a local library's proposed budget. Also, budget figures could not be inflated with a balance remaining from the previous year (Manual, 1956: 89). The completed budget was then submitted to the library board of trustees for approval and forwarded to the local police jury before the beginning of the next fiscal period (Manual, 1956: 91).

Most library boards in Louisiana operated on a cash basis. As a local library's financial books were closed at the end of each fiscal year, a large balance on hand was shown which, in accounting, would be a surplus. The funds in this balance, however, were actually for the operation of the calendar year just beginning (Manual, 1956: 90).

Administrative Records. A monthly financial statement showing a balance at the end of each month with all receipts and expenditures had to be completed and submitted to the library board and the police jury. All receipts and expenses were recorded in the financial ledger of the library. This included salaries, withheld monies for insurance and income tax, travel, purchases of books and materials, office supplies, building supplies, and equipment. Also, a record for the revolving fund or "petty cash" had to be maintained (Manual, 1956: 93-94).

Except for memorandums interchanged among staff members of local public libraries in Louisiana, all communications going out and coming in the library were kept on file. A furniture and equipment inventory was maintained with prices indicated for each item. Records had to denote equipment and materials supplied by the Louisiana State Library with the current status of each item. Also, for present and past employees, personnel records were kept showing work experience, training, salary, annual or sick leave, addresses, and other pertinent
The local public libraries in Louisiana were required to submit regular reports to the State Library. A "Statistical Report of Use" was a monthly statistical record which covered such activities as circulation, interlibrary loan, and reference transactions. Also, reports indicating the removal of State Library supplied materials from a library's collection had to be submitted. A monthly bookmobile report was also completed on the operation of bookmobiles and the circulation of materials from them. Monthly reports were cumulated into a six months and an annual report (Manual, 1956: 84-85). Each library was also required to make annual financial reports to the parish governing body, to its constituency, and to the State Library detailing the "Stewardship of its functions, responsibility, and finances" (Manual, 1956: 86).

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a review of the available related research studies and to provide background information necessary for understanding the material presented on developments in Louisiana public libraries under the Library Services Act and the Library Services and Construction Act, 1957-1973.

An important element in public library administration was the preparation of a budget. Most public libraries operated with a traditional line-item budget format. The program planning budgetary system (PPBS) was less widely used but was more flexible and functional.

The purpose of the Library Services Act (LSA) of 1956 was to extend public library services to rural areas having little or no services. In 1964 the LSA was amended and renamed the Library Services
and Construction Act (LSCA) which extended federal benefits to urban as well as rural areas and provided for construction of libraries with the addition of Title II. In 1966, three more titles providing for interlibrary cooperation, institutional library services, and services to physically handicapped persons were added. In 1970 the LSCA was again amended with titles IV-A and IV-B being consolidated under Title I.

With some exceptions, local public libraries in Louisiana were parish agencies and employed line-item budget formats. The Louisiana State Library by law was responsible for public library development in the state and received regular monthly and annual reports from the local libraries. The budget format followed by the State Library was identified as a program planning type.

Chapter 3 will present information from annual state plans, annual narrative reports, reports of actual expenditures, and other sources dealing with projects funded under the Library Services Act between fiscal 1957 and fiscal 1964.
Chapter 3

DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT, 1957-1964

The period of the Library Services Act in Louisiana involved the establishment of the foundation for future programs and developments under the Library Services and Construction Act. In a sense, the Library Services Act pushed public libraries in Louisiana into the modern era of informational services; and without the LSA, the subsequent developments under the Library Services and Construction Act would have been greatly diminished.

The information for this chapter was literally extracted from the federal program files in the office of the State Librarian of the Louisiana State Library. While the files were clearly and properly labelled, the contents often lacked complete narrative reports and related records for the fiscal years. In fact, some complete or partially intact LSA reports and supporting documents that were examined had to be located in the general correspondence files for the period. The researcher assumes that all of the pertinent materials are buried somewhere in the various files of the State Library.

PROGRAMS AND PLANS

As required by federal guidelines under the Library Services Act (LSA), the Louisiana State Library submitted budget summaries for proposed projects and programs. The early program plans consisted of lump sum budget formats accompanied by a brief narrative that varied in detail, and supporting documents such as an organizational chart of the State Library, the promise to repay funds inappropriately used, a
statement of authority for the State Librarian, and the certification of the program plan by the required state officials.

The initiation of LSA projects and activities began in fiscal 1957. Because of this, no material was presented for 1956.

1957

The state plan submitted for federal funds under the Library Services Act for fiscal year 1957 was brief with a minimum of narrative for each proposed project. Included were a short statement of the authority of the Louisiana State Library and a sketch of its organizational structure, an outline of fiscal provisions, an outline of policies and method of administration of federal library projects, and finally, an identification of each of the proposed projects.

The Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1957 received $289,350 in state money with over sixty percent of this amount to be spent in the extension programs and services (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 1.0). The state money used for LSA projects was to be $64,112, local funds were to amount to $10,388, and the first federal allotment for Louisiana under the LSA was $40,000 (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 5.0).

Federal funds under the Library Services Act (LSA) were mainly intended for the continuation of the State Library's demonstration plan at a quickened pace in the twenty parishes of Louisiana still without local public libraries (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 3.0). The continuation of a library demonstration begun with state money earlier in the year was to receive federal support during the last half of 1957, while three new demonstrations were to be established (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 5.0).

The Vernon Parish Library Demonstration was budgeted for
$12,645. This amount included $2,500 for salaries of which $324 was for reimbursement of a State Library field consultant. The book allotment was $2,500, building and operating expenses were allotted $30, and administrative and miscellaneous expenses were budgeted $425 (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 5.2).

The Allen Parish Library Demonstration was allotted a total of $14,731 for a four-month period in fiscal 1957. Salaries for the project were projected at $6,285, and books were allotted $1,875. Building and operating costs were budgeted at $3,955 with all of this amount coming from parish funds. Administrative and miscellaneous costs were budgeted $2,616 (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 5.2).

The Red River Parish Library Demonstration was allotted $46,384 with $1,258 being for salaries. Reimbursement for the State Library field consultant was set at $825 for one and a half months. The book budget was $20,300 for approximately 8,000 volumes. Administrative and miscellaneous costs were set at $24,826 which included furniture, equipment, shelving, and a library sign, with $12,240 of the total for book processing. Travel expenses for field consultants of the State Library were set at $520 (Program Plan, Jan. 14, 1957: 5.2).

The budget for a library demonstration in an undesignated parish totalled $40,000 for fiscal year 1957. The cost of the 8,000 volumes was approximated at $20,000 with equipment costs estimated at $8,500. Equipment costs included the price of a new bookmobile. All other operating expenses were $12,240 which included the cost of processing the books (Program Plan, Jan 14, 1957: 5.7). No further detailing of projected expenses was provided.
1958

The plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library under the Library Services Act (LSA) for fiscal year 1958 was, like that of the previous year, very brief in narrative content. Again, no program objectives were listed and a line-item budget was used.

The plan for fiscal 1958 included continuation of demonstration libraries in Vernon Parish and Allen Parish, and the opening of a demonstration in St. Bernard. St. Bernard Parish replaced Red River, which was listed in the previous year's plan, because the police jury of Red River Parish did not make the necessary local appropriation for the demonstration year. Also included in the list of projects was a tentative demonstration, dependent upon local approval, for bookmobile service in Caddo Parish. A budget was included for a demonstration in a parish yet to be determined and for a multi-parish library demonstration project in East and West Feliciana Parishes and St. Helena Parish. Money was also set aside for headquarters services at the Louisiana State Library (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.1).

The total state appropriation for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal year 1958 was $284,894 with sixty percent of it budgeted for the extension program. Funds budgeted by the State Library for LSA projects amounted to $122,409. Local appropriations were set at $17,305 with the federal funds for fiscal year 1958 totalling $103,777 (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

The Allen Parish Library Demonstration was allotted $19,477 with $11,712 going for salaries. The cost for books was set at $3,000 for 1200 volumes. Building and operations were to receive $1,440 from parish sources. Administrative and miscellaneous funds were set at $3,324 (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).
The Caddo Parish demonstration of bookmobile service was allotted a total of $48,170. Salary costs were estimated at $9,030 including $18.00 per day costs for fifteen days for a State Library consultant. Expenses for book and magazines were set at $12,850 and administrative and miscellaneous costs were set at $26,290 which included two bookmobiles at $8,000 each, bookmobile upkeep and operating expenses, travel expenses for a State Library field consultant, and $7,560 for processing the books to be used in the demonstration (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

The St. Bernard Parish Library demonstration was provided $28,950 in the 1958 State Library plan for ISA projects. Salaries totalled $16,980, books were $3,750, and building and operating expenses were set at $4,495 and included $2,295 for book processing (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

The regional or multi-parish library demonstration for East and West Feliciana Parishes and St. Helena Parish was budgeted a total of $86,663. Salary costs were set at $7,020 with a State Library field consultant allotted $20.00 per day for twelve days. Book and magazine expenses were set at $38,100. Both state and parish funds were to be used for the $5,460 established for building and operating costs. Administrative and miscellaneous expenses were established at $36,083 with $22,950 of this cost being for the processing of books for the demonstration (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

For a demonstration in a parish not yet determined at the time this plan was submitted, a total of $42,940 was set. The only budget divisions were $20,300 for books and magazines and $22,640 for administrative and miscellaneous expenses with $12,240 of this going for
book processing. Also included was a $1,700 car allotment (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

In addition to requests for funds for public library demonstrations, the Louisiana State Library also included $9,460 for a LSA project designated as "headquarters services." This involved programs at the State Library of value to local public libraries in general. Salary costs for this project were set at $2,760 for one clerical assistant, $3,000 for the purchase of films, and $3,700 for administrative and miscellaneous expenses including travel expenses (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

The allocation for reimbursable and non-reimbursable expenditures in Louisiana State Library program plans submitted under the LSA was based on a proration of costs. An example was the proration of salaries for State Library field consultants for which the State Library was reimbursed with federal funds for the time a consultant spent in the field working with a LSA project (Program Plan, July 16, 1957: 5.2).

1959

The fiscal 1959 plan of the Louisiana State Library for LSA funds was more concise than that of the year before. There was a one page general narrative of what was to be done during the year. No separate budget descriptions were provided for individual projects to be continued or established during the year. A single page outlined the general costs of each project during the year (Program Plan, July 24, 1958: 5.2).

Total state appropriations for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1959 were set at $267,000 with sixty percent intended for the extension program (Program Plans, July 24, 1958: 5.2). The State
Library budgeted $70,780 of state money for LSA projects, $12,165 from local sources, and $125,470 in federal funds. These amounts were combined and then divided among the projects planned for the year (Program Plan, July 24, 1958).

The State Library Plan for 1959 included the continuation of demonstrations in St. Bernard Parish at a cost of $1,744, Caddo Parish at a cost of $16,028, and the opening of a demonstration library on June 30, 1958 in Cameron Parish. The demonstration library for Cameron Parish was substituted for the multi-parish demonstration previously planned for East and West Feliciana Parishes and St. Helena Parish because the police juries in these parishes were unable to make the necessary local appropriations. Also, a demonstration library was planned for Plaquemines Parish at a cost of $55,880 and a demonstration for a parish not yet determined was budgeted $70,800 which included books, equipment, and operating expenses, but no salaries. Special headquarters services at the State Library were budgeted $9,410, and a special public relations project in parishes without public library service was planned at a total cost of $21,693.00. In this public relations project a representative of the State Library was to "conduct book talks, lead film discussions, plan exhibits for groups, prepare film and book lists." The major expenditure for the public relations project was $8,000 for books and materials with $6,000 for salaries, $2,700 for equipment, and $4,393 for other operating expenses (Program Plan, July 24, 1958: 5.2).

1960

The Louisiana State Library Plan under the LSA in fiscal 1960 was again very brief with only a general summary for each of the several
projects listed. Except for a film production project and a professional recruitment project, no objectives or reasons were given for the establishment of the projects. A map of the state was provided indicating the general location of the LSA projects. This 1960 LSA plan of the Louisiana State Library was amended because of additional federal funds beyond the amount of previously available. There was no separation of federal, state, and local funds according to projects.

The total state appropriation for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1960 was set at $284,894 (Program Plans, Aug. 21, 1959: 5.2). For LSA projects during the year, state sources were to provide $106,952, local sources $41,140, and federal funds $171,216 (Program Plan, Aug. 24, 1959: 5.2).

The Cameron Parish Library Demonstration was to be continued with $16,576 as was the Plaquemines Parish project at $17,386. A demonstration library was to be opened in Grant Parish at a cost of $21,379 and another in Jackson Parish at a cost of $36,185. Two demonstration libraries in yet to be designated parishes were allotted $74,289 and $35,550 respectively. Headquarters services at the Louisiana State Library were budgeted at $60,652 with $40,642 intended for the purchase of library books and materials (Program Plan, Aug. 21, 1959: 5.2).

Included in the plan for fiscal 1960 was a recruitment project which was to begin September 1, 1959. The purpose of this project was to alleviate the acute shortage of qualified librarians for staffing Louisiana library demonstrations and rural public libraries. A professional librarian and one clerical assistant were to be employed with responsibility for contacting college and high school students to
interest them in public librarianship as a profession. Other activities were listed as organizing a "Speakers Bureau" and developing an informational campaign utilizing newspapers, radio, television and exhibits (Program Plans, Aug. 21, 1959: 5). The description of the recruitment project was vague with no indication of implementation. An amendment to the plan included the possibility that the techniques and materials developed might be of value in other states that were short of professionally trained public librarians. The amount allotted to this program was $16,315 (Program Plan, Aug. 21, 1959: 5.2).

Another project was the production of a fourteen minute film about the Louisiana State Library's demonstration program. Contracts were let under the fiscal 1959 public relations project. The cost for this project was set at $3,976 (Program Plan, Aug. 21, 1959: 5.2).

1961

The LSA plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1961 had more narrative information than the previous ones. This was probably due to a change in the planning guidelines issued for LSA project proposals by the United States Office of Education. While not clearly indicated, some rationality for the need of each project was implied. Budgets for projects were again brief with no detail. Narrative information was provided for topics such as the policies and methods of handling federal funds by the Louisiana government, administration of the plan, detailed explanation of the Louisiana State Library demonstration program, and special programs of the Louisiana State Library such as information services and recruitment.

In the discussion of policies and administration in the fiscal 1961 plan was a reference to anticipated employment of additional
library consultants and service specialists needed in the expansion of State Library programs and services. Also, the Louisiana State Library was to undertake special unnamed state projects that would benefit all rural public library services in the state (Program Plan, Sept. 26, 1960: 3.1).

The total state appropriation for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1961 was $286,900 (Program Plan, Sept. 26, 1960: 1.3). Funds by source for LSA projects were $94,132 from the state, $4,000 from local sources, and $257,542 from the federal government (Program Plan, Sept. 26, 1960: 5.2).

The Grant Parish Library Demonstration was to be continued with $5,949 along with the Jackson Parish Library Demonstration with $23,511. A demonstration was to be established in Ascension Parish at a cost of $42,754. The establishment of the Audubon Regional Library Demonstration for East and West Feliciana Parishes and St. Helena Parish was budgeted $89,218. A centralized processing center for Madison and Tensas Parishes was to be established at a cost of $7,899. The recruiting activities of the State Library were allocated $17,366 and headquarters services of the State Library were budgeted $58,345. Funds for the establishment of a demonstration library in a yet to be determined parish were set at $12,500 (Program Plan, Sept. 26, 1960: 5.2).

The project for Madison and Tensas Parishes involved the hiring of two additional professional staff members and the purchase of all necessary equipment for processing materials for the two parishes. The two local libraries provided funds for the administrative librarian who supervised the library operations of both parishes and for salaries of
staff members already working in each parish. The project was to be operated for a two-year period (Program Plan, Sept. 26, 1960: 5.0).

1962

The LSA program plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1962 was again very short with a minimum of narrative in support of the proposed projects. As in earlier plans, there were no set objectives, short-range or long-range. There was a budget outline listing each project but there were no individual project budgets. The various sections of the plan included the identification of total state appropriations for the Louisiana State Library, a brief descriptive list of included projects, a budget summary for each project, the funds and sources for the fiscal year, a map of the state, the allocation between reimbursable and non-reimbursable expenditures, and the certification of the state plan by the State Librarian.

Total state appropriations for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1962 were $312,669 (Program Plan, May 30, 1961: 5.2). For LSA projects $107,570 was from the state, $189 from local sources, and $157,418 from the Library Services Act (Program Plan, May 30, 1961: 5.2).

The Ascension Parish Library Demonstration was to continue its operation with $9,331 as was the Audubon Regional Library Demonstration with $41,522. The payment of salaries for the two professional assistants in the Madison-Tensas project was also to be continued with $9,166. Two demonstration libraries in yet to be determined parishes were budgeted $62,089 and $58,474. The recruiting project was continued with an additional half-time publicity assistant for a total of $18,250 for the year with $13,000 of the amount for salaries. Headquarters
services were budgeted for $66,345 which was for activities of the State Library that could not be divided into specific expenditures used in support of the other projects (Program Plan, May 30, 1961: 5.2).

1963

The fiscal 1963 plan was more detailed than earlier LSA plans submitted by the Louisiana State Library. Narrative descriptions were provided of how the salaries of State Library staff members were prorated for services directed to rural areas. Superficial budget summaries were provided for the projects included. Also, a description of the establishment of parish and special demonstrations and special services was included.

State appropriations for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1963 were $267,000 (Program Plan, July 27, 1962: 1.3). Appropriations for Library Service Act projects by source were $135,070 in state money, $1,413 from local sources, and $157,418 from the federal government (Program Plan, July 27, 1962: 5.2).

Included in the narratives in support of the need for the proposed LSA projects was the statement that no public libraries in Louisiana met the standards of service set by the American Library Association in 1956. Public library demonstrations of the Louisiana State Library were established in the chronological order in which parishes approved the required ordinance for establishment of a local public library. In addition to its basic library demonstration program, the Louisiana State Library planned special library demonstrations in parishes already having established but inadequate public libraries. Also, due to an increase in the effectiveness of local programs and services, the State Library was to take the initiative in the
establishment of special projects of benefit to the entire state (Program Plan, July 27, 1962: 3.1).

In the State Library LSA plan for fiscal 1963, the Audubon Regional Library Demonstration, one of the undetermined parishes in the 1962 plan, was to be continued at a cost of $18,878. A parish library demonstration for Lincoln Parish, another unidentified demonstration site in the 1962 plan, was planned with a budget for 1963 of $27,548. The Madison-Tensas Parish centralized processing project was to be continued with a budget of $8,586. A yet to be determined demonstration library was budgeted for $21,518. The recruitment activities of the Louisiana State Library were budgeted for $10,150 including a scholarship for graduate study in library science. The budget for headquarters services at the State Library jumped to $178,571 (Program Plan, July 27, 1962: 5.2).

The increase in the allocation for headquarters services included salary supplements to the staff of the State Library prorated on the basis of their service involvement with rural areas. The total for salaries was $129,807 while only $24,279 was to be used for purchase of books and materials and $24,485 was for all other operating expenses. Salary supplements were provided for the Louisiana State Librarian at thirty-three percent, the director of the recruiting project at twenty-five percent, and the staff and clerical personnel involved in the Field Services Department at ten to seventy-five percent. Time studies were planned at various times and the 1963 plan amended as required (Program Plan, July 27, 1962: 5.3). No schedule of other information was provided about how or who was to make the time studies (Program Plan, July 27, 1962: 5.3).
1964

The fiscal 1964 plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library
under the LSA was similar in content and format to that for 1963. Both
contained detailed discussions of the allocation between reimbursable
and non-reimbursable expenditures. The 1961 plan still employed line-
item budget summaries with a minimum of narrative for objectives,
evaluative criteria, and procedures for the proposed projects.

The appropriation of state funds for the Louisiana State Library
in fiscal 1964 was $287,748 (Program Plan, July 29, 1963: 1.3). Funds
by source for LSA projects during the fiscal year were $160,159 from the
state of Louisiana, $1,524 from local sources, and $157,157 from the
federal government (Program Plan, July 29, 1963: 5.2).

In fiscal 1964, the Lincoln Parish Library Demonstration was
budgeted $6,101 through October 1963. A public library demonstration
was to be established in Bienville Parish with $45,602. The Madison-
Tensas centralized processing project was budgeted $3,133 for
professional personnel. Funds appropriated for the preparation of
library demonstrations in St. Landry and West Baton Rouge Parishes in
fiscal 1964 were $46,020 and $24,000 respectively. The recruitment
project was to be continued with expenditures of $10,470 which included
the part-time services of a director, public relations assistant,
secretary with one scholarship for graduate study in library science.
Funds to be allocated for headquarters services in fiscal 1964 were
increased to $183,514 (Program Plan, July 29, 1964: 5.2).

REPORTS AND RELATED MATERIALS

The regularly published reports of the Louisiana State Library
often referred to projects financed under the LSA and LSQA. These reports contained narrative and numerical data on the operations, programs, and services of the State Library and were meant to inform the clientele of the State Library and interested state officials of the status of the State Library's various activities. Most were biennial with the last two covering three-year periods.

Another publication of the Louisiana State Library was Public Libraries in Louisiana, an annual report of use statistics, salaries, and staffs of each public library in the state based upon the annual reports submitted by the local public library agencies to the State Library. Preceding the statistics in each edition was usually a brief narrative introduction that merely touched upon important developments in public librarianship in Louisiana during that year.

1957 and 1958

No annual reports or financial records as required under the Library Services Act (LSA) could be located for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 in the files of the Louisiana State Librarian. If copies of the 1957 and 1958 reports did exist, they were lost somewhere in the correspondence or general operating records for the period (Casayoux, 1974).

The Seventeenth Biennial Report of the Louisiana State Library for 1956-1957 acknowledged the receipt of an initial allotment of LSA federal funds in fiscal 1957 that totalled $40,000, the initial base allocation for all states (LSL Report, 17th: 9). No information about the use of these funds was found. A brief description was given about the matching requirements of the Library Services Act.
The Eighteenth Biennial Report of the Louisiana State Library for 1958-1959 mentioned that the State Planning Committee of the Louisiana Library Association in 1959 recommended that a state-wide recruiting program for relief of the extreme shortage of trained librarians in Louisiana be planned and directed by the Louisiana State Library. Such a project was possible under the LSA and was included in the state plans with the project in full operation in January 1960. This eighteenth report noted that it was still too early to evaluate the success of the project but that at the end of a two-year period the State Library "optimistically" expected that many more capable students would be enrolled in the library science programs of the state. No evaluation of other projects was made (LSL Report, 18th: 9).

The LSA report made by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal year 1959, and for later years, included a statistical summary of parishes and people served, personnel added, and a descriptive summary of each project with specific attention given to factual data, results of projects, in-service training programs, publications, and human interest items (Annual Report, Sept. 24, 1959: 1-2). Demonstration projects discussed were St. Bernard, Caddo, Cameron, Plaquemines, and Grant parishes. At the time of this report the story outline and script of the film production project had been completed with filming to have begun in August 1959. The special publicity or promotional project was not implemented by the State Library because a suitable person could not be located (Annual Report, Sept. 24, 1959: 6-7).

The fiscal 1959 LSA report stated the State Library's budget had increased $17,894 to $284,894. Interest in the use of public libraries
was reported on the rise in Louisiana due to an increase of 841,280 in circulation between 1957 and 1958. Also, the estimated per capita revenue of Louisiana public libraries rose from $1.48 in 1958 to $1.72 in 1959 (Annual Report, Sept. 24, 1959: 7).

1960

The fiscal 1960 LSA report followed the same format as did the 1959 report. A statistical summary of services was followed by a statistical summary of personnel and finally the major portion of the report which was the narrative of individual projects. According to the summary of services, nine bookmobiles were purchased during the year and fourteen additional professional librarians were employed in LSA projects along with twenty-six clerks and bookmobile drivers (Annual Report, 1960: 1).

Project descriptions were provided for established demonstrations in Cameron, Plaquemines, Grant, and Jackson parishes. Preparation was continued for a demonstration in Ascension Parish and a multi-parish demonstration designated the Audubon Regional Library in the parishes of East and West Feliciana and St. Helena. The film production project resulted in the twenty-minute color film "Libraries for Louisiana," which dealt with the story of the Louisiana State Library's public library demonstration program. The hope was expressed that the film would "hurry" the opening of libraries in the remaining fifteen parishes that had none. A print of the film was deposited with the headquarters library of the American Library Association in Chicago and loan prints were available from the Louisiana State Library. Total production cost was $10,000 (Annual Report, 1960: 4).
The activities for the two-year recruiting project began September 1, 1959. The director of the project, James S. Cockston, reported such activities as visits to college campuses, high school campuses, civic, service, and professional organizations, appeals to library trustees and community library action groups, and the use of publicity announcements through radio, television, newspapers, exhibits, and professional journals. It was suggested that the time was still too premature "to measure accurately the tangible results" but it was believed the public had been made keenly aware of the library profession and interest had been generated. The suggestion was made that an increase in enrollment in the graduate library courses of Louisiana State University was a result of this project (Annual Report, 1960: 5).

Statistics from the biennial reports of the Louisiana State Library for 1956-57 and 1958-59 were reproduced to show significant increases in several areas. Included were statistics of total persons served, use of public libraries, average per capita support, salary range for administrative public librarians, average salaries, and salary ranges for professional public library assistants (Annual Report, 1960: 6).

The narrative segment of the 1960 LSA report was a good example of ornate or flowery writing because of the use of pretentious and ostentatious adjectives and phrases. One of the more extreme examples of this style, which went beyond the description of facts, was in the description of the two parishes in the film project. Cameron Parish was described as being "widely known for Hurricane Audrey" and Plaquemines Parish as the "fabulous land of orange blossoms and oil wells" (Annual Report, 1960: 4). The producer of the film was described as a "magazine
writer and photographer, who brings both talent and technique to her productions" (Annual Report, 1960: 4). Another example of the flowery or ostentatious style was the narrative description of the work of the two state library consultants:

"It should also be noted that the intelligent and wise supervision of the two State Library field consultants contributed materially to the success of the demonstration programs. Their enthusiasm and tireless efforts cannot be overestimated in the accomplishments of these library demonstrations" (Annual Report, 1960: 6).

There were some problems in the planning of early LSA project budgets. These problems involved omission of necessary data for some projects and incorrect reporting of budgeted expenses for others. Evelyn Day Mullen (Nov. 17, 1959), Library Extension Specialist of the Library Services Branch of the Office Of Education, wrote to Essae M. Culver, Louisiana State Librarian, requesting information about the variance between reported expenditures and amounts budgeted in the state plan under LSA. Specifically, variations over or under $5,000 in the establishment and operation of a proposed project had to be requested in an amended plan. There were significant variations from the planned budgets and the reported expenditures in fiscal 1960 for projects in Grant Parish, Jackson Parish, Ascension Parish, headquarters services, and the recruiting project. In the 1960 plan, $35,550 was budgeted for a demonstration in an undetermined area but no report of expenditure was actually made. Miss Culver (Jan. 9, 1960) forwarded copies of correct figures to Miss Mullen. The problem developed because of an error in recording figures and as a result of the need for switching funds budgeted from some projects to other ones.
The annual descriptive report submitted under the LSA by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1961 was of the same format as the previous reports. Through fiscal 1962, a cumulative total of twelve bookmobiles had been purchased with the help of LSA funds, twenty-one professional librarians hired, and thirty-eight clerks and drivers added for the projects established during the LSA years (Annual Report, 1961: 1).

Descriptions were provided for projects of a demonstration nature in Grant, Jackson, Ascension, Madison, and Tensas Parishes. Also included was the Audubon Regional Library Demonstration (Annual Report, 1961:3). Activities of the recruiting project were divided into the categories of College, High School, Publicity, and Librarians, Trustees, and Friends of Libraries. Specific activities of the project director involved talks before groups of students, visits to Career Days at schools, preparation of recruiting brochures, television announcements, radio announcements, newspaper releases, and displays and exhibits at fairs and festivals. Tangible results of the recruiting project were considered to be an increase in both undergraduate and graduate library programs in colleges and universities of the state, better qualified people entering the profession in Louisiana, increased applications for employment, and more letters of inquiry about library career opportunities. Two $2,000 scholarships for graduate study in librarianship were given (Annual Report, 1961: 4).

The United States Office of Education required the submission of a descriptive summary for the entire period of the Library Services Act through June 30, 1961. This five-year report had to be as close as
possible to four typed pages and had to accompany the regular annual ISA report of 1961. It was expected that some photographs would be included (ISA Administrative Memorandum, June 23, 1961).

The five-year summary report filed by the Louisiana State Library stated that available ISA funds enabled the State Library to continue its demonstration program at a "quickened speed" so that all citizens of the state would have reasonable access to a public library. The organization and operation of library demonstration projects was generally described. Some numbers were mentioned in the text mainly in reference to book stocks in examples of a pilot or library demonstration program (Summary, 1961: 1-2). Inserted were two tables, one of which summarized the population served, borrowers, circulation and book stock of the ISA demonstrations during the five years covered by the report. The second table summarized the sources of funds for the demonstrations and the estimated tax yield from special library taxes for support of the public libraries (Summary, 1961: 3-4).

Another activity covered in the five-year report was the recruiting project including the scholarships. The purpose of the project and the activities were summarized. The information provided for this was almost repetitious of the information in the annual descriptive report (Summary, 1961: 6).

The purposes, production, and content of the film "Libraries for Louisiana" were summarized. Seven prints of the film were owned by the Louisiana State Library. According to this five-year report, the film had been shown to an audience of 4,263 in 109 showings in the state, in 19 other states with an attendance of 340 at 32 showings, by three television stations, and in Australia to 280 persons (Summary, 1961:5).
The last item of the report was a table summarizing the expenditures of source in the five-year period for the film project, recruiting and headquarters services. Also, total expenditures by the State Library for all five years were summarized by sources of funds, whether local, state, or federal (Summary, 1961: 8).

1962

The United States Office of Education made some slight changes in the format of the forms for the annual descriptive report for fiscal 1962. Section I of the new format was a statistical summary for the year of the report. Formerly, this section required cumulative data. Section II included the narrative descriptions of the individual projects (LSA Administrative Memorandum, July 23, 1962).

According to the annual LSA descriptive report for fiscal 1962 the equivalent of 1 1/2 professional librarians were hired along with five clerks and drivers to carry out the proposed 1962 programs. One bookmobile was purchased during the year (Annual Report, 1962: 1-2).

Projects briefly summarized in the narrative section included the Audubon Regional Library Demonstration, and demonstrations in Ascension Parish and Red River Parish, and the special service demonstration between Madison and Tensas Parishes. The local tax elections for the continuation of the Audubon Regional Library were set for the same date in each of the three participating parishes (Annual Report, 1962: 3-4).

The recruiting project again had the longest description and was again prepared by the project director, James S. Cookston. The usual types of activities such as visits to schools, colleges, and exhibits at fairs were reported. The director of the project served as the Louisiana Executive Director of National Library Week activities for
1962. Through the recruitment project, recruiting materials were provided for distribution through the local National Library Week committees. Also during the year, two more $2,000 scholarships were provided for work toward a professional library degree. Tangible results of the project were again reported as being increases in the enrollments of graduate and undergraduate library programs of the state (Annual Report, 1962: 4-5).

An annual Report of Expenditures was also filed with each annual narrative report. These expenditure reports presented general function-object budgets for each project and included the following categories: title of project, total funds, salaries and wages, purchase of books and materials, purchase of equipment, and all other operating expenses. The major category of support for the year was salaries and wages with $82,373 followed by $79,512 for books and materials out of the year's total allotment of $251,011 from all sources. These expenditure reports were submitted for use in determining the total amount of federal funds to which the state was entitled under the Library Services Act in the following year (Report of Expenditures, October 23, 1962).

A Conditions for Payment form (July 5, 1961) was required for determination of whether Louisiana met the requirements of the Library Services Act for payment of federal funds. The Conditions for Payment report was used in determining the allotment of funds which a state was to actually receive based upon its request. The basic item in this document was the total expenditures from the state for public libraries in 1956, the base year. Using a lump sum budget format, projected state funds for public libraries in the year involved were entered as well as the total local funds in the areas to be covered by that year's state LSA plan.
Along with the Report of Expenditures forms was a Request for Federal Funds (May 30, 1961). This included the estimated expenditures for funds available by source for proposed LSA projects in the next fiscal year. Also covered was the amount of federal money to be requested for the first half of the fiscal year with the remaining portion of the "federal share" not requested. The Report of Expenditures utilized a lump sum format.

1963

According to the Twentieth Biennial Report of the Louisiana State Library, progress and leadership in the provision of public library services to the residents of Louisiana was made despite budget limitations of the State Library in the 1962-1963 biennium. Funds were needed for such general elements of the State Library program as strengthening of media resources supplementary to local public library collections, additional professional staff in reference and consultant services, and for in-service training programs for local public libraries. Also, there was a demonstrated need for state-wide planning to assess needs, to meet them, and to determine the best procedures for getting maximum use of library resources and staffs for every public dollar spent (LSL Report, 20th: 1).

Projects receiving funding under the LSA in fiscal 1963 included the following demonstrations: Audubon Regional Library, Red River Parish, Lincoln Parish, Madison-Tensas Parishes, Bienville Parish, and a demonstration in an undetermined parish. Headquarters services were funded for the improvement of the resources of the State Library (LSL Report, 20th: 10-11). It was still considered impossible to measure tangibly the results of the recruiting project. The supposition was
made that the recruiting project increased the interest in librarianship as a profession and caused enrollments in graduate and undergraduate library curricula to continue to rise (ISL Report, 20th: 34-35).

A development possibly directly related to the Library Service Act (LSA) programs was the formation of a Standards Conference sponsored by the Louisiana State Library and Louisiana State University Library School, November 27-30, 1962. This was the beginning of the formulation of state standards for Louisiana public libraries. Final adoption of the standards was accomplished by the Public Library Section of the Louisiana Library Association in 1964. The standards stressed "cooperative, coordinated" endeavors among local libraries, special educational projects, joint public relations programs, centralized purchasing and processing of materials, in-service training programs and cooperation in the storage of little used materials (ISL Report, 20th: 8).

According to a federal audit of the Louisiana State Library's handling of LSA funds, all reported expenditures for LSA projects were proper and within federal guidelines. No part of any state funds used to earn federal money was used in any way contrary to the provisions of the approved state plan for fiscal 1963 or federal regulations. The federal share of all LSA programs and activities established by the State Library was reported (Fiscal Audit Report, Jan. 30, 1964).

1964

Specific uses of federal LSA funds in fiscal 1964 included the establishment of a library demonstration in Bienville Parish and continuation of the Madison-Tensas cooperative purchasing and processing project. Preparations were made for demonstrations in St. Landry and
West Baton Rouge Parishes. The Lincoln Parish demonstration became locally supported in fiscal 1964 (ISL Report, 21st: 1).

The public relations program was continued, although the director, James S. Cookston, resigned in August 1963 (ISL Report, 21st: 34). Mrs. Betty Edgerton, the public relations assistant, became responsible for the production of state-wide and local news releases, television spot announcements, exhibits, displays, and for coordination of National Library Week activities. In recruiting, only one $2,000 scholarship was given in 1964 (ISL Report, 21st: 19).

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter was to present material about the planned uses and actual applications in Louisiana of federal funds from the Library Services Act (LSA), 1957-1964. The information provided was obtained from the examination of annual LSA program plans, annual LSA reports, State Library reports, memoranda, and correspondence.

The Louisiana State Library emphasized the employment of demonstration library projects under the LSA between fiscal 1957 and 1964 as the best means for establishing public libraries in parishes previously without any. The available LSA funds also permitted other activities such as a public relations project, enrichment of the State Library's collection, and a formal recruitment program for increasing the number of trained public librarians in Louisiana.

Chapter 4 will follow the same format but will cover developments in Louisiana public libraries during the period of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), 1965-1973.
Chapter 4

DEVELOPMENTS UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT, 1965-1973

The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) broadened the service base of the Library Services Act (LSA) by encompassing both rural and urban public library programs and services in addition to the construction and renovation of public library facilities. During this period, a milestone in Louisiana public library development was reached. In 1969 the last parish without public library service available to all parish residents assumed support for continuing a public library established as a State Library demonstration project. Finally, all residents of the state of Louisiana had reasonable access to public library services.

PROGRAMS AND PLANS

The files of annual program plans submitted under the LSCA were more complete than those for the LSA. The LSCA annual programs of the Louisiana State Library were detailed in statistical data with narrative of varying specificity.

1965

The first state plan for receipt of federal funds under the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) submitted by the Louisiana State Library was very detailed in the narrative description of proposed projects, audit procedures, necessary reports, administrative policies, and the organization and responsibilities of the State Library. This
State Library. This State Library plan for LSCA projects was almost thirty pages long and established a pattern of increasing detail in justifying the need for federal money. Though more detailed narrative was provided, the same budget summary format was used as in the previous plan.

State support for the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1965 was budgeted at $287,748 (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 1). Funds by sources for LSCA related activities were $276,630 from state sources, $2,803 from local governments, and $453,397 from the federal government (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 25).

Under this plan local units of service were responsible for disbursing local funds under the LSCA guidelines with the approval of the State Library. Disbursements of federal funds by the New Orleans Public Library Board were governed by a contract between the Louisiana State Library and the New Orleans Public Library Board under the supervision of representatives of the State Library. The budgetary time frame for the Louisiana State Library was identified as the fiscal year while that of the local governmental units and their public libraries was the calendar year (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 7-8).

The fiscal 1965 plan under the LSCA indicated that supporting fiscal records and documentation for audits were to be located in the Bienville Parish Demonstration Library in Arcadia, the St. Landry Parish Demonstration Library in Opelousas, and the New Orleans Public Library. It was also noted that detailed state audits of the federally funded projects of the State Library were made annually (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 9).

According to this plan, the Louisiana State Library was to accept
and approve applications and disburse funds for the construction of public library facilities that were a part of a parish or regional library system and where there was evidence of a cooperative arrangement between a municipal library, the parish library, and the regional system. In order to receive construction money a public library had to provide substantiation of the need and provide local matching funds of 50 percent of the cost of construction from public sources or an amount not less than 35.23 percent from local public funds and not more than 64.77 percent from federal funds. Also, the proposed facility had to meet construction and service requirements as specified in the application and contract signed by the Louisiana State Library and the local responsible governing body. Priorities of construction were established in the order that applications were approved and local funds made available (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 20a).

The continuation of the Bienville Parish Library Demonstration was budgeted for $17,317 and the preparation for the opening of the St. Landry Parish Library demonstration was allocated $121,463. To continue preparations for the library demonstration in West Baton Rouge Parish, $25,000 was budgeted. The preparation for a demonstration library in a yet to be determined area was budgeted $16,790. A single $2,000 scholarship was proposed with the obligation that the recipient work in a designated public library in Louisiana for two years. The initiation of an in-service training program for personnel of an undetermined area was allocated $17,651 (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 22).

The amount budgeted for headquarters services at the State Library jumped to $447,609 for fiscal 1965. This amount covered services from the State Library to local agencies which could not be broken down in specific amounts for a particular area. Also included in
headquarters services were personnel services, library materials, supplies, and equipment used by the Louisiana State Library to provide support to local public libraries in the form of information and reference services, films and recordings, materials for blind persons, and consultative and advisory services for library development (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 23).

Funds in the amount of $85,000 were to be provided to the New Orleans Public Library for the purchase of materials in the areas of information and reference, business, science, art, and music (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 22). These funds were to be spent according to a contract between the State Library and the New Orleans Public Library. The New Orleans Public Library agreed to keep and forward a list of the books purchased to the Louisiana State Library and to make available the materials to all public libraries of the state through interlibrary loan (Program Plan, June 25, 1964: 25).

1966

The fiscal 1966 Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library was shorter in length than the program proposal of 1965. While there was less narrative, the budget summaries were still alike. A new addition to this plan was a statement that non-discrimination and fair labor practices were required for continuation of projects.

The state appropriation to the Louisiana State Library in 1966 was $281,914 (Program Plan, June 29, 1965: 2). The money budgeted by source for the operation of LSCA projects in fiscal 1966 included all of the state support for the State Library, $6,700 from fees and self-generated funds of the State Library, and $453,397 in federal money (Program Plan,
June 29, 1965: 5).

The St. Landry Parish Library Demonstration was to be continued through February 1966 at a cost of $68,916. Preparation for the opening of the West Baton Rouge Parish Library Demonstration scheduled for October 1965 was budgeted $35,868. Preparation for the spring 1966 opening of demonstration areas in the previous year's plan were allocated $117,230. A demonstration for a yet to be determined parish was allocated $14,824. Two $2,000 scholarships for graduate study in library science were also proposed for fiscal 1966. Funds for the purchase of non-fiction materials by the New Orleans Public Library under contract with the State Library totalled $45,000. Headquarters services at the Louisiana State Library were allotted $445,328, mainly for salaries of personnel (Program Plan, June 29, 1965: 12).

A new project under the LSCA program in Louisiana was a comprehensive state-wide survey with emphasis on special implications for the improvement of public library service through cooperative and coordinated activities. The total cost of the project was set at $30,000 with the beginning date in January 1966 and the termination in December 1967. For fiscal 1966, $7,500 was budgeted to finance the first phase of this survey project (Program Plan, June 29, 1965: 8).

1967

The LSCA plan of the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1967 was the most detailed of all plans of proposed projects up to that time. The fiscal 1967 plan totalled fifty-five pages that covered all phases of the LSCA legislation. Included in this document were narrative and numerical data on the general provisions of the plan. These data included the official title of the state officer responsible for
administering the uses of LSCA funds in Louisiana, proposed projects under the plan, explanation of the coordination of activities, definition of free public library service, organization of the State Library with a diagram depicting such, the qualifications of personnel involved, procedures for the receipt and safeguarding of federal funds, the procedure for disbursing federal funds, and the official title of the disbursing officer. Also, there was a description of the state fiscal policies including accounting procedures and authority, adequacy of records, audit guidelines, the reporting process, and the procedures for amending plans for proposed projects. The narrative portions of the fiscal 1967 plan included a definition of special parish demonstration projects, a definition of special programs, a list of priorities and conditions for improving public library services in the state, and considerations for immediate and long-range planning.

The handling of Title II construction projects was also detailed. This included criteria for evaluation of construction proposals, establishment of priorities, and the procedure for approval of construction proposals, and the opportunity for state hearings on rejected construction proposals. The 1967 plan included copies of the certification forms from the appropriate state officials, the functions of the Louisiana State Board of Library Commissioners, pertinent state civil service regulations, copies of contracts between the State Library and local governing bodies, and an outline of the service standards applied to public libraries in Louisiana. Little narrative was provided for Title III in this LSCA program plan because no cooperative projects were involved.

In support of the State-wide survey of library services that was
partially funded under the 1966 LSCA plan, general state-wide
conferences were held among public librarians, school librarians,
academic librarians, library educators, and public library trustees.
The purpose of these meetings was reported to be the exploration and
planning for the development of cooperative library programs that would
benefit the general public. The material and recommendations that
developed from these conferences and those to be held at local and
regional levels were to be used in providing support for the completion

The LSCA plan of the State Library for fiscal 1967 specified the
assurance of adequate records. Detailed materials showing the receipt
and expenditure of federal and state funds under this plan were to be
maintained by the Louisiana State Library. Such records had to be
adequate for thorough and "expeditious" audits of the financial
accounts. Payment vouchers, memoranda, and other materials had to be on
hand at the Louisiana State Library and in a central location in each
project area (Program Plan, March 23, 1967: 7).

The 1967 LSCA plan anticipated that the goal of a public library
in every parish would be reached in two years and the completion of the
state-wide library survey would hopefully provide a basis for the
formulation of new and longer range objectives. Other immediate goals
expressed in this plan dealt mainly with the quality of public library
services. These quality-oriented goals included the strengthening of
the collections of metropolitan public libraries in the state,
supplementing the collections of established libraries with non-print
media, improving reference and information services through enlarged
resources of the State Library, enlarging the support staff of the State
Library, recruiting qualified persons into public librarianship in
Louisiana, initiating in-service training programs for the development of professional competencies of public library personnel, and planning for cooperative projects such as the sharing of personnel, pooling of resources, and centrally processing materials (Program Plan, March 23, 1967: 21-22).

Priorities and criteria for improving public library services in Louisiana were based upon the needs determined mainly in relation to the Standards Statement for Louisiana Public Libraries published by the Louisiana Library Association in 1964 (Program Plan, March 23, 1967: 22). Priorities in the order of their importance were the completion of the establishment of libraries in those parishes having none, continuation of the enrichment of reference resources of the State Library, acceleration of the recruitment activities through internships and traineeships for undergraduates, reinforcement of the established public libraries through cooperative programs, and the development of effective in-service training programs (Program Plan, March 23, 1967: 24).

The 1967 LSCA plans contained a summary of project budgets similar to that of earlier ones. Appropriations for LSCA projects by source were budgeted at $295,496 from state sources for the State Library's total budget, a sum of $499,296 from local sources, and $631,904 in federal funds (Program Plan, March 23, 1967: 55). The amount budgeted from local sources was misleading. The bulk of these funds was for the enrichment projects and were not indicative of local budget increases and were only reported as matching funds from the operating budgets of the major libraries.

The West Baton Rouge Parish Demonstration Library was to be completed with a budgeted amount of $10,774. The St. James Parish
Library Demonstration was allotted $32,466 while the St. John Parish project was budgeted $36,938. Because of the failure of the parish demonstration, the Louisiana State Library budgeted $8,716 to re-establish public library services in St. Landry Parish through city libraries in Eunice and Opelousas. Caddo Parish was allotted $122,197 in funds for enrichment of its book collection, and Calcasieu Parish was budgeted for $77,016 for the same purpose. The East Baton Rouge Public Library was budgeted $90,218 for enrichment of its collections, and Jefferson Parish's enrichment allotment was $172,880. Lafayette Parish's enrichment budget was $38,170. New Orleans Public Library's enrichment funds totalled $165,304, and the Ouachita Parish Public Library's budget for strengthening its collections was $54,351. A demonstration library in an unspecified parish was budgeted $44,373. Three scholarships totalling $6,000 were budgeted along with $15,000 for the state-wide survey of public libraries. Headquarters services of the Louisiana State Library were allotted $552,322 (Program Plan, March 23, 1967: 55).

1968

The LSCA plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1968 was again lengthy and detailed. It employed a different format based upon the four titles included in the legislation at this time. Budget summaries and sources of funds were provided for each title and sub-title of the act. There was a single listing of total local, state, and federal money. The breakdown of funds for specific projects included such categories as salaries, books, audio-visual materials, equipment, contractual services, all other expenses, and sources of funds for the project costs. Title II funds and budgets for construction were handled separately.
Total federal funds budgeted for fiscal 1968 were $631,904, state money totalled $293,232, and local funds for the LSCA projects during the year were $203,418. The local amount was part of the operating budget of the New Orleans Public Library identified for matching purposes. The total funds identified in support of LSCA projects in fiscal 1968 were $1,128,544 (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 16).

Most of the projects for the year were under LSCA title I which covered services. The St. John Parish Library Demonstration was budgeted $12,844 through October 1967. The West Carroll Parish Library Demonstration was budgeted $36,216 for the year. Funds for the establishment of demonstration projects in Assumption and Jefferson Davis Parishes were set at $58,512 and $112,653 respectively. The city libraries of Eunice and Opelousas were allotted a total of $4,000 for providing free service to all parish residents. The budget for the enrichment of the collection of the New Orleans Public Library totalled $248,048 of which $203,048 was identified from its operating budget with $45,000 additional in federal funds. The continuing survey project was allocated $7,500, and a management study of the Louisiana State Library was allotted $30,000. The production of a twelve-minute color film on the functions and services of the Louisiana State Library was budgeted $20,000. The scholarship-internship program, budgeted for $6,800, covered one scholarship and eight two-month internships for summer work. Headquarters services at the Louisiana State Library were budgeted for $554,755 which included salaries, purchase of print and non-print materials and equipment, and service to blind and physically handicapped persons (Program Plans Jan. 24, 1968: 16).

The Title III segment of the fiscal 1968 plan of the Louisiana
State Library provided funds for improving library cooperation among public and other types of libraries. The Library Development Committee of Louisiana, a committee of the Louisiana Library Association, acted as an advisory council to the Louisiana State Library in the area of library cooperation. The committee had thirty-five members, twenty-one lay persons and fourteen professional librarians (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 23).

Under Title III a feasibility study of a centralized processing center at the State Library was continued from fiscal 1967. The study was to provide practical guidelines for the establishment of a centralized processing center which would contribute to improved services in rural libraries by releasing professional staff for public service duties. The budget for the study was $4,700. The establishment of the processing center was budgeted $13,000 (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 33c).

Under Title III of the LSCA, $16,236 in funds were allotted for the publication of a second supplement to the Louisiana Union Catalog for the years 1963-1967. Also, $7,500 was provided for the publication of a cumulative index to the original Louisiana Union Catalog and its two supplements (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 33c).

Policies and objectives of the proposed projects under Title IV-A of the LSCA were prepared by the State Library with advice of the Advisory Council on Library Services in State Institutions. This body was involved in the preparation of long-range program objectives for health and correctional institutions in accord with the national standards (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 36). The criteria applied to institutional libraries was that in order to be eligible for a library
project an institution had to be substantially supported by the state of Louisiana, which included all institutions in the executive budget of the state. Priority considerations in evaluating project proposals were the kind of institutional residents best able to use and profit from library service, availability of matching funds from the state department concerned, and assurance that the library programs and services would be continued with expenditures for operation not being less than the second preceding year (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 35).

The Advisory Council on Library Services in State Institutions, after visits to correctional institutions, decided that correctional institutions should receive initial attention for the establishment and improvement of their libraries (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 40). For the establishment of a two-year demonstration library at the Louisiana State Penitentiary at Angola, a sum of $53,657 was allotted. An additional allocation in the amount of $17,887 was made for improving the library of a yet to be determined institution (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 44). The Angola project included 5,000 volumes for a central library collection located in the prison education building and a bookmobile for services to outlying camps. Free personnel could also make use of the library facilities. At the end of the demonstration period, the Louisiana State Library was to continue to provide professional advice, supplementary service, and reference support on a continual basis. Inter-library loan was also available (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 38-39).

The objectives outlined for Title IV-B included increased cooperation between the State Library's Department for the Blind and Physically Handicapped and local parish libraries including the free
loan of appropriate non-print materials, provisions for dependable reference services, identification of eligible handicapped persons, improvement of the Talking Book Service by consolidating responsibilities for distribution of materials and equipment, the inventory and cataloging of all available resources within the state useful to the physically handicapped, increased publicity for services, and the development and production of useful materials on the local level. Eligibility of a handicapped person for services under Title IV-B was determined by written statements of certification from physicians and professionals in the fields of public health, social work, public welfare, and library services (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 47-48).

Priorities were established for Title IV-B projects. The highest priority was given to projects involving coordination among agencies with basic and official responsibilities for public library services to all residents of the state. Next were projects of effective case finding and identification of book and information needs of the handicapped. The third priority was the production of suitable library materials for the use of eligible persons. Finally, applications were approved in the order of application date and limited only by available federal funds (Program Plans, Jan. 24, 1968: 51).

Three projects were presented under Title IV-B for the fiscal 1968 plan of the Louisiana State Library. The establishment of an advisory council on services to blind and physically handicapped persons was budgeted $1,076 (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 64). This council was to be composed of representatives from each of the ten or more public and voluntary non-profit agencies and organizations providing aid to the physically handicapped in Louisiana. The primary function of the
council was to assist the State Library in program planning and to provide an effective liaison between the State Library and other appropriate agencies (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 55). The case funding project for identifying and certifying eligible handicapped persons was budgeted $18,163. The establishment of a voluntary recording project for increasing the specialized resources required under Title IV-B was allotted $8,821 for fiscal 1968 (Program Plan, Jan. 24, 1968: 64).

1969

The Library Services and Construction Act plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1969 was shorter than the previous year's plan and had a minimum of narrative. Each project budget report form was followed by a very specific statement of purposes or aims for a project. The format was easy to read because the page arrangement did not appear cluttered, yet the financial information provided was still detailed.

Each project form contained a variety of information relative to the project. The identification of the project was provided along with the necessary financial information. The budget for each project was divided into money for salaries and wages, books, equipment, other expenses, total funds for the project, and the sources of funds, whether federal, state, or local.

The project report form for each proposed project was followed by a brief project description. Next was a statement on the aim or purpose of the project, the administering agency, the location of the project with reference to a state map, and a list of project participants. The map of Louisiana was divided into congressional districts and was provided along with a copy of the contract between the State Library and
the New Orleans Public Library for enrichment of its collection.

Under Title I the West Carroll Parish Library Demonstration was to be continued through part of the year at a cost of $31,929, all in federal funds (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 1). The Assumption Parish Library Demonstration was budgeted $35,770, all in federal money, through April 1969 (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 3). The establishment of the Jefferson Davis Parish Library Demonstration in fiscal 1969 was budgeted a total of $77,376 with $1,229 from local funds and the rest in federal money (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 5). The enrichment project for the New Orleans Public Library was budgeted a total of $240,772 with $195,772 being identified in the local budget and only $45,000 in federal funds (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 7).

Other Title I LSCA projects included in the 1969 plan were the scholarship-internship project which was budgeted $28,066 in federal money and headquarters services which were allotted a total of $638,818 of which $352,771 was federal and $286,047 was state. The scholarship-internship program was intended as a recruiting device and provided for five $2,000 graduate level scholarships and twenty-nine undergraduate internships for summer work in specified Louisiana public libraries. The general aims of the headquarters services projects were to enrich the resources of the Louisiana State Library, to increase its staff, and to generally strengthen the state agency in order to provide improved services to the local library agencies (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 11-14).

Also under LSCA Title I was a regional in-service training project budgeted for a total of $31,721 in federal funds. Grants were made to the dominant libraries in each of four geographical regions of
the state to cover the expenses of providing a regional in-service training program. Costs included professional fees, travel, materials, and office supplies. This project was designed for the non-professional staff members in public libraries. The parishes in which the activities were centered were East Baton Rouge Parish, Rapides Parish, Lafayette Parish, and Calcasieu Parish (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 15-17).

The final project under Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) in Louisiana for fiscal 1969 was a regional public information project which was allotted $30,500 entirely in federal money. The Libraries administering this program were in the parishes of Caddo, Calcasieu, and Ouachita. The purpose was to assist public libraries in disseminating facts and figures about libraries in general and information about Louisiana Libraries in particular in an attempt to reach and more effectively serve every segment of Louisiana's population (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 18-20).

Four projects were funded under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). The first was a pilot processing center at the State Library that was allotted $3,000 in federal funds. This project for 1969 involved only the planning phase in the actual establishment and the initiation of operations of such a center with the advice of a professional library consultant. The purpose was to demonstrate the economic advantages of cooperatively ordering and processing books in order to release personnel for public service activities in local public libraries. Twenty parish and institutional libraries were to be included on a fee basis (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 21-22).

The second Title III project was the establishment of a TWX
communications network with an allotment of $28,683 in federal funds and $42,883 in funds identified for matching purposes from the libraries involved. The ultimate objective was to provide library users with rapid and easy access to library materials, no matter where the user was in Louisiana. Included in the project were twelve academic libraries, two special libraries, eight local public libraries, and the Louisiana State Library (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 24-25).

A third project proposed under Title III of the LSCA was a library resources survey budgeted for $1200 in federal funds. The purpose of the survey was to identify and describe types of collections, rather than specific book titles, and to determine the subject strengths of Louisiana libraries. The Louisiana Library Association appointed a special committee to establish the parameters of the project and to execute the study (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 27-28).

The fourth Title III project of the fiscal 1969 LSCA plan of the Louisiana State Library was the beginning of preparations for the establishment of a pilot library system. The initial phase was budgeted $10,000 in federal funds for assisting interested libraries in working together in evaluating needs, determining possible participation, and planning the organizational structure and services (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 29-30).

Under Title IV-A of the LSCA was a project involving the continuation of two established institutional libraries and preparation for the opening of two more. Federal funds budgeted for the project were $39,509 with $31,025 from the state agencies involved. The library at the Louisiana State Penitentiary at Angola was continued with a library at the Louisiana Correctional and Institutional School in
DeQuincy scheduled to begin operation in February 1969. Materials, furniture, and equipment were to be purchased in preparation for libraries at the Louisiana State Penitentiary for Women at St. Gabriel and the Central Louisiana State Hospital in Pineville. Each institution was provided with a central library and, when necessary, a bookmobile (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 31-32).

Under Title IV-B of the LSCA was the library service improvement project for blind and physically handicapped persons in Louisiana. The budget contained $25,251 in federal monies and $18,309 in state funds. The objectives of the State Library for this project, which was a continuation of related projects from the previous year, included demonstrating and making known available services, identifying and certifying eligible handicapped persons, establishing appropriate channels of communication for each eligible reader, providing reference services and guidance in the use of the materials, and recruiting local volunteers willing and capable of assisting in the production of more recorded materials for the handicapped (Program Plan, Feb. 28, 1969: 35-36).

1970

The format of the fiscal 1970 LSCA plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library was like that of the 1969 plan. Again, budget report forms summarizing the use of funds and their sources were used and were followed by specific statements of the purposes and objectives for each project.

Under Title I the Jefferson Davis Parish Library Demonstration was budgeted $26,254 until its termination in October 1969 (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 1). The continuation of the enrichment program
for the New Orleans Public Library collection was allotted $5,000 in federal funds with $200,422 more being identified from the operating budget of the library (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 4). Headquarters services of the Louisiana State Library were allotted $287,810 in federal funds with $262,790 being identified in the State Library budget for matching purposes for a total fiscal 1970 budget of $550,600 (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 7). This project, as in previous plans, included services which were supplemented by Title IV-B (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 8).

An amendment to the fiscal 1970 plan was made under Title I and involved a project titled the "Northeast Louisiana Pilot Library System". This project was budgeted $90,000 in federal funds and was a continuation of a planning project under Title III of the 1969 state LSCA plan. The funds were to be used to purchase books to improve the reference collections of participating libraries and to enlarge the reference and informational collection of the central library. Thirteen parish libraries and three academic libraries were included in this pilot library system. The Ouachita Parish Library, which was the largest in the region, was designated as the Library Center. The long-range objective was to make available all print and non-print library materials to all persons within the area. The immediate objectives were preparatory to actual operation and included establishing a reference center, the improving the book collections of member libraries, upgrading professional administrative salaries, publicizing the advantages of such a system, and developing local history collections in participating libraries. A copy of the contract between the Louisiana State Library and the Ouachita Parish Library was provided (Program Plan

Under Title III of the LSCA, the TWX Communications Network, funded the previous year, was budgeted a total of $74,691 in fiscal 1970 with $31,806 in federal funds and $42,883 in local funds. The network consisted of twelve academic libraries, three special libraries, eight public libraries, and the State Library. Libraries included were selected by a committee of the Louisiana Library Association on the basis of a geographical distribution proposed in the Humphry report (1968), the nature and size of book collections, and population density factors. The TWX Committee was given the responsibility for the development of specific guidelines for use of the teletypewriter system (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 9-10). A sample contract for membership was included (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 12).

Under Title III of the 1970 LSCA plan filed by the Louisiana State Library was the continuation of the Library Resources Survey with a budget of $11,075 in federal funds (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 13). The attached guidelines for the Library Resources Survey stated that the purpose of the project was to compile a descriptive catalog of the collection and program strengths of Louisiana libraries. The final report was to be divided into a description of all participating libraries, an analysis of special types of collections, and a subject analysis of strengths reported by respondents. Questionnaires were to be used in accumulating the necessary data (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 14-17).

Under Title IV-A of the LSCA, the pilot library programs in Louisiana correctional and health institutions were continued with a federal allotment of $39,509 and a state allocation of $31,742 for a
total budget of $71,251 (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 21). The operation of libraries at the Louisiana State Penitentiary and the Louisiana Correctional and Industrial School were continued. Preparations were continued for the scheduled opening of libraries at the Louisiana State Penitentiary for Women and the Central Louisiana State Hospital in July 1969 and January 1970. Also, plans were begun for a library at the Leesville State School for the retarded with emphasis on "multi-stimuli" materials involving all of the senses (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 22). A copy of the project contracts between the Louisiana State Library and the Louisiana State Department of Corrections and State Department of Hospitals for demonstration libraries at the Louisiana State Penitentiary, the Louisiana Correctional and Industrial School, the Louisiana State Penitentiary for Women, and Central Louisiana State Hospital were included (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 27-30).

Under Title IV-B of the 1970 LSCA plan, the project for providing improved service to the blind and physically handicapped of Louisiana was continued with a budget of $40,939. Of the total, federal funds amounted to $25,251 and state funds $15,688 (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 32). Because of a reported drastic reduction in federal appropriations for Title I of the LSCA, increased use was made of Title IV-B for salaries of personnel involved in programs and services for blind and physically handicapped persons. Two new staff members, a librarian and a typist, were added to the State Library for strengthening these special services (Program Plan, Sept. 19, 1969: 33).
The LSCA plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1971 was the longest up to this time with over seventy-five pages. The format was similar to that of the previous years' and utilized the same project budget forms followed by fairly detailed narrative descriptions of each project with the general purposes, objectives, governmental units involved, and other information. The projects were grouped in the order of the different divisions of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). A new element in this plan was the budgeting of funds for the general administration of each segment under the federal legislation. Examples of contracts executed in the development and operation of projects, were provided.

For the administration of Title I LSCA projects the Louisiana State Library allotted $62,538 in state funds. Salaries and wages consumed $55,222 of the total with $7,316 listed for other expenses. No narrative explanation was provided following the budget report form (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 1). For the continued enrichment and development of the collection of the New Orleans Public Library, a total of $345,368 was designated with $45,000 in federal funds and $200,368 identified in the local budget. Participants in this project were the Louisiana State Library, the New Orleans Public Library, and the New Orleans City Council (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 2-4). Headquarters services of the Louisiana State Library in Baton Rouge were budgeted $437,804 in federal funds and $337,808 in state funds for a total of $775,612 in fiscal 1971. These headquarters services included the purchase of materials, services of staff members in providing library materials and information to local public libraries, the services of
field staff in supervising established public libraries and in planning
and supervising library systems, services to the blind and physically
handicapped which were also supplemented by Title IV-B, services to
institutional library programs which were supplemented by Title IV-B,
and centralized processing for selected public and institutional

Also included in Title I was the continuation of the Northeast
Louisiana Pilot Library System, which was also known as the Trail Blazer
Pilot Library System, begun April 1, 1970 with a termination date set
for December 31, 1971. This project was budgeted $107,000 in fiscal
1971 with $45,732 for salaries and wages, $41,622 for books and
materials, and $19,646 for other expenses. Federal funds provided
$99,600 and state funds $7,400 (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 8). A
system-wide library card was devised so that any resident of the region
could use the services of all libraries in the system, either directly
or indirectly via interlibrary loan. Urgent requests for materials were
conveyed by telephone to the Library Center at the Ouachita Parish
Library in Monroe with a vehicle delivering the needed materials to
libraries on a regular twice-weekly schedule (Program Plan, Sept. 10,
1970: 9).

A project for evaluating the book stock of the Louisiana State
Library during the year was budgeted $5,000 in federal funds. This
involved systematically checking the collection of the State Library
against standard lists, acquiring basic check lists in principal areas,
separating inactive titles from the main collection, establishing
priority lists of subject areas based on level of demand, and
contracting for expert evaluation of qualified subject specialists
Another evaluative project was that for the State Library processing center which was budgeted $2,500. Involved in this was a review of the procedures for evaluating the processing center's efficiency and making plans for its future. A significant objective was to outline the cost basis for future charges for the processing services to the thirty-six libraries included (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 16-17).

For a library system planning project, the Louisiana State Library budgeted $36,000 in federal funds. This project involved six planning grants of $6,000 each for the remaining six eligible system areas. Upon approval of an application that met the requirements to be specified later, the grant was to be allocated to the designated Library Center of a region. The Trail Blazer System was not eligible, since it was already operational (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 20-21).

For a planning project dealing with services to the unserved segments of the population of the Greater New Orleans Metropolitan Area, the State Library budgeted $6,000 in federal funds. This grant was to be made to the New Orleans Public Library for the development and establishment of service demonstrations for specific population groups in Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 23-24).

The administrative budget for Title II of the LSCA in the 1971 plan was allotted $114,919 with $26,383 being federal monies and $88,536 being local funds. This phase of the project involved the installation of teletype instruments in fourteen major resource units across the state and a WATS (Wide Area Telephone Service) installation at the State
Library to be used in conjunction with the state centrex telephone system providing toll-free service to an additional eighty libraries (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 31-32).

The continuation of the Library Resources Survey project begun in fiscal 1969 was budgeted $6,000 in federal funds. This involved the reproduction and dissemination of the completed report in sufficient numbers for the needs of the two hundred participating libraries (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 44-45). A project on interstate planning was funded $500. The purpose of the project was to finance participation of representatives from the Louisiana State Library in a conference with representatives from Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona. The conference program involved the identification of those library services which could be more economically or efficiently maintained on an interstate basis and to explore possible organizational arrangements (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 52-53).

The last Title III project was for interlibrary cooperation and was budgeted $10,000 in federal funds for a grant to one of the six remaining system areas of the state. The development of the resulting project was to be planned locally under the supervision of the State Library for meeting the needs of the area (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 54-55).

Administration of Title IV-A of the fiscal 1971 plan of the Louisiana State Library was budgeted $7,942 (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970). Also under Title IV-A, the pilot library programs in correctional and health institutions were budgeted a total of $64,311 with $39,309 being federal money and $25,002 state money (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 58). The demonstration library project at the Louisiana
State Penitentiary was terminated in December 1969 with the State Department of Corrections assuming responsibility for the operation of the library. The pilot library at the Louisiana Correctional and Industrial School was scheduled to terminate its demonstration phase on December 31, 1970. The library projects at the Louisiana State Penitentiary for Women and Central Louisiana State Hospital were continued (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 59). The organization of libraries was continued at the Leesville State School and the Ruston State School for the educable mentally retarded. Also, planning was begun for a library at Southeast Louisiana Hospital in Mandeville (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 60-61). Examples of contracts executed between the State Library and these institutions were provided.

The budget for administering Title IV-B funds of the LSCA in Louisiana for fiscal 1971 was $3,178 in state funds (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 71). The continuation of the project for improving library services to the blind and physically handicapped in the state was budgeted $40,939 with $25,251 being in federal funds and $15,688 in state money (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 72). A consultant was assigned to the greater New Orleans area to make personal contact with twenty-three percent of the state's total physically disabled persons residing in the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard. The responsibilities of this individual were the development of reading plans, stimulation of new reading interests, and instruction in the placing of requests for materials. Also, a coordinator for the volunteer recording and production program was added to the staff of the Louisiana State Library. A partial allotment of Title IV-B funds was made for regular staff salaries so the Department for the Blind and
Physically Handicapped could meet the standards of service set by the Commission on Standards and Accreditation of Services for the Blind (Program Plan, Sept. 10, 1970: 73).

1972

The state LSCA plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1972 was again lengthy with over eighty pages. The same budget summary format used previously was again employed along with narrative explanations. The designation of administrative expenses for Titles II and III was dropped. The specific objectives to be achieved by each project during the year were combined with the narratives. Also, programs previously submitted under Titles IV-A and IV-B were combined under Title I according to the amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act.

Under Title I of the fiscal 1972 program plan, the information and reference service project was budgeted $467,964 of which $326,706 was federal funds and $141,258 was state funds. The heavy emphasis on this project resulted from the fact that readers' services at the State Library were most directly related to the improvement of library services throughout the state of Louisiana. Objectives listed for this project included an increase in the percentage of information and loan requests filled within a forty-eight hour period and a ten day period to sixty percent and eighty percent respectively, a ten percent increase in circulation, a ten percent increase in the acquisition of books, and the compilation and distribution of bibliographies of significant library holdings in the most heavily used subject areas (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 1-2).
Expenditures for films and recordings were budgeted $99,735 of which $69,346 was in federal funds and $30,389 was in state money. The aim of this program was the development of an extensive central collection for state-wide use through local libraries. Specific objectives for the year were to lend 15,000 films and fill requests that would serve 700,000 viewers (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 3-4).

Services to the blind and physically handicapped in the 1972 program plan were budgeted $128,258. Of this total, $89,177 was in federal funds and $39,081 was in state money. This project was intended to improve those services for the handicapped through a professional staff and clerical staff sufficient to meet recommended standards of service at the state level. A full-time librarian was stationed at the New Orleans Public Library to identify as many as ten thousand people who needed special format library materials and to inform them of available services. The measurable objectives for the 1972 fiscal year included the doubling of the 500 persons served the previous year and the addition of two hundred new titles in special handicapped materials through the voluntary recording project under the supervision of a qualified specialist (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 5-6).

The centralized processing center of the Louisiana State Library was budgeted $172,457 with $85,144 in federal money and $37,313 in state funds. Salaries and wages were allotted $102,016 of the total with $12,165 for equipment and $58,276 for other unspecified expenses. Sixty percent of the parish libraries already benefited from this project because book orders of participating libraries were consolidated for important discounts, cataloging was standardized, and book preparation was simplified. Measurable objectives for fiscal 1972 included the
processing of 100,000 new books for fifty public and institutional libraries and reducing the unit cost an additional ten cents (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 10-11).

A project for updating the Louisiana Union Catalog was budgeted $18,711 for the fiscal year. Federal funds amounted to $13,009 and state funds $5,702. Salaries and wages were allotted $14,749 and other miscellaneous expenses $3,962. The Louisiana Union Catalog, which was maintained in card form, detailed the library location of all books and pamphlets about Louisiana or by Louisiana writers in the state. The objective of this project was the addition of 2,500 new entries and 12,000 new and additional locations to the catalog (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 15-16).

For fiscal 1972 a planning and development project was funded $69,173 with $48,096 in federal funds and $21,077 in state funds. Salaries were allotted $45,840 of the total. This project involved advisory services provided to public libraries and boards of trustees. Specific attention was given to system planning for the geographic regions of the state (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 27-28). No specific objectives were stated.

While library system planning was mentioned in the previous project, a total of $366,891 was allotted for library system development. Federal funds provided $114,726, state sources $50,276, and local sources $201,891 identified for matching purposes. Salaries and wages were funded $132,233 and books $198,340 with $4,000 for equipment and $32,318 for other expenses. The Trail Blazer Library System was continued beyond its termination date with a continuing grant from the State Library and member libraries contributing to operating
costs on a per capita basis. A second system was planned for organization in fiscal 1972 based upon review and evaluation proposals being prepared with funds granted in the previous year. Copies of contracts for the organization of the new system were to be forwarded at a later date (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 43-44a).

The Jericho project for the metropolitan area of New Orleans was budgeted $44,570 with $30,989 in federal funds and $13,581 in state funds. Salaries were allotted only $2,960 while miscellaneous expenses were budgeted $41,610. This project was planned with funding grants from the previous year. The name Jericho was based upon the purpose of the program which was "Breaking barriers to library service." These barriers were identified as being economical and cultural. The New Orleans area was selected because it had the greatest concentration of disadvantaged persons in the state of Louisiana. The State Library provided a grant under a contract with the New Orleans Public Library for the purpose of operating a program to reach the previously unserved ethnic and low income groups in the parishes of Orleans, St. Bernard, and Jefferson. Three target groups were identified: the Hispanic population, the aged and indigent, and the Black community. Books with high interest and low reading levels and Spanish language materials were to be purchased. Local leaders, spokesmen, and grassroot members of the various target groups were enlisted in the planning and execution of the various phases of the project (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 47-48).

Pilot library programs in correctional and health institutions of the state were budgeted $66,236 with $39,509 in federal funds and $26,717 in state funds. Salaries and wages were allotted $37,717, books $11,850, audio-visual materials $2,600, equipment $11,475, and
miscellaneous expenses $2,684. Operation of three pilot projects at the state's penal institutions was assumed by the institutions and the State Department of Corrections. The demonstration project at Central Louisiana State Hospital was to end in December 1971. Projects at two state institutions for the educable retarded were completed in the previous year. A pilot library was scheduled to open at Southeast Louisiana Hospital during fiscal 1972 (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 51-52). No specific objectives for the year were listed, although the significance and need for institutional libraries were briefly stated. Copies of contracts between the State Library and the institutions were provided.

The regional cooperative projects were funded $28,155 of which $19,576 was in federal money and $8,579 in state funds. Salaries and wages were allotted $2,960 while other unspecified expenses were allotted $25,195. Partial funding of these projects was provided under Title III (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 59-60). These projects involved the continuation of the rapid communications network consisting of teletype and telephone connections (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 68).

Administrative expenses were budgeted for $78,641 under Title I from state sources. Salaries and wages were allotted $69,640 and miscellaneous expenses $9,001 (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 61).

Under Title III of the LSCA program plan for Louisiana in fiscal 1972, library system development was budgeted $13,693. The total allotment from federal funds was for salaries only. Partial funding of this project was provided under the information and reference service project of Title I (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 63-64).
The budget for regional cooperative projects under Title III totaled only $6,415, all in federal money. This entire allotment was identified as "other expenses." Grants were available for planning interlibrary cooperation for those regions that could not yet qualify for a system grant or which did not find it feasible to organize a system. Projects receiving grants were to take the form of preliminary studies for organizing a system, educational programs featuring current social problems, or service to special population groups (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 64-65).

An allotment of $30,289 was made under Title III for the rapid communications network. Federal funds totalled $16,589 and state sources provided $13,700. Salaries and wages were allocated $15,202 and other expenses were budgeted $15,087. This was a continuation of a previously funded project for providing all Louisiana residents with rapid access to desired library materials. Telephone service in fiscal 1972 was substituted for some of the less active TWX stations (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 67-68).

The interstate library cooperation project funded in the previous year was budgeted $2,000 in federal funds for fiscal 1972. This amount was for Louisiana's participation in the development of a multi-state planning and coordinating bureau of several southwestern states for determining common needs which could be met only on a cooperative basis (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 79-80).

The LNP: Numerical Register of Books in Louisiana Libraries project was budgeted $10,500 in federal funds. The total was specified as being for other miscellaneous expenses. This project had the purpose of further expanding the coverage of a state-wide union catalog based on
the Library of Congress Catalog Card numbers with the information being converted to machine readable form. The measurable objective for the fiscal year was to double the 500,000 title data based from the monograph collection of one metropolitan and five academic libraries. The libraries were those of Loyola University, Xavier University, Northeast Louisiana University, Louisiana Tech University, Louisiana State University, and the New Orleans Public Library (Program Plan, Sept. 22, 1971: 82-84).

1973

The LSCA program plan filed by the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1973 was again detailed and lengthy. The narrative of a proposed or continuing project was preceded by the related budget summary form. The budget summary forms for projects were shortened with only the LSCA title, project number, and funds by source and purpose indicated. The readability of this program plan was better than the others because of the streamlining of the budget forms.

Under Title I the information and reference service project was continued with a budget for fiscal 1973 of $445,190 of which the federal allotment was $319,605 and state funds were $125,585. Salaries and wages were budgeted $228,839, books $136,500, equipment $7,445 and other expenses $78,406. The measurable objective for the year was to add 20,000 books to the collection and complete an evaluation of the total book collection (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 1-3).

Films and recordings were budgeted $103,960 with $74,539 from federal funds and $29,421 in state funds. Of the total budget, salaries and wages were allotted $44,776. The State Library planned to continue consulting user groups in order to purchase the most useful materials.
The audiovisual services of the State Library were also available in state health and educational institutions. The measurable objective for the year was to lend 20,000 films for an audience of 800,000 viewers (Program Plan, June 28, 1973: 4-5).

Library services for the blind and physically handicapped were budgeted $135,113 under LSCA Title I for program continuation. Federal funds comprised $96,888 of the total. Salaries and wages were allotted $110,235, equipment $1,000, and other expenses $23,878. These funds were directed toward public relations and enlarging the collection (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 12).

The Louisiana State Library's centralized processing center was to be continued with an allotment of $189,434 under LSCA Title I. Federal funds were to provide $99,978, state funds $39,461, and local sources $50,000. The measurable objectives included processing 125,000 books for participating public and institutional libraries and reducing the unit cost by an additional ten percent (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 13-17).

The Louisiana Union Catalog project was to receive $19,847 with $14,230 from the federal government and $5,617 in state funds. Objectives for the year included adding 1,500 new titles and 5,000 additional locations. Of the total amount budgeted $17,003 was for salaries and wages (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 28).

Planning and development projects for fiscal 1973 were allotted $76,485 with $54,839 in federal funds and the rest from state money. The long-range considerations of the State Library for the period 1973-1977 included enlarging the library development staff with the addition of a general consultant and one for directing continuing education
activities. The continuing education consultant's duties were to include development of a correspondence reference course for nonprofessional library staff members, responsibility for the annual conference of administrative libraries, a plan for continuing education of library system staffs, and responsibility for the SLICE project. Also, the Library Development Department of the State Library was to organize trustees in the southeast district and assist in planning and conducting regional conferences following the Governor's Conference on Libraries in the Spring of 1973 (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 29-30). Salaries for these activities were allotted $60,309 and other expenses $16,176 (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 46).

The library system development project was to be continued with a budget of $353,659 of which $115,989 was federal money, $45,761 was state, and $201,889 was local. Salaries and wages were allotted $133,761, books were allotted $200,840, and other or miscellaneous expenses were allocated $20,058 (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 52). The Trail Blazer Library System was to receive a continuation grant, although it had completed its pilot or demonstration period. The Green Gold Library System uniting eight parish libraries, two academic libraries, and three special libraries in northwest Louisiana was organized as a pilot project in October 1971 and was to be continued. The library center for the Green Gold Library System was the Shreve Memorial Library in Shreveport (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 47).

The Jericho Project sponsored by the New Orleans Public Library and the St. Bernard Parish Library was to be continued with a budget of $42,233. Of the total allotment, $30,281 was in federal funds and $11,952 was in state funds. Only $1,019 was for salaries and wages with
other or miscellaneous expenses receiving the rest (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 56).

Continuation of services to health and correctional institutions of the State of Louisiana was budgeted $67,742 under Title I. The federal government was to provide $29,929 and the state $37,813. Equipment was allotted $5,616, salaries and wages $28,926, books $16,576, audio-visual materials $5,000, and other expenses $11,624 (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 63). The library at Southeast Louisiana Hospital was opened, and preparation was made for pilot libraries at East Louisiana State Hospital and Hammond State School. The promotion of local library services for local institutions, such as jails and half-way houses, was also planned (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 57-58).

For administrative expenses for the fiscal year, the total budget was $75,330, all in state funds. Salaries and wages were allotted $72,730 and other expenses were to be $2,600 (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 64).

Library system development under Title III was budgeted $14,607 in federal funds for fiscal 1973. The entire allotment was to be used for salaries and wages. This project was supplementary to the Title I project for development of library systems (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 67).

Under interlibrary cooperation, the State Library was to fund three or more related projects with Title III funds. Each project was to be administered by a local library agency or an incorporated nonprofit library association with participants to include two or more types of libraries representing many areas of the state. The specific projects included The LNR: Numerical Register of Books in Louisiana
Libraries, provision of teletype access to the Louisiana State University Library, and development of a plan for academic libraries in the utilization of a computer-based state-wide bibliographic network (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 73).

For interstate library cooperation under Title III in fiscal 1973, the State Library allotted $4,000 in federal funds for miscellaneous expenses (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 77). This project involved the continuation of the Louisiana State Library's participation in the multi-state planning and coordinating bureau, the Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor (SLICE), sponsored by the Southwestern Library Association (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 74).

For fiscal 1973 a public information project was budgeted $8,800 with $5,300 in federal funds and $3,500 in local funds. The total was to go for unspecified costs (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 80). The purpose of the program, as identified in the long-range plan of the State Library, was to make all types of libraries "visible" so that their services, needs, and objectives would become better known to a larger proportion of the population. The specific elements included a public relations program utilizing the various public media, distribution of the long-range program summary, and meetings among local groups. Another element was a one-day Governor's Conference to be held in Baton Rouge in February 1973 in order to focus attention on the goals of the long-range plan for Louisiana libraries and on funds needed for achievement of these goals. The third element or phase of this public information project was to be regional conferences in the seven service areas into which the state was divided. The regional conferences were to follow-up the Governor's Conference (Program Plan, June 28, 1972: 78-79).
REPORTS AND RELATED MATERIALS

Documentation appeared to be more detailed for the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) than the materials for those of the Library Services Act (LSA). While there was more material available, the organization was still awkward in that specific materials could not be easily located.

The reports and related materials for the actual development and operation of LSCA projects indicated relatively little variance from the budgets and plans of the proposed programs. The exception was in 1973 when federal funds under the LSCA were slashed thus aborting some proposed projects and requiring budget adjustments for the rest.

1965

The format of the annual report submitted by the Louisiana State Library under the LSCA for fiscal 1965 was revised from that of earlier reports. The data requested was more specific as were the project evaluations. Population data for public library coverage was required along with a list of parishes having no public libraries, appropriations for state grants-in-aid, staff and positions added, and narrative summaries of projects. Each project summary was preceded by a printed form that requested the project title, beginning and ending date, area affected, and population covered.

According to the fiscal 1965 LSCA narrative report, the number of professional positions at the State Library increased from twenty-two in 1964 to thirty-one in 1965 in full-time equivalents. Nonprofessional positions increased from forty-two in 1964 to fifty and one-half in 1965. There were six remaining parishes without parish-wide free public
library services: Assumption, Jefferson Davis, St. James, St. John, West Baton Rouge, and West Carroll. All other parishes had established public libraries or had library demonstrations in progress (Annual Report, 1965: 2).

The undetermined demonstration area indicated in the state program plan for fiscal 1965 was reported in the fiscal 1965 narrative report to be St. James - St. John Parishes. Initial preparations were done with the belief that this project would be a bi-parish demonstration (Annual Report, 1965: 12).

On July 1, 1964, the United States Office of Education instituted the policy of making monthly payments of the federal share shown in state plans under the Library Services and Construction Act for Title I, Services. The change from semi-annual payments was made in order to conform to a policy of the Treasury Department for retaining cash in the Treasury of the United States until it was actually needed by recipients for program purposes. The only effect foreseen was to be on the frequency and amounts of individual federal payments. If funds were needed in July or August, the first "Quarterly Estimated Requirements for Federal Cash" forms had to be submitted to the Library Services Branch of the Office of Education as soon as possible at the beginning of a fiscal year. If immediate payment of funds was not needed, the requesting state library agency could wait until a LSCA appropriation for the fiscal year was available. The budget format of the request forms was in lump sums with no breakdown by function or program (LSCA Memorandum, July 10, 1964).

According to the expenditure records for fiscal 1965, a total of $751,186 was spent from local, state, and federal sources for LSCA
programs and services in Louisiana by the State Library. Of the total, $364,962 went for salaries. The second largest category for spending was $232,690 for books and materials (Report of Expenditures, Oct. 7, 1965).

The 1965 report of expenditures format had lined columns with the order of the information reversed from that used the previous year. Also, the newer form could be used for proposed budgets in addition to reporting actual expenditures (Report of Expenditures, October 7, 1965).

1966

The annual report form for fiscal 1966 was similar to that for fiscal 1965. The annual report for 1966 requested more specific data on Title I projects and Title II construction projects. This annual report was comprised of an annual statistical summary to which specific project statistical summaries and narrative information were attached. Each project narrative was divided into a brief statement of the project's purposes and objectives, description of the project and developments during the year, and a brief evaluation. Following the individual project reports were brief narrative evaluations of the total Title I program and Title II program. Finally, there was a brief ten-year summary and evaluation of the Library Services Act (LSA) and Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) programs along with a financial summary of lump sum expenditures.

In fiscal 1966 there were five parishes left in the state of Louisiana that still had no locally provided public library services on a parish-wide basis (Annual Report, 1966: 2). The amount for books purchased under the LSCA plan in 1966 totalled $41,553 according to corrections made in the report. Also, five bookmobiles were added
The major development recorded in the annual report for fiscal 1966 LSCA programs in Louisiana was the failure of the St. Landry Parish Library Demonstration to receive local financial support for continuation after the trial period. The plan for library service in St. Landry Parish included six service outlets, three branch libraries and three bookmobiles for rural coverage outside of the towns of Opelousas and Eunice. On November 2, 1965, the citizens of the parish voted down a three mill library tax for ten years and a one-and-one-half mill bond issue tax for twenty years for financing the construction of library buildings in Opelousas and Eunice. The margin of defeat was twenty-four popular votes and $503,379 in assessments, less than five percent of the total assessment voted. A petition for a second election failed on February 7, 1966. The State Library which had extended the demonstration period for an additional month closed the parish-wide library and began withdrawing its materials and equipment (Annual Report, 1966: 6-7). This appeared to be the only glaring project failure reported under the Library Services Act and Library Services and Construction Act.

The defeat of the library tax was analyzed in-depth by State Library officials and local community representatives who supported the project. Several possible factors were believed to have interacted, thus causing the defeat of the St. Landry Parish demonstration project: lack of cooperation and the antagonism of several political leaders, especially a political boss in the rural areas; general revolt of the community against taxation probably because seven "special revenue-raising" elections were scheduled in the period November 2 through
December 4; general feeling that a property tax was unfair since a minority of the people were asked to provide a specialized service for the majority; objections by some leaders to the facilities and services being integrated, especially since a large segment of the black community did not own property but quite often used the library services and facilities; attitude among rural residents that they did not receive service equal to residents of Opelousas and Eunice; and finally, the possible impact of a low literacy rate in which the median educational level of the population twenty-five years or older was only 5.9 grades in school (Annual Report, 1966: 8).

A compromise for what appeared to be a total and final defeat was the State Library's consideration of establishing a bi-city library for Opelousas and Eunice. Citizens in these towns had voted in favor of continuing the local library, and the city councils had expressed great interest in providing library services to their citizens. Under the plan, the State Library agreed to make available to the two cities all of the books, furniture, and equipment that were in the library branches during the parish demonstration (Annual Report, 1966: 8).

The purpose for the enrichment project for the collection of the New Orleans Public Library was stated briefly: "To help build up the Library's inadequate book collection." This project was considered successful because the grant helped in improving the book collection by increasing the book budget. Also, the New Orleans Public Library had provided three additional staff members to expedite the ordering and processing of books acquired with the federal allotment (Annual Report, 1966: 15).

A compromise for what appeared to be a total and final defeat was
the State Library's consideration of establishing a bi-city library for Opelousas and Eunice. Citizens in these towns had voted in favor of continuing the local library, and the city councils had expressed great interest in providing library services to their citizens. Under the plan, the State Library agreed to make available to the two cities all of the books, furniture, and equipment that were in the library branches during the parish demonstration (Annual Report, 1966: 8).
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The scholarship project in 1966 was also deemed successful in that the $2,000 scholarship assured the State Library of one additional librarian for public library service and the attendant publicity supposedly generated interest in librarianship as a profession (Annual Report, 1966: 17). The survey project was underway with John A. Humphry, Director of the Brooklyn Public Library, appointed director. It was considered too early to make a determination of the accomplishments or failures of this project (Annual Report, 1966: 19).

Included as part of the annual ISCA narrative report for fiscal 1966 was a report of the Survey Subcommittee of the Louisiana Development Committee of Louisiana, November 30, 1965. This report outlined the purposes, scope, timeliness, and financing of the survey
project. Attendant to these elements was the responsibilities of the survey director, the Survey Subcommittee, the Louisiana State Library, the Louisiana Library Association, and the individual librarians and trustees. The State Library was to finance the survey, publicize it, and act as liaison between the Survey Subcommittee and the director. The Survey Subcommittee had responsibility for selecting a survey director, planning his duties, enlisting the cooperation of organizations and agencies related to the survey, and receiving and reviewing the preliminary and final drafts of the survey report. The Louisiana Library Association was to provide its official sponsorship and assistance through its committees and officers (Annual Report, 1966: 20-23). The membership of the Survey Subcommittee, which consisted of several persons identified closely with the State Library, included: Frances Flanders, Margie Lynch, Mrs. Weldon Lynch, Mrs. Florrinell F. Morton, James S. Cookston, E. J. Scheerer, Kenneth Toombs, and Sallie Farrell, State Librarian and Chairman (Annual Report, 1966: 21).

The overall program evaluation of the annual LSBA report for Title I in fiscal 1966 emphasized the failure of the St. Landry Parish Library project. Also, the refusal of the police jury in St. James Parish to enter a bi-parish demonstration with St. John Parish was described as a disappointment. The survey project was suggested as being very necessary for future planning. Additional staff members at the State Library were described as being vital to both consultant activities and headquarters programs (Annual Report, 1966: 29). The Title II Program evaluation emphasized the significance of the construction of the Algiers Regional Branch in the metropolitan area of New Orleans (Annual Report, 1966: 30). Another important development
was the organization of the thirty-three member Library Development Committee of Louisiana by the Louisiana Library Association for the purpose of formulating long-range plans and assuming responsibility for National Library Week activities in Louisiana (Annual Report, 1966: 31).

The ten-year summary and evaluation of the LSA and LSCA in Louisiana emphasized the continuation of the State Library's demonstration program with fourteen of fifteen projects successfully providing parish-wide library services in sixteen of the seventeen parishes involved. Federal funds made it possible to provide adequate staffs and materials otherwise impossible in these demonstration projects. Periodicals and nonprint and print materials were added to the resources of the State Library, substantially increasing its ability to effectively support local parish library programs and services (Annual Report, 1966: 32).

The ten-year summary stressed the impossibility of measuring clearly the effects of the recruiting project conducted for four years of the ten-year period. Specifically, the recruiting project may have resulted in increased graduate and undergraduate enrollments in the library programs of Louisiana colleges and universities. Among the intangible effects listed were the increased public awareness of and interest in public libraries. The scholarships assured the availability of seven more fully trained professional librarians for public library service (Annual Report, 1966: 33).

In addition to the Algiers Regional Branch which was completed, LSCA funds provided the impetus for the design and construction of the following new and renovated public library facilities: Pointe Coupee Parish Headquarters and Branch, East Baton Rouge Parish Mid-City Branch,
addition and alterations to the Bossier City Branch, Jefferson Parish Library Headquarters, addition and alterations to the St. Mary Parish Library Headquarters, and the New Orleans Lake Forest Regional Branch, Phase I (Annual Report, 1966: 33).

A comparison among certain factors affecting public library development and services in Louisiana was made between a pre-LSA year and the middle of fiscal 1966. In 1955 there were forty-two parish libraries in Louisiana while in 1965 there were fifty-seven. The population served by public libraries increased from 2,256,555 in 1966 to 3,144,681 in 1965. Total expenditures for public libraries in Louisiana increased from $2,105,582 in 1955 to $5,325,318 in 1965. The per capita expenditure for public libraries in Louisiana rose from $.93 in 1955 to $1.69 in 1965 (Annual Report, 1966: 34).

1967

The Twenty-Second Biennial Report of the Louisiana State Library for 1966-1967 mentioned the failure of the St. Landry Parish Project with its closing in March 1966 and the books and equipment being returned to the State Library. No discussion of the causes for the failure was provided (LSL Report, 22nd: 2).

The annual report of the Louisiana State Library for fiscal 1967 under the LSCA was basically of the same format as that for fiscal 1966 but with much more detail. The 1967 report had a breakdown for expenditures under Title I for materials and equipment. Also, there was a statistical listing of the number of projects approved under Title II, the number approved in fiscal 1967, the number completed as of June 30, 1967, and the number not completed as of June 30, 1967. Along with these elements was a table indicating the uses of federal funds for
survey projects and a narrative discussion of planning activities, other than surveys. The bulk of the document included the project report forms with financial data accompanied by narrative discussions of project purposes, objectives, developments, and evaluations. The final segment was a lump sum accounting of Title II projects and total program evaluations for Titles I and II.

According to the fiscal 1967 annual report, the remaining parishes without parish-wide public library services were Assumption, Jefferson Davis, St. Landry, and West Carroll (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 2). The total professional positions on the State Library staff were twenty-seven (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 3). Total books added to public library collections in fiscal 1967 were 189,753, and the total bookmobiles added to the State Library fleet were two (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 5).

Under Title III of the LSCA, the State Library commissioned a feasibility study on centralized processing based upon responses to a state-wide questionnaire. On May 9, 1967, a meeting was held with representatives from education, health and correctional institutions, and libraries to discuss the needs which Title IV-A of the LSCA could help meet. Because of staff shortages and time limitations, additional planning was impossible (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 7).

The federal grant received by the Louisiana State Library under Title IV-B for the purpose of developing a plan of service was used primarily to gather and organize as much pertinent data as possible. A university professor in business administration was employed to study and evaluate the operation and management of the Department for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. A library educator with prior related
experience was contracted to evaluate the professional services of the department in terms of new standards for library service to the blind and physically handicapped. A consultant was hired to evaluate the volunteer recording program and to make recommendations for the improvement of media production. Another consultant from a university graduate program in social welfare was contracted to advise and provide guidance in the collection of data from and about potential users (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 8-9).

Demonstrations in St. James Parish, St. John Parish, and West Baton Rouge Parish received favorable local tax votes in fiscal 1967 (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 14-21). The Opelousas-Eunice Public Library was established as an outgrowth of the St. Landry Parish Library Demonstration that failed to receive local funds in 1966 for continued operation. The two major municipalities in the parish agreed to dedicate a portion of their sales tax revenue to the operation of a bi-city public library. The State Library agreed to make available, upon provision of local funds, the books, furniture, and equipment used for the demonstration. The bi-city library was scheduled to open to the public in October 1967, with additional books provided in 1968 to supplement the demonstration materials available (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 28). Preparations were begun for the opening of a demonstration in West Carroll Parish in fiscal 1968 (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 51-52).

The project purposes and objectives for the provision of added materials to the library collections of the public libraries in the parishes of Caddo, Calcasieu, East Baton Rouge, Jefferson, Lafayette, Orleans, and Ouachita were quite briefly stated. The entire rationale
for each of these projects was simply "To help build the Library's inadequate book collection." The accompanying narratives of project description and evaluation were the same for each, except in the case of the New Orleans Public Library which had been receiving the enrichment grants for several years and had added staff to process the materials (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 30-50).

Three scholarships were awarded by the Louisiana State Library in fiscal 1968 to help alleviate "the urgent need for professionally-trained librarians." The evaluative narrative noted that the number of applicants had decreased and that the internship program initiated in fiscal 1968 might prove to be a more effective recruiting device (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 54).

A report form for completed construction was included for the Title II Mid-City Branch Library project in East Baton Rouge Parish. This form was fairly detailed with descriptive statistics of the building and its costs, including architect's fees, site acquisition, new construction, renovations, equipment, and miscellaneous costs. The sources and amounts of funds were indicated along with a narrative discussion of the needs and purposes of the construction (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 65-67-b). Other project completion reports included were for the Bossier City Parish Library addition and the St. Mary Parish Library facility (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 68-74).

The total program summary for Title I recapped the individual project reports. Emphasis was placed upon the nearing completion of the State Library's demonstration program. Part of the time and effort put into the defunct St. Landry Parish Demonstration was salvaged with the establishment of a bi-city library in Eunice and Opelousas. Only the
parishes of West Carroll, Assumption, and Jefferson Davis remained without parish-wide public library services, but their governing bodies had requested establishment of demonstration projects. The importance of the survey project was characterized by this statement: "The receipt of the first draft of the survey report in November 1967 is eagerly anticipated" (Annual Report, August 21, 1967: 75).

In fiscal 1967 there was growing interest in the establishment of a centralized processing project. According to a memorandum from Sallie Farrell, State Librarian, to administrative public librarians in the state, the establishment of a processing center received much attention at the Annual Administrative Librarians' Conference in October 1966. Such a center was considered possible when the demonstration plan for public libraries was ended the following fiscal year. The State Library would handle the entire processing of books from ordering, through cataloging, to physical processing, and to shipping the books and cards to the participating libraries. In all cases, the libraries involved would pay the invoiced price of materials processed. There was an indication that if such a centralized processing center were deemed feasible, the policies and procedures would be formulated with the help of an advisory committee of administrative librarians. The completion of an attached questionnaire was requested to determine the interest necessary in justifying such a project (Farrell, May 16, 1967).

An example of the preliminary studies contracted by the State Library under Title IV-B was that of evaluating the volunteer tape recording program in terms of procedures, equipment, personnel, and recommended improvements. The narrative report was brief with subjective comments based upon a careful but superficial examination of
the content and nature of the activities involved in media production of
the State Library Department for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

The report of the study described the volunteer recording program as
"patently inadequate." The reasons suggested for this description
included the production of book recordings on an "irregular, unplanned
schedule" by untrained persons using equipment unfamiliar to them. The
quality of the volunteer readers varied from excellent to those with
very poor and annoying speech characteristics, poor diction or phrasing,
and monotonous deliveries that bordered on the unintelligible. The
facility for production of recordings was also very poor because only a
"small, noisy room" was used. Also, the recording of books was limited
to regular library hours during which professional and qualified
persons, who were willing to help, were not available (Pead, 1967: 1-2).

Recommendations included determining the qualifications of
volunteers, providing recording equipment for home use, and soliciting
assistance from professional radio and television personnel and
qualified college faculty and students (Read, 1967: 2). The possibility
of paying recording personnel on an hourly basis was largely discounted.
The use of commercial radio studios and the L.S.U. Recording Services
might temporarily remedy the shortcomings in recording facilities. The
permanent solution, however, was emphatically presented as being well
designed recording booths. The cost of four such booths was indicated
with the name and address of the manufacturer. On an interim basis, the
suggestion was made that the production of materials be contracted
through commercial firms, probably at a cost of twelve dollars or less
per final recorded hour (Pead, 1967: 6-13).

The Twenty-Second Biennial Report of the Louisiana State Library
clearly stated that the reluctance of the state legislature to accept its responsibilities to the State Library caused the State Library to increase its reuse of federal funds for day-to-day operations. The very limited application of federal funds for improving established public libraries with inadequate services was due to the necessary use of LSA and ISCA money for support of the State Library. The situation deprived local programs of their just share of federal funds (LSL Report, 22nd: 13-14).

1968

The annual report submitted under the ISCA for fiscal 1968 by the Louisiana State Library was similar to that for the previous year with a few exceptions. Line-item budget summaries were provided for Title I, Title III, Title IV-A, and Title IV-B programs. The Title II projects report was omitted because it was filed separately. The projects outlined in the state plan of programs for fiscal 1968 were essentially the same as covered in the report for that year. The largest amount of federal funds was used again for headquarters services with a total of $298,739 (Annual Report, Dec. 29, 1968: 17).

Two significant developments reported in fiscal 1968 were the establishment of the centralized processing center and the issuance of the report of the survey of Louisiana libraries. The feasibility study for a State Library centralized processing center was done by Marvin Mounce and was initiated on the basis of responses to a questionnaire by the State Library. In the questionnaire, all respondents indicated some degree of interest in the utilization of such a center depending upon the nature of the services provided and the cost (Mounce, Aug. 31, 1967: 2).
The establishment of the processing center was strongly recommended by Mounce (Aug. 31, 1967: 3-4) for several reasons. First, the center would free professional and clerical personnel in local public libraries from non-public service activities and make them available for assisting patrons. With limitations of local funds, a processing center would provide for the maximum use of available personnel in public services without substantially increasing costs. The second reason was that the application of uniform cataloging and assembly line processing methods would reduce the share of each participating library's cost. Third, the processing services would easily satisfy the local needs because of a large degree of compatibility between the State Library and local library cataloging, which resulted from a large number of the local libraries having been established as demonstrations by the State Library. Finally, the quality of the work would be better because of the employment of experienced specialists at the State Library.

The entire feasibility report was in easily read narrative and was thorough in content. In addition to the reasons for establishing a centralized processing center, the report covered such topics as functions of the center, service policies, the nature and form of financial support, the administrative structure, projected costs, and future implications. The report strongly emphasized planning for the future welfare of participating libraries, especially in the event of the discontinuance of the service, either individually or on a total basis (Mounce, Aug. 31, 1967: 23). Miss Jewel Hardkopf, a library management consultant, was employed in 1968 to assist in the actual planning and establishment of the center on the basis of the
recommendations in the feasibility study (LSL Report, 22nd: 10).

The final approved report of the state-wide library survey conducted by John Humphry and James Humphry III was released just prior to the Louisiana Library Association convention in March 1968 (LSL Report, 22nd: 3). The report was titled Library Service in Louisiana, Keeping Pace with Progress and covered in detail the past, present, and future of public, school, and academic libraries in Louisiana as well as library education. The report was done in a readable style with a minimum of charts, though several were used for comparisons and were incorporated in the text. The report was generally complimentary of the programs and directions taken by the State Library. This report made positive recommendations for improving public library services while being as uncritical as possible.

A recommendation of the Humphry survey (1968: 54) was that the membership of the Louisiana State Library Board of Commissioners be enlarged for broader representation of the interests of the state. An essential consideration was that members of the Board be encouraged to participate more in stimulating new approaches to library service throughout Louisiana. Also, the report was recommended that the Board should become more involved in service and program planning and that it should be selected from local boards of trustees.

Of all the recommendations made by the Humphry report, the major one was the establishment of systems of libraries. This recommendation included discussions of the philosophy of library systems, components of library systems, a description of a hypothetical system for Louisiana, designation of libraries to be included in the seven suggested Louisiana library systems, the administrative organization of the seven systems,
and finally, their financial support (Humphry, 1968: 67). An example of a system organization was cited with the Ouachita Parish Library as the library system center. The system center and the Ouachita Parish Library would work in cooperation rather than duplicating facilities, services, and resources (Humphry, 1968: 75).

The proposed library systems were titled according to their geographical location in Louisiana and were the Southeast, Capital, South-Central, Southwest, Central, Northeast, and Northwest (Humphry, 1968: 79). It was stressed that the State Library should not dictate the policies of each of the system programs but should retain review authority through approval of plans proposed by system boards and submitted to the "State Library Board of Commissioners" (Humphry, 1968: 84).

In April 1968, an intensive three month case finding project was initiated to identify and certify qualified users of the Services to the Blind and Physically Handicapped. Seven area field consultants headquartered in the larger public libraries of the state informed public and governmental agencies of the State Library's free "Talking Books" services. The increased number of users reportedly justified the project and indicated a need for continuing such efforts (LSL Report, 22nd: 4).

1969

While the program plan submitted by the Louisiana State Library under the ISCA was fairly brief, the annual report for fiscal 1969 was very long and extensive in narrative. The format consisted of project report forms used in the submitted program plan followed by a narrative discussion of each project. Financial summaries for each ISCA title
were followed by narrative summations of the total program activities.

According to the 1969 annual report under the LSCA, support for public libraries in all parishes of the state was assured, thus bringing to an end the long demonstration program of the State Library. The last three demonstration projects were in the parishes of West Carroll, Assumption, and Jefferson Davis (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 2-13). Tax support for continuance of the Jefferson Davis project was assured later in fiscal 1969, although the demonstration period was not scheduled to end until fiscal 1970 (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 13).

Notable project activities in fiscal 1969 were the four in-service training programs held in the Capital Region - East Baton Rouge Parish Library, the Central Region - Rapides Parish Library, the South-Central Region - Lafayette Public Library, and the Southwest Region - Calcasieu Parish Library (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 42). The programs were considered very successful based upon the responses of the participants. The purposes of these programs were to improve the training of library staffs and to demonstrate the advantages of cooperative staff training (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 38). The few criticisms reported by the participants included the large size of the discussion groups, too much of a time spread, and repetition of subject content with that of previous library experience (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 41).

Another innovative project evaluated in the Annual LSCA report for 1969 was the regional public information programs. Regional areas included were the Southwest, the Northeast, and Northwest. A follow-up questionnaire for evaluation indicated that most participants realized the importance of using all the news media in public relations and that
a total public relations program could be best coordinated by an experienced public relations representative at the regional level (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 46). Thirteen of the twenty-two involved libraries indicated that they would like to continue a regional information program if budgets permitted; two felt it would only be advantageous to participate in special activities such as promotion of summer reading programs; and five would not consider participating in such programs even if their budgets would allow them to do so. Two of the questionnaires were not returned. The parish libraries in Calcasieu and Ouachita Parishes decided to continue their own public relations programs and retained the professional public relations representatives from their regions on a part-time basis (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 47-48).

The TWX communications network was designed to provide improved service to library patrons. The Study Committee on Library Development of the College and Reference Section and the Public Library Section of the Louisiana Library Association identified the establishment of a rapid communications system as a high priority under Title III of the LSCA (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 60).

Participants in the rapid communications project included twelve academic libraries, eight public libraries, three special libraries, and the State Library. The reported strengths of the project were very superficial and general. One was that the TWX system proved that all types of libraries in the state could cooperate in providing better services to patrons. Other advantages were that the teletypewriter did not need a constant attendant and "written requests" had unstated advantages over voice communications. Also, the time for interlibrary
loan service from the Louisiana State University Library to users in the state was reduced (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 61).

Weaknesses of the TWX project which were reported were more specific than the listed strengths and included the uncertainty of federal funds which prevented a more thorough investigation of various types and combinations of rapid communications systems and a better orientation program for participants. Another criticism was the high fixed rental fees for the equipment. Heavy use of the equipment reduced unit costs, but toll charges increased overall expenditures. The unit cost for the State Library, the heaviest user, was $.41 with a unit cost of $14.21 for the smallest user. The average unit cost for the first five months of operation was $1.39 (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 61).

An evaluation meeting of TWX project participants was held in July 1969 at which six low use teletype stations were dropped. The installation of one WATS (Wide Area Telephone Service) "In" station at the State Library served as a replacement for the dropped teletype units (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 61-62).

Though not included in the state program plan for fiscal 1969, the State Library allotted under Title III $450 to the Recorder of Documents of the Louisiana Department of State. These funds were for the purchase of Library of Congress cards for use in the cooperative cards-with-documents program. Library of Congress cards were provided for state documents distributed by the Recorder of Documents to academic, public, and special libraries (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 67).

The evaluation of the pilot libraries project for state correctional and health institutions of Louisiana under Title IV-A
reported that libraries had been established at the State Penitentiary at Angola, the Correctional and Industrial School at DeQuincy, and the Women's Penitentiary at St. Gabriel. All were reported to be widely used with circulation figures gradually increasing. The only problem that developed was the loss, implying theft, of books at the State Penitentiary. One reason for this loss factor was that the library could not be completely secured when not open for service. The situation was reportedly being corrected. Loss was not a problem at the two other correctional institutions (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 70-74).

Delay in the final federal appropriations and a developing State fiscal crisis placed mandatory restrictions on equipment purchases and employment of new personnel for the Title IV-B project for improving state-wide library services to the blind and physically handicapped. Budget adjustments were made with actual salaries totalling $29,307 while the budgeted amount was $26,389; equipment purchases totalled only $3,850 while $11,188 was budgeted; and other expenses totalled $7,265 with $5,983 budgeted. Automatic addressing equipment and magnetic tape was purchased. Salaries previously funded under Title I were provided under Title IV-B in fiscal 1969 (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 83).

Under Title II, Construction improved physical facilities were provided with new parish headquarters being completed for Grant and Union Parishes. Planning was begun for new structures in St. James and Catahoula Parishes. The Lake Forest Regional Branch was completed and an addition to the Gentilly Branch of the New Orleans Public Library was underway. A branch building of the Terrebonne Parish Library and an addition to the Ouachita Parish Library were completed. The Opelousas-
Eunice Public Library was nearing completion, and construction had begun on the Grand Isle Branch of the Library Division of Jefferson Parish (Annual Report, Dec. 8, 1969: 95).

The Study Committee on Library Development of the Louisiana Library Association consisted of thirty-seven members from all fields of librarianship appointed by the Executive Board of the Louisiana Library Association. This committee was organized in 1968 with responsibility for studying recommendations of the Humphry survey of libraries in the Louisiana, ascertaining the feasibility of recommendations, developing alternative proposals, and formulating priorities in library development (LSL Report, 23rd: 2). Vivian Cazayoux of the State Library chaired the committee which made its report in March 1969 (Cazayoux, Feb. 20, 1969).

The Study Committee on Library Development recommended the development of a state-wide plan for library systems as suggested by the Humphry report. The State Library was asked and agreed to establish and conduct a pilot library program and included the necessary funds in its 1969-70 budget. Conditions for qualifying for a pilot library system grant were outlined by the Committee. The population to be served had to be at least 200,000 with no less than fifty percent of the public libraries and one academic library in the area participating. The public library having a collection of at least 80,000 volumes and serving the largest population area was to be designated as the library system center with the administrative librarian of the central library being head of the system (Study Committee, March 1969: 2-4).

An example of the participation by local librarians in establishing LSCA projects of the State Library was a letter from Mrs. Max Schenker requesting a meeting of parishes included in the Capital
Region. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the State Library plan under Title I regarding regional in-service training programs and proposed regional public information programs (Schenker, July 23, 1968).

An example of the criticisms and suggestions provided by local librarians about the use of federal funds was a letter from Sallie Farrell (Aug. 17, 1968) to M. E. Wright, director of the New Orleans Public Library. Miss Farrell agreed with Mr. Wright's criticism of the geographical delineation by trade area for the library systems recommended by the Humphry study and she acknowledged the suggestion of New Orleans librarians that in-service training programs be devised and directed by the Library School of Louisiana State University rather than being locally planned and executed. Farrell reminded Wright of a shortage of library school faculty and the variation in training needs from one region to another. Farrell stated that the proposed regional in-service projects under LSCA precluded the suggestion by New Orleans' librarians and that the experience gained would offer much for devising future in-service training activities, possibly on a state-wide basis. Her closing sentence curtly expressed appreciation for the interest of Mr. Wright and wished the regional projects well with the hope that Mr. Wright's recommendations might be implemented in the future (farrell, Aug. 17, 1968).

A corollary development to the LSCA financed planning activities of the Louisiana State Library was an institute on the concept of system libraries with application to Louisiana. This institute was conducted by the Louisiana State University Library School in October 1968 (LSL Report, 23rd: 3). The proceedings of the institute were published in 1969. Participants in the institute were representatives of the
libraries included in the regions formulated for systems programs and cooperative projects by the Sub-Committee of Planning of the Library Development Committee of the Louisiana Library Association (Kleiner, 1969: 100). Sallie Farrell, State Librarian, outlined several activities which the Louisiana State Library and the Louisiana Library Association were considering for the strengthening of state-wide library services. These activities included the improvement of communications within the profession, a coordinated public information program, a union list of serials, increased numbers of State Library consultants and Louisiana State University Library school faculty, continuation of the rapid communications network, continuation of the processing center, and the need to study various possible means of "financing total library service" (Kleiner, 1969: 122).

1970

The format for the LSCA report filed by the State library in fiscal 1970 was the same as that of the previous fiscal year. The fiscal 1970 report, as did the 1969 report, had lengthy, general narrative summaries.

Attached to the report was a letter from the State Librarian, Sallie Farrell, to S. Janice Kee, Library Service Program Officer of the Dallas Regional Office of the United States Office of Education. The letter explained discrepancies between the proposed and actual expenditures for projects under the fiscal 1970 LSCA plan. Because of the uncertainty of the federal allotment, only $5,000 was budgeted for the enrichment of the New Orleans Public Library's collection under Title I. When federal funds were made available, the grant was increased to $34,000 (Farrell, Aug. 21, 1970).
The threatened reduction in federal funds caused very 
conservative budget estimates for headquarters services under Title I 
with the actual expenditures reflecting the additional allotments. The 
$7,859 budgeted under Project 4 of Title I for the Trail Blazer Library 
System was expended in Title III for the interlibrary cooperative 
aspects of the project. No budget for the Scholarship-internship 
Project was originally included, but when funds became available two 
$2,000 scholarships were awarded. The $7,859 for the rapid 
communications network under Title III was based upon the reduction of 
participants with TWX equipment. Toll charges for all participating 
libraries were overestimated due to the State Library's brief experience 
with the network. The overage in local expenditures occurred because 
the program plan for 1970 reported minimum local funds for matching 
while the annual report included the actual amount of local matching 
funds (Farrell, Aug. 21, 1970).

The $7,859 in federal funds originally budgeted under Title I for 
the Trail Blazer Pilot Library System was actually expended under Title 
III for the interlibrary cooperative aspects of the project and was not 
a reflection of a substantive change in the proposed project. The 
change was merely an adjustment in the allocation of title funds 
(Farrell, Aug. 21, 1970).

The proposed budget allocation of federal funds for headquarters 
services in fiscal 1970 was $287,810 and that from state funds $262,790. 
The actual federal expenditure after federal funds were available was 
$393,500 with $326,665 in state funds. The proposed total for salaries 
and wages was $404,727 while the actual amount spent was dropped to 
$394,865. Increases were made in the book allowance, equipment, and

The major change in the information submitted in the program plan of proposed LSCL projects for fiscal 1970 was the changing of the name of the Northeast Pilot Library System to that of the Trail Blazer Pilot Library System. The reason for the name change was "the hope being that it will blaze the trail for other such library systems in the state."

The actual public operating date for this demonstration or pilot system was July 1, 1970. During the interim, publicity for the system was prepared and disseminated and the librarians involved produced the necessary procedural manuals covering registration and the use of system borrower's cards as well as interlibrary loan. The executive council of the system, consisting of the administrative librarians of the sixteen libraries participating, was organized. The system board, consisting of a representative from each library board of the participating libraries, was organized and had its first meeting on May 14, 1970. The system board functioned in an advisory capacity during the pilot period (Annual Report, Aug. 21, 1970: 6-7).

A slight alteration was made in the TWX communications network project. In October 1969, six little-used teletype machines were replaced with toll-free telephone service to a WATS (Wide Area Telephone Service) installation at the Louisiana State Library. The economy and simplicity of WATS along with its predictable rental fee made such a service the "logical complement to the original TWX network" (Annual Report, Aug. 21, 1970: 23-24).

The program summary under Title II indicated the completion of several building projects. These included a headquarters facility and separate branch building for the Catahoula Parish Library, the Opelousas
Public Library building, the renovation and enlargement of the Gentilly Branch of the New Orleans Public Library, and a building for the Grand Isle Branch of the Jefferson Parish Library. Construction was begun on the James Parish Library Headquarters and Branch at Lutcher (Annual Report, Aug. 21, 1970: 48).

The program summary also noted the expansion of the centralized processing operations under Title III. From the original twelve libraries in September 1968, the number of participants had increased to thirty-six at the end of fiscal 1970. The total included twenty-nine public libraries, six institutional libraries, and the State Library (Annual Report, Aug. 21, 1970: 48).

The overall summation of LSCA programs and projects for fiscal 1970 characterized the year with the words "planning" and "uncertainty-maddening fiscal uncertainty." The lack of acceptable state support for the Louisiana State Library combined with the uncertainty of federal funds restricted the ability of the State Library to implement its plans for library development and future continuation of services at 1970 levels (Annual Report, Aug. 21, 1970: 52).

The proposal for the establishment of a pilot regional library system in northeast Louisiana was completely narrative and general. The two long-range objectives of the system were broadly stated. The first was to provide the widest range of available information to all library patrons within the area of the system. The other long-range objective was to provide competent and knowledgeable personnel "to assimilate, disseminate, and accumulate...[the] collection and make it accessible to those persons served within the systems area." Short-range objectives included the establishing of a reference center, strengthening book
collections of member libraries, increasing salaries of professional librarians, developing a public information program, and encouraging the development of local history collections (Proposal, March 24, 1970: 1). Other elements of the proposal were the definition of responsibilities of organizational elements the system structure, staff of the system unit, development of a selection policy, and various services and activities of the system. These activities and services included system library cards, lending regulations, reference and research services, interlibrary loan and availability of materials, copying services, special subject collections, a union list of serials in the system, and children's programs. The duration of the pilot library system was planned to be April 1, 1970 through December 31, 1971 (Proposal, March 24, 1970: 2-6).

1971

The format of the 1971 LSCA report submitted by the Louisiana State Library was similar to that of 1970. The same budget proposal-report forms were used. Appropriate narrative information followed most project reports and there were again summaries for each LSCA title and a general assessment of the total LSCA program in relation to the Louisiana State Library's objectives. The only difference in the fiscal 1971 report was that the annual expenditures report forms were placed before the individual project materials.

Headquarters services were originally budgeted $437,804 in federal money under the program plan and $337,806 in state funds. The annual report for fiscal 1971 indicated the federal funds actually expended were $484,111 and state funds $303,067. The bulk of the total allotment went for salaries and wages which totalled $160,756 followed
by $100,069 for books, $30,029 for audio-visual materials, and $4,752 for equipment. The amounts originally budgeted for salaries, wages and books were $407,907 and $145,768 respectively (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 6).

Under Title I for fiscal 1971, the Northeast Louisiana Pilot Library System (Trail Blazer Pilot Library System) received $81,723 in federal funds while $99,600 in federal funds was budgeted in the program plan. The project was budgeted $7,400 in state funds but received none according to the annual report. The total budgeted amount in the program plan under Title I was $107,000 while the annual report indicated an expenditure of $81,723, all in federal funds (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 7).

The evaluation of State Library book collection was originally budgeted $5,000 in federal funds but the annual report for fiscal 1971 showed only that $2,951 was spent (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 8).

Under Title I, planning was reported to be an emphasis of the State Library in fiscal 1971. To encourage planning for the improvement of services to the general public and special groups in particular, the State Library originally budgeted $6,000 for planning grants available to the six remaining library regions, five of which qualified. Because of unspecified delays in beginning the program, the grants were reduced from $6,000 to $5,000 and later to smaller amounts. The grant for planning services to the disadvantaged remained at $6,000 (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 12-13). All of the five regions adopted as their chief objective the development of a comprehensive plan for the establishment of systems. Three regions eventually submitted applications for system grants. Participating in the planning of
services to the disadvantaged were the New Orleans Public and St. Bernard Parish Libraries. The original program plan included Jefferson Parish, but the head librarian there chose not to participate (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 12-13).

The LNR: Numerical Register of Books in Louisiana Libraries exceeded its projected goal of 250,000 entries during its first year by 100 percent. Bound copies of the reproduced computer print-out were provided for the participants in the project and were also placed in all other Louisiana academic libraries (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 25).

A professional coordinator was appointed to direct the volunteer recording project under Title IV-B of the LSCA. Thirty-six new book titles, some of which were college textbooks, were added in the six month period of operation. The recordings were reported to be of superior quality (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 39).

Under Title II, Construction, the headquarters and branch building for the St. James Parish Library was completed. Construction had begun on parish library facilities in Richland and Jackson Parishes (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 42-43).

The effectiveness of the institutional library demonstrations under Title IV-A was based on the willingness of the individual institutions and co-sponsoring state departments, Corrections or Hospitals, to finance the libraries on a continuing basis after completion of the pilot periods. Partial allocation of Title IV-B funds for salaries of regular State Library staff was necessary in the first half of fiscal 1971 (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 44-45).

The general assessment of the total LSCA program in Louisiana emphasized a turning point in Louisiana library development. This
pivotal point was the completion of the State Library's demonstration program in 1970. The next year in fiscal 1971 the State Library began moving in the direction of projects designed to clearly demonstrate the benefits of regional and state-wide cooperative and coordinated service (Annual Report, Oct. 6, 1971: 45).

A memorandum from Vivian Cazayoux, Associate State Librarian for Library Development, to Sallie Farrell and June Stringfield noted that S. Janice Kee, Library Service Program Officer of the Regional Office of the U. S. Office of Education, pointed out that the program plan for fiscal 1971 indicated no matching funds from state or local sources, only federal for the Trail Blazer Pilot Library System. Kee suggested that the book budgets of the participating libraries be used for matching purposes. According to Cazayoux, the omission was purposeful in order to maintain the effort base for funding and that the state and local amounts were not an absolute requirement (Cazayoux, Sept. 22, 1970).

A survey of the collections of school, public, special, and academic libraries in the northeastern region of Louisiana was funded under Title III of the LSCA in fiscal 1970 with the report being published in September 1970 (Hefley, Sept., 1970: 4). The survey was based upon two questionnaires sent to all libraries of the area with a third form being limited to public and academic libraries. The purpose of this questionnaire was to identify specialized holdings and strengths of the academic and public libraries in the region. No criteria for the determination of strength or specialty were applied, only the administrative librarian's subjective estimate (Hefley, Sept., 1970: 28).
The fiscal 1972 LSCA annual report filed by the Louisiana State Library had the same format and materials arrangement used the previous year. Annual expenditures reports were followed by the project reports and narratives, then by summaries of the title programs, and finally by the summary of the entire LSCA program for the fiscal year.

Films and recordings were budgeted $99,735 in the program plan with $78,925 actually being spent. The federal share was reduced from $69,346 to $59,059 and state funds from $30,389 to $19,866. An additional $20,381 in state money was expended as matching funding funds in the Title IV-A Social Security Act reimbursement program for social services. The largest category of films purchased was children's films for support of Headstart centers, day-care centers, mental health centers, the institutionalized, and the aged. The next largest categories were child care and nature films (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 4-5).

Under the Title I project for library systems development, the Green Gold Pilot Library System was established in northwest Louisiana. This system united eight public, two academic, and two special libraries into a cooperative arrangement with the Shreve Memorial Library, the largest public library in the area, as the central library (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 8).

Three pilot institutional libraries were completed in fiscal 1972. Forest Glen Library at Central Louisiana State Hospital and the libraries at the state schools for the retarded at Leesville and Ruston were ended with continuing support provided by the appropriate state agency. The library program at the Southeast Louisiana Hospital in
Mandeville was described as an exemplary example of an institutional library demonstration (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 15).

Library system development under Title III of the revised LSCA was budgeted for a total of $13,693, all in federal money, with actual expenditures being reported at $18,973 (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 18). The project for The LNR: Numerical Register of Books in Louisiana Libraries was continued with the addition of the monograph holdings of one metropolitan library and five academic libraries. Library of Congress card numbers provided access to the machine data base of this catalog of over one million title locations. Borrowing libraries using this tool agreed to borrow from the smallest institution holding the title with the objective of reducing the interlibrary loan load of the larger libraries. Two public, one special, and eighteen academic libraries were participating (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 21-23).

A project for interlibrary cooperation which was not budgeted in the 1972 program plan was reported in the annual LSCA report. This was a modest $3,000 made to a committee of academic librarians with State Library representation for the purpose of establishing priorities among a number of possible cooperative projects for the benefit of all types of libraries in the state. Over half the academic library administrators in Louisiana participated. A preliminary report of this group recommended the application of technology to support library functions as a top priority during the next five years (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 25-26).

The summary and evaluation of Title I in the fiscal 1972 annual report stated that the meager regional planning grants of fiscal 1971 were rewarded with the establishment of the Green Gold Library System of
northwest Louisiana, the Jericho project in New Orleans, a motivational study for determining why people of various ages and backgrounds use and do not use public libraries, a sound slide production for promoting the use of seven central Louisiana parish libraries and cooperative projects among several non-system public libraries. The Trail Blazer Library System of Northeast Louisiana completed its pilot period in December 1971. All member libraries agreed to continue the system with 75 percent of the financing provided by the State Library with LSCA Title I and III funds and participating libraries providing 25 percent (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 28-29).

Under Title II in 1972, a branch and headquarters building in Richland Parish was completed. The Jackson Parish Library project was near completion, and construction had begun on facilities for the Bienville Parish Library and the Eunice City Library (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 32).

The Louisiana State Library with LSCA funds participated in the establishment of the Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor (SLICE). This was a six-state planning and coordinating bureau for determining library needs common to all members that could be met via interstate activities. An unspecified number of Louisiana librarians participated in two continuing education workshops provided by SLICE. One was on services to the disadvantaged and the other on planning and evaluation (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 32).

Louisiana's long-range program for library development for the years 1973-1977 was completed and submitted to the Regional U. S. Office of Education in Dallas, Texas at the end of fiscal 1972 (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 33). The goals and objectives presented in the long-
range plan were formulated by the Louisiana State Library and the
Louisiana Advisory Council on Libraries (Louisiana Advisory Council,
1972: 1). The Louisiana Advisory Council on Libraries was composed of
fourteen members and included both professional librarians and lay
persons (Louisiana Advisory Council, 1972: 53). Six members out of the
fourteen possibly had close ties with the State Library.

The fiscal 1972 annual LSCA report of the Louisiana State Library
suggested that several 1972 projects under the LSCA were already
indicative of Louisiana libraries moving toward attainment of the goals
prescribed in the long-range plan, Clear Purpose—Complete Commitment,
1973-1977. Reference correspondence courses given in the two
established library systems and the reference and interlibrary loan
workshops supported Goal I - Personnel which was "To enhance the
usefulness and effectiveness of library personnel at every level of
service." The enrichment of the collection of the State Library and
libraries in regional systems and The Louisiana Numerical Register
supported Goal III Library Materials which in part stated, "To provide the
public with enriched library materials and to assure more productive use
of these materials...." The Jericho project in metropolitan New Orleans
was in direct support of Goal III - Service to the Disadvantaged which
stated, "To develop programs...meaningful to the urban and rural
disadvantaged and to racial minorities...." The pilot institutional
libraries under the LSCA plan were related directly to Goal V - Service
to health and Correctional Institutions that stated, "To continue to
support, broaden, and strengthen the total rehabilitation program of
health and correctional institutions...." LSCA Title II funds directly
applied to Goal VII - Physical Facilities which was, "To provide the
physical facilities necessary to develop improved library and information services...." Studies and evaluations funded under various LSCA titles were related directly to Goal VIII - Study and Evaluation which stated, "To assure more effective library service through study and evaluation...." (Annual Report, Nov. 22, 1972: 33-36).

The five-year plan of the Louisiana Advisory Council on Libraries, Clear Purpose—Complete Commitment, 1973-1977, reported that the State Library began moving in new directions after the completion of the last parish demonstration library in 1969. These new directions emphasized regional and state-wide planning and resulted in the establishment of a State Library centralized processing center, a communications network, regional library systems, regional cooperative projects, The Louisiana Numerical Register, and interstate library cooperation (Louisiana Advisory Council, 1972: 5-6).

The five-year plan for Louisiana library development included narrative discussions of background information on the State Library, public libraries, library systems, academic libraries, school libraries, special libraries, and library education in Louisiana. Needs were identified, and general goals with supporting objectives and activities for implementation were formulated in the areas of personnel, library materials, service to the economically disadvantaged, service to the blind and physically handicapped, service to health and correctional institutions, financing, physical facilities, and study and evaluation of various programs and services. This five-year plan was an extension of the Humphry report of 1968 and continued to stress the application of large service units and regional cooperation among various types of libraries and service agencies (Louisiana Advisory Council, 1972: 3-4).
Also, there was the implication that the reliance upon federal funds for construction and the establishment of regional systems was to be continued (Louisiana Advisory Council, 1972: 41-44).

In 1971 the Louisiana State Library allocated funds for an evaluation of the services of the Trail Blazer Pilot Library System. Specific considerations were the performance of the system relative to its objectives, possible new services to be offered, improvement of administrative routines, user satisfaction, and the usefulness of statistics. The starting date for the study was November 1971 with Phyllis I. Dalton (1971:1) as the director.

This evaluation of the Trail Blazer Pilot Library System by Dalton (1972: 13-14) concluded that most of the immediate objectives for the project were being achieved, with only the development of local history collections not receiving the desired support. Progress toward the long-range goals was not measured because they were too broad to allow anything beyond generalizations. The recommendation was made that long-range goals and immediate objectives be rewritten so that progress toward each would be measurable.

Another recommendation obliquely related to planning was the development of a revisable system manual drawing together all procedures and policies into one volume. This would provide for more efficient decision-making and make evaluations of policy and procedural changes easier (Dalton, 1972: 25). According to the unpublished draft of the Twenty-Fourth Report of the Louisiana State Library for 1971-1973, the library boards and police Juries of the thirteen parishes of the Trail Blazer Library System voted to continue participation in the system upon completion of the two-year pilot period in December 1971. The
participating parishes assumed approximately fifteen percent of the
system costs with the rest of the needed funds to be derived from
federal funds administered by the State Library (LSL Report, 24th:
n.p.).

In August 1971, the State Library received an application for
federal funds to establish the Southeast Louisiana Library Network
Cooperative (SEALLINC). Efforts to enlist the participation of Tulane
University, Plaquemines Parish, and Jefferson Parish failed. Delgado
College and Dillard University showed some interest and were expected to
cooperate informally during the early stages of the project's
development (Wright, Aug. 31, 1971).

The SEALLINC application for LSCA funds was rejected by the State
Library with the available grant awarded to the Northwest Pilot Library
System (Green Gold Pilot Library System) which had ninety percent of the
area population covered. With Jefferson Parish and Plaquemines Parish
not participating, the Southeast Network would have provided service to
only 66 percent of the total population of the area (Farrell, Sept. 22,
1971).

The failure of the SEALLINC application for a system grant
occurred because of what might be termed a petty reason in relation to
the scope of the total project. Jefferson Parish refused to involve
itself in the proposed system because the New Orleans Public Library
had previously refused Jefferson Parish residents access to its current
periodicals collection while Jefferson Parish had made available its
fiction collection to residents of Orleans Parish. Also, the
administrator of the library in Jefferson Parish believed that $100,000
was too high a cost for such a cooperative project and that the proposed
organizational structure was "possibly unworkable" (Walsh, Aug. 12, 1971).

1973

The format of the fiscal 1973 LSCA filed by the State Library was similar to that for the previous year. There were no deletions or additions to the projects planned for fiscal 1973.

Most of the reports for specific projects during fiscal 1973 reflected a "devastating" 33 percent cut in federal funds. Because of the reduction in federal funds, the State Library was forced to halt book purchases in November 1972 and to cancel ten percent of its periodical subscriptions. No funds were available after November for the acquisition of new and replacement films. However, the State Library continued its support of the Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor (SLICE). The one-day Governor's Conference on Libraries followed by six regional meetings was described as having been highly successful in focusing attention on the long-range library development goals of Louisiana and the financing needed to achieve these goals (Annual Report, Oct. 19, 1973: 41-42).

Grants for the two established library systems, Green Gold and Trail Blazer, were reduced by one-third and plans for evaluation by an out-of-state librarian had to be delayed. The State Library staff was reduced from eighty-five to seventy-three persons by the end of the fiscal year. The employment of two persons in the Department for the Blind and Physically Handicapped was terminated. One was the consultant in the New Orleans metropolitan area and the other was the coordinator of the volunteer tape recording program. Four other professional positions were also terminated. The pilot library project at Southeast Louisiana Hospital received fewer library materials and less equipment.
Travel funds for consultants were discontinued during the last six months of fiscal 1973 (Annual Report, Oct. 19, 1973: 43-44).

Three library construction projects were completed in fiscal 1973 but were financed from the previous fiscal year's money under LSCA Title II. These projects included buildings for the Jackson Parish Library, the Bienville Parish Library, and the Eunice Public Library (Annual Report, Oct. 19, 1973: 44).

Title III LSCA projects also felt the impact of reduced federal funds. These included The LNR: Numerical Register of Books in Louisiana Libraries which was increased by only 65,000 new acquisitions rather than the planned 500,000. Funds available did permit the continuation of compensation to Louisiana State University for its support of Louisiana's interlibrary loan network (Annual report, Oct. 19, 1973: 44).

In the general assessment of the total LSCA program for Louisiana, the fiscal 1973 report stated that many objectives for the year, such as additional consultants and continuing education activities, could not be accomplished. A planned third library system and new programs for service to the disadvantaged in rural and urban areas were not implemented. The evaluations of the pilot library systems, the pilot institutional libraries, and the development of state standards for the library systems were not done. The evaluation of the State Library book collection begun in fiscal 1971 was not completed (Annual report, Oct. 19, 1973: 46-48).

The reduction of LSCA funds by one-third was compounded by a two percent cut in state appropriations for State Library programs and services. The reduction in construction funds under LSCA Title II was

An innovative project that was considered very successful was "Jericho" in metropolitan New Orleans. A cursory evaluation of the project indicated that library services to Spanish speaking peoples were successful, services to the black community only moderately successful, and services to the aged successful in some cases. Because of the project's strengths, the New Orleans Public Library agreed to continue the programs and services at a reduced level with local funds (LSL Report, 24th: n.p.).

Because of the budget crunch of the State Library in fiscal 1973, the Wide Area Telephone Service (WATS) initiated in October 1969 had to be terminated in April 1973. This telephone service provided immediate toll-free access to the State Library's reference desk for every public, academic and state institutional library in Louisiana (LSL report, 24th: n.p.).

On February 9, 1973, the first Louisiana Governor's Conference on Libraries convened in Baton Rouge. Conference participants included representatives from state-wide organizations as well as leaders in the fields of education, government, business, labor, industry, agriculture, the "professions", and student leaders from Louisiana colleges and universities. The program was designed to convince citizens and public officials that libraries were a very important factor in the development of an informed society and to seek the support of participants for the continuation of existing programs and their assistance in the identification and implementation of new ones (Library Excellence,
1973: l). The state conference was followed by six regional meetings. The annual LSCA report for fiscal 1973 described the state conference and subsequent regional activities as "highly successful [in] focusing attention on goals and on funds needed to achieve these goals." Persons identified as "seasoned and astute observers" felt this cooperative effort between the State Library and the Louisiana Library Association resulted in "...a keener awareness than ever before of the needs of libraries and, particularly, the fiscal plight of the State Library" (Annual Report, Oct. 19, 1973: 42).

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter was to present material on the planned uses and actual applications in Louisiana of federal funds from the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), 1965-1973. The information provided was obtained from examination of LSCA program plans, annual LSCA reports, State Library reports, memoranda, various committee and survey reports, and correspondence.

After the completion of the last parish library demonstration in fiscal 1970, the Louisiana State Library turned its attention to the improvement of established libraries through such LSCA funded projects as a centralized processing center at the State Library and the development of regional library systems. Emphasis was also placed on improving services to the physically handicapped and those persons in the state health, custodial, and penal institutions. Money from the LSCA permitted the State Library to initiate long-range planning and the evaluation of federally funded programs and services by out of state consultants.
Chapter 5 will provide information on some general developments in the fiscal policies of Louisiana public libraries, particularly the State Library, during the period 1956-1973. Also, Chapter 5 will include material on variations in the degree of the local public library funding efforts of all of the parishes for eleven selected years and the effect of monetary inflation upon the funding of Louisiana public libraries for each year of the period 1956-1973.
Chapter 5

DEVELOPMENTS IN BUDGETING, FUNDING EFFORT, AND ECONOMIC INFLATION OF LOUISIANA PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The federal interference and complicated guidelines usually associated with federal funding programs were not evident under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). In fact, the Louisiana State Library had considerable leeway in identifying needs and establishing programs to meet those needs.

BUDGETING IN LOUISIANA PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Both the LSA and LSCA emphasized the discretion of the state public library agencies in program development and the application of federal funds. Thus, state level public library budget formats and planning considerations may have been more immediately affected by the federal funds than local public library programs and services.

Budget Procedures

The Louisiana State Library employed a budget format that was standardized for all state agencies. This budget format was a program budget detailing the objectives of each State Library activity with supporting evidence of the value of the program or service. The budgets for specific programs and services were prepared in line-item format and were then combined into the general budget which had a program format. Attached to the general budget was a simple line-item budget summary with a narrative summation for lay members of the Budget Committee of the State Legislature (Stringfield, Nov. 21, 1974).
For most State Library programs and services, the federal and state money was combined. No attempt was made to separate the funds by source by supporting some activities with only federal funds and others with only state monies. Because of the need to provide separate accounting of federal funds, a separate reporting of federal funds for each individual service and program receiving federal funds was maintained. In the main budget of the State Library, the state and federal funds were "lumped" together with the percentage of federal funds identified on a pro-rated basis (Stringfield, Nov. 21, 1974).

At the beginning of a fiscal year, the State Library had to operate blindly in formulating budgets for LSA and LSCA projects because of Congressional continuing resolutions. Until fiscal 1973, the State Library assumed that the final approved allotment under the LSA or the LSCA would not be less than that for the previous year. When notification was made of the actual amount of federal funds available for public libraries, which was often late in the fiscal year, a request for change in allotment was filed with the Division of Administration of the State of Louisiana and an amended annual program plan forwarded to the United States Office of Education. While knowledge of the amount of federal money was often tardy, the federal funds had to be encumbered in the same fiscal year of the appropriation (Stringfield, Nov. 21, 1974).

Local libraries employed the traditional line-item budget. In formulating proposals for the use of federal funds, as in the development of a regional library system or other cooperative enterprise, local libraries had to deal in terms of program planning budgeting systems (Cazayoux, Dec. 27, 1974).

Since the budget format employed by the Louisiana State Library
was a standardized form, one cannot suggest that the federal Library Services Act (LSA) or the Library Services and Construction Act (ISCA) had a direct influence on the State Library's procedures. Control over the budgets of Louisiana state agencies gradually tightened over the course of several years, although this control possibly became more accelerated in recent years. There was a possibility that federal funding programs in general, not any particular one, had an impact on the budget procedures employed by the State of Louisiana. Then again, budget guidelines on both the federal and state levels may have progressed in the same directions and merged in compatibility without the "influence of one being dominant over the other" (Stringfield, Nov. 21, 1974).

A positive factor of the LSA and the ISCA was the relatively simple, brief format employed in the required budget forms for proposing projects and reporting actual expenditures. There was little federal interference as to the uses of the federal money, while the federal representatives willingly provided much assistance when requested in the completion of the required numerical and narrative forms (Stringfield, Nov. 21, 1974).

The major weakness of the LSA and ISCA programs was the delay in the appropriation of funds, often until the last half of a fiscal year. The State Library had to operate in the dark until official notification of the actual funds available and then hurriedly re-budget programs and file amendments to the original annual program plans (Stringfield, Nov. 21, 1974).

Fiscal Planning

According to the State Librarian, Sallie Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974),
the Louisiana State Library had always received the highest praise from members of the State Legislature and the Governor about its services and programs. While the State Library received much moral support, the State Legislature provided little financial support. This situation was probably due to the comparatively large amounts of federal funds, especially under the ISCA.

The State Library generally avoided the use of small grants to locally established libraries over the years. An exception was the money provided to the New Orleans Public Library for the enrichment of its collection. Other grants provided were for the development of cooperative library systems or for other regional cooperative activities, such as public relations or in-service training (Farrell, Nov. 22, 1974).

During the LSA period and the early part of the ISCA years, planning and developing decisions for federally funded programs and services were done strictly at the State Library. This was necessitated by the limitations on the uses of LSA monies and the State Library's long-term plan for establishing libraries in every parish of the state, which was not accomplished until 1969. Under the ISCA, advisory committees were required to broaden the State Library's information base for formulating priorities and directions in program and service development. More people outside of the State Library were involved than before (Cazayoux, Dec. 27, 1974). The development of systems under the ISCA required the involvement of local libraries in planning, since their participation in the systems was to be voluntary (Farrell, Nov. 22, 1974).

At the State Library, decision-making which affected the planning of programs and services was hierarchical. Department heads received
information from professional staff about service and program strengths based upon demand and the opportunity to develop new areas of demand. Department heads then forwarded their information to the Associate State Librarians who along with the State Librarian made the necessary decisions. The ultimate authority and responsibility for decisions rested with the State Librarian, although such was not done without the support of the lower echelon administrators (Wellman, Nov. 20, 1974).

According to the Associate State Librarian for Library Development, Vivian Cazayoux (Dec. 27, 1974), the prime objective of the Louisiana State Library was to have parish-wide public library services established in every parish of the State. When this was accomplished in 1969, the top priority of the State Library became the improvement of the public library services available. The advent of federal funding under the LSA and the LSCA made it possible for the State Library to accelerate its library demonstration program and to establish more adequate libraries than previously possible with only state funds.

At the conclusion of the demonstration period in 1969, the State Library, in following the recommendations of the 1968 Humphry study of libraries in Louisiana, chose the development of cooperative systems in seven regions of the state as the best means of improving services (Cazayoux, Dec. 27, 1974). Systems, according to the Associate State Librarian for Readers and Technical Services, Murrell C. Wellman (Nov. 20, 1974), offered the most economical and direct means for providing improved services to the largest number of people while compensating for less adequate service to the poorer parishes.

Sallie Farrell, Louisiana State Librarian (Nov. 22, 1974), stated that the number one goal of the State Library was the improvement of
service to Louisiana citizens. She emphasized that the top priority in improving service was people, trained professionals. No matter how many books or pieces of equipment that a library has, trained and competent staff are needed. Therefore, a basic objective of the State Library under the LSCA after 1969 was the development and establishment of in-service training programs for both professional and non-professional staff members in local public libraries.

Under the LSCA, an elementary evaluation of projects was required (Wellman, Nov. 20, 1974). Self-evaluation by participants in federally funded public library projects in Louisiana proved to be ineffective. Therefore, the State Library emphasized evaluation by public library authorities outside of the state. This was especially true in the review of the library systems. No definitive criteria were established for determining the worth of various projects. Generally, evaluation was subjective and employed the usual library statistics of circulation, reference requests, interlibrary loan requests, requests filled, and others (Cazayoux, Dec. 27, 1974).

According to Wellman (Nov. 20, 1974), not until 1965 was there emphasis on the use of federal funds to strengthen the supportive services of the State Library. These services included the establishment of the processing center, additions to the films and recordings collection, services to the blind and physically handicapped, and reference and interlibrary loan. State Library book purchases in 1965 were up fifty percent from that of 1964.

Wellman (Nov. 20, 1974) stated that the additional federal money, especially under the LSCA, used for adding staff and increasing the collections of the Louisiana State Library, resulted in comparable
increases in services provided and demanded. Prior to 1965, special requests forwarded to the State Library for reference assistance and interlibrary loan were filled at a modest rate of fifty percent. With increased emphasis on trained staff and enrichment of the collection, the rate of requests filled was above eighty percent.

After the establishment of the Trail Blazer Library System in northeast Louisiana and the Green Gold Library System in northwest Louisiana, the number of interlibrary loan and reference requests from these areas to the State Library stabilized. Requests forwarded to the State Library from the system centers were those which could not be filled within the system. Overall demand for library service increased with the establishment of systems, while not reducing the need for the reference and interlibrary support of the State Library. The State Library was called upon to purchase more expensive technical materials to satisfy the increased sophistication of the requests it handled (Wellman, Nov. 20, 1974).

According to Farrell (Nov. 20, 1974), the identification of the most successful and least successful projects under the LSA and LSCA was too difficult. She stressed the point that all projects proved valuable and to differentiate between their value was impossible because of the divergent characteristics of the projects and the impact of local political situations. If there were weaknesses, they were the failure to provide sufficient follow-up.

Cazayoux (Dec. 27, 1974), stated that the most successful program under the LSA and the LSCA was that of the local public library demonstrations. St. Landry Parish involved the only incidence of a parish failing to continue a public library established by the State
Library. This situation was not a complete disaster because city libraries in Eunice and Opelousas were established with free service to all parish residents.

Cazayoux (Dec. 27, 1974) suggested that the least effective projects under the LSA and the LSCA were the cooperative public relations programs in the northeast, northwest, and southwest regions of the state. One project was continued at a reduced level on a regional basis with another being continued on a parish basis. The publicity generated by the hiring of professional public relations individuals was generally considered poor.

Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974) stated that the strength of the LSA and LSCA funding during the period 1957-1973 was the permitted flexibility in use. State agencies could decide how to use the funds with little interference and very little "red tape." Farrell indicated that she could not criticize the administration of either the Library Services Act (LSA) or the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), but she felt that such legislation needed definite strengthening. One point was that the maintenance of effort under these acts required that the state maintain its financial support at the level of the second preceding fiscal year. To have encouraged added state support, the LSA and LSCA should have required state funding increments from one year to the next.

Cazayoux (Dec. 27, 1974) agreed with Farrell's assessment of the strengths of the LSA and LSCA but added that this legislation drew the attention of State Library as well as local librarians to the need for systematic planning. A major development was the formulation of a five-year plan (Louisiana Advisory Council, 1972) for library development under the LSCA guidelines in 1972.
Wellman (Nov. 25, 1974) added that the federal funds provided a more substantial local library service base upon which to build quality library services in the future than would otherwise have been possible. The funds under the LSCA provided for improved reference and interlibrary loan services that resulted in increased demand.

Cazayoux, Farrell, and Wellman all agreed that the major and most glaring weakness of the LSA and LSCA during the period 1957-1973 was the uncertainty of the total funds to be allocated until late into a fiscal year. Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974) suggested the procedure of advance funding employed by Congress for educational programs would result in better planning by reducing the possibility of "crash" planning that was often the case from 1957 through fiscal 1973.

According to Cazayoux (Dec. 27, 1974), local libraries in Louisiana were not dependent upon federal funds and their budget processes were little affected. Continuation of the library systems, Trail Blazer and Green Gold, was totally dependent upon LSCA funding or state assistance which was not likely to develop. Many economically poor parishes were approaching the five mill tax limit for public library support and were not able to provide much beyond basic services and certainly could not contribute substantially to a regional library system.

Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974) indicated that the Louisiana Legislature would probably have more adequately supported the State Library if there were no federal funds available. This support would probably have been only for in-house operations and basic consultative services and not for operating grants for continuing regional library systems. Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974) stated that "An embarrassing amount of federal dollars have gone for routine expenditures."
Cazayoux (Dec. 27, 1974) reported that there was no formal contingency plan for systematically reducing the operations of the State Library in case of a drastic or total reduction in federal funding. Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974) indicated that the State Library would first drop financial support to the library systems and then reduce the materials acquisition budget of the State Library. The termination of staff would be the last action taken if federal funds were cut sharply as in fiscal 1973.

In summarizing the impact of federal funds under the LSA and the LSCA during 1957-1973, Cazayoux (Dec. 7, 1974) believed that the federal money had little effect upon local library budgeting procedures or on State Library budget procedures. Federal funds did have a direct effect on public library planning on the state level in Louisiana and an indirect effect on the local library level.

Farrell (Nov. 22, 1974) stated that she hoped the LSCA would not be renewed in its present form after its scheduled termination in 1976. The future role of the federal government would then involve the provision of support for those necessary public library activities which state governments are unable to support, such as interstate cooperation and multi-state public library systems.

**FUNDING EFFORT FOR LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN LOUISIANA**

Table 1 indicates the general effort index scores of Louisiana parishes for eleven years between 1956 and 1973. The total personal income data for each of the parishes was available only for the eleven years represented (Coleman, 1974).
The effort index score was computed by dividing the annual operating budget of a public library for a parish, county, city, or multi-jurisdiction region by that area's total annual personal income. The resulting figure indicated the financial effort that an area was exerting in the provision of public library services. These effort index scores were used for comparisons and for determining funding trends because they were more indicative of the support provided than a simple reporting of total library budgets or per capita expenditures (Mersel, 1969).

Effort index scores were not computed for all parishes because total personal income information was not available for each separate one. The parishes surrounding the major metropolitan centers of the state were combined into Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) for determining total personal income (Coleman, 1974). As Table 2 shows, the SMSA was employed for determining the combined effort index score for those Louisiana parishes so affected.

Inspection of Table 1 suggests that in twenty-two parishes there was a downward trend in the effort being exerted to provide public library services during the period. Only in one parish, St. Mary, was there an indication of an upward trend beginning in 1968, which was the end of a declining trend from 1959.

According to Table 1, the highest effort index score was 37 for Caldwell Parish in 1964. By 1972, though, Caldwell Parish's score had steadily declined to 15. Vernon Parish generally had the lowest effort index scores due to the presence of a large military installation, Fort Polk. Vernon Parish's score dropped twenty-two points from 27 in 1959 to 5 in 1962.
Table 1 indicated that the greatest increase and decline among years was between 1964 and 1967 in Iberia Parish. This fluctuation was due to the inclusion of construction funds with operating funds and was not a clear measure of the effort expended by the parish for public library services.

According to Table 1, the effort index scores of the large metropolitan areas (SMSA's) of Louisiana were generally lower than that for the rural areas. Also, these SMSA scores tended to be more stabilized over the years than the effort index scores for the other parishes. Of the SMSA districts, Monroe, which included the parishes of Ouachita and Webster, had the highest scores. The lowest SMSA scores were those for Lafayette. The most stabilized scores were for New Orleans.

Inspection of Table 1 indicates that most effort index scores peaked by the year 1967 or earlier. This was then followed by a downward trend. Eleven areas registered increases in public library financing in 1972 as compared with 1971. The only SMSA that increased its effort in 1972 as compared with 1971 was Lake Charles.

Table 1 shows that the highest years of individual effort exhibited by local areas in financially supporting public libraries generally were the earlier ones. There appeared to be a declining trend in the mid-sixties with a few increases by 1972. A number of parishes displayed irregular patterns of effort over the years with increases and decreases from one year to the next.
### Table 1

**Effort Index Scores of SMSA and Non-SMSA Parishes**

*For 1959 - 1972*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia Parish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Parish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption Parish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoyelles Parish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauregard Parish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienville Parish</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell Parish</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Parish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catahoula Parish</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne Parish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Parish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Soto Parish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carroll Parish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangeline Parish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Parish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia Parish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia Parish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Davis Parish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche Parish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salle Parish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Parish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Parish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse Parish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natchitoches Parish</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natchitoches Parish</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita Parish</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita Parish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine Parish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles Parish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Parish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist Parish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Landry Parish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin Parish</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Parish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrebonne Parish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Parish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermilion Parish</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Parish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Parish</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Carroll Parish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winn Parish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

\( a \) Effort Index Score computed by dividing total personal income of an area into the total operating funds for public libraries in an area (Mersel, 110).

\( b \) SMSA - Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area


Sources of total personal income data from SMSA and Non-SMSA parishes:

\( d \) Scott, 107-163.

\( e \) Bobo, 1971: 150-152.

\( f \) Bobo, 1967: 11-83.

\( g \) Bobo, 1974: 168-170.

\( h \) U.S. Department of Commerce

SMSA Parishes:

\( i \) East Feliciana Parish, West Feliciana Parish, St. Helena Parish

\( j \) Rapides Parish, Grant Parish

\( k \) Ascension Parish, East Baton Rouge Parish, West Baton Rouge Parish, Livingston Parish

\( l \) Lafayette - City, Lafayette - Parish

\( m \) Lake Charles - City, Calcasieu Parish

\( n \) Ouachita Parish, Webster Parish

\( o \) Jefferson Parish, Orleans Parish, St. Bernard Parish, St. Tammany Parish

\( p \) Bossier Parish, Caddo Parish
EFFECTS OF ECONOMIC INFLATION
UPON PUBLIC LIBRARY FINANCING
IN LOUISIANA

According to Table 2, the total state funding for public libraries in Louisiana during the period 1956-1973 increased at a rate much slower than that of local funding. Even taking into account the establishment of public libraries in parishes previously without any, the growth in local support was substantially faster. Between 1956 and 1973 when local funds more than quadrupled, state public library support increased by only 17 percent. During the period 1956-1973 state funding reached its highest level in 1972 which was a 20 percent increase over the $267,267 allocated in 1956. While total state funding declined in six years, total local funding declined in only one year. Total federal funds under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) showed slight declines in five different years and a drastic decline between the 1972 and the 1973 funding levels.

Table 2 indicates that while federal support for public libraries in Louisiana increased steadily with reductions in some years being offset by increases, except for 1973, state support for public libraries increased at a much slower rate. The greatest increase in federal support occurred in 1965, the initial year of LSCA funding, with $485,541 as opposed to the $157,138 allocated in 1964 for a percentage increase of 65.7. The greatest decline in federal funds was a 49 percent drop in 1973 with $594,288 from the previous year's $885,475. The largest increase in state funding was 12.2 percent between 1968 and 1969 when state support rose from $270,532 to $319,048.

The deflated or adjusted columns in Table 2 offer a more realistic picture of public library financing during the period 1956-
1973. Adjustment of the total amounts by source was done by utilizing the Consumer Price Index (see Appendix F) with 1967 as the base year. Thus, a dollar prior to 1967 was worth more and a dollar later than 1967 was worth less than the 1967 value. This accounts for the adjusted or deflated sums being greater than the appropriated amounts of local, state, and federal funds prior to 1967 (Willis, Nov. 7, 1974).

Table 2 shows that increases in deflated dollars was at a much slower rate than non-deflated amounts. Declines in deflated amounts were greater than decreases in the corresponding non-deflated totals. Increases in adjusted totals for local and federal funding occurred at higher rates that that for state funding. Also, decreases in adjusted local and federal funds were less than the decreases that occurred in state public library support.

According to Table 2, while state funding for public library services in Louisiana registered an increase in adjusted or non-deflated amounts between 1956 and 1973, there was a significant decline in the deflated totals. In 1956 the purchasing power of the state allotment of $267,267 was equivalent to $328,338 when adjusted, while the 1973 purchasing potential of the $313,731 state total was equivalent to only $235,711 in adjusted value. The adjusted purchasing power of the state appropriation for 1973 was 25 percent less than the adjusted state allotment in 1956. The adjusted purchasing power of the state allotment for public libraries in 1973 was approximately 12 percent less than the total non-adjusted 1956 appropriation.
Table 2

Local, State, and Federal Funding of Louisiana Public Library Services, 1957-1973, Adjusted by 1967 Dollar Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCAL FUNDS ( \text{TOTAL} )</th>
<th>LOCAL FUNDS ( \text{DEFLATED} )</th>
<th>STATE FUNDS ( \text{TOTAL} )</th>
<th>STATE FUNDS ( \text{DEFLATED} )</th>
<th>FEDERAL FUNDS ( \text{TOTAL} )</th>
<th>FEDERAL FUNDS ( \text{DEFLATED} )</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDS ( \text{TOTAL} )</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDS ( \text{DEFLATED} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>$2,445,405</td>
<td>$3,004,183</td>
<td>$267,267</td>
<td>$328,338</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$47,450</td>
<td>$3,000,428</td>
<td>$3,559,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957d</td>
<td>2,664,561</td>
<td>3,160,808</td>
<td>295,867</td>
<td>350,969</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,000,428</td>
<td>3,559,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,254,743</td>
<td>3,728,334</td>
<td>272,611</td>
<td>312,269</td>
<td>125,470</td>
<td>143,723</td>
<td>3,559,227</td>
<td>4,184,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,655,980</td>
<td>4,121,736</td>
<td>284,894</td>
<td>321,188</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>4,098,884</td>
<td>4,621,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4,047,040</td>
<td>4,516,786</td>
<td>286,900</td>
<td>320,201</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>4,491,950</td>
<td>5,013,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>4,561,771</td>
<td>5,035,067</td>
<td>297,226</td>
<td>321,188</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>4,957,948</td>
<td>5,406,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>5,053,503</td>
<td>5,537,940</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td>304,495</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>4,957,948</td>
<td>5,406,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5,543,038</td>
<td>6,035,067</td>
<td>287,748</td>
<td>309,737</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>5,889,632</td>
<td>6,016,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5,957,031</td>
<td>6,466,357</td>
<td>270,532</td>
<td>290,035</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6,466,357</td>
<td>6,976,884</td>
<td>287,748</td>
<td>304,495</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>6,976,884</td>
<td>7,458,815</td>
<td>287,748</td>
<td>304,495</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7,458,815</td>
<td>7,976,884</td>
<td>270,532</td>
<td>290,035</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7,976,884</td>
<td>8,466,357</td>
<td>270,532</td>
<td>290,035</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,466,357</td>
<td>8,976,884</td>
<td>270,532</td>
<td>290,035</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8,976,884</td>
<td>9,466,357</td>
<td>270,532</td>
<td>290,035</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>9,466,357</td>
<td>9,976,884</td>
<td>270,532</td>
<td>290,035</td>
<td>158,010</td>
<td>176,140</td>
<td>6,289,632</td>
<td>6,655,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>10,688,856</td>
<td>8,030,696</td>
<td>304,048</td>
<td>280,554</td>
<td>729,787</td>
<td>644,651</td>
<td>8,880,371</td>
<td>8,087,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Deflated by Consumer Price Index, base year 1967.


d Percentage variation from previous year.

e Data missing for Jefferson Parish, so estimated at 340,500 dollars.
SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The purpose of this chapter was to present information on the budget procedures and planning considerations of local public libraries and the Louisiana State Library and possible changes resulting from the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) during the period 1957-1973. Also, information was presented on the effect of economic inflation upon the local, state, and federal funding of Louisiana public libraries. Effort index scores were computed for all of the parishes for eleven selected years of the period 1956-1973.

Chapter 6 concludes the study and will provide the inferences developed from the research, the summary of the study, and recommendations based upon the research.
Chapter 6

INFERENCES, SUMMARY, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Inferences in this chapter are based upon the researcher's interpretations of the Louisiana State Library's records of federal funds provided under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (ISCA). These records of the State Library were reviewed in relation to the reported background material related to public library law, financing, administration, organization and function of state libraries, library systems, planning, general budget procedures, and related studies. The recommendations made are based on the inferences and include suggestions concerning planning considerations of the Louisiana State Library and future public library legislation of the federal government.

INFERENCES

1. Based upon the material reviewed and critiqued by this study, the effect that federal funding under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (ISCA) had upon local library budgeting in Louisiana was negligible. Local public libraries continued to employ the traditional line-item (function-object) budget format.

2. Federal funding under the LSA and LSCA had little, if any, effect upon the funding of parish public libraries established by local governments prior to 1956. Total local public library support in Louisiana increased substantially during the period because of those newly established public libraries which had their start as federally funded demonstration projects.
3. Funds provided under the LSA and the LSCA had a negligible impact upon local public library planning. The exceptions were those parishes libraries involved in the establishment of library systems and other cooperative projects, such as the regional public relations programs.

4. The LSA and LSCA promoted the establishment of public libraries through demonstrations in parishes previously without any. The demonstration program that had been under way in Louisiana for many years was accelerated under the LSA and the LSCA, and the libraries established were probably of better quality than would have been possible with only available state funds.

5. Federal funding in the period 1957-1973 under the LSA and LSCA had no direct effect upon the Louisiana State Library's budget procedures. The State Library was required to use a budget format which was standardized for all state agencies. Though the budget format employed was a program type, it probably evolved over the years somewhat independently of federal guidelines but to some extent under their influence.

6. Federal money under the LSA and LSCA provided the impetus for more substantive planning by the Louisiana State Library. A requirement of the attendant guidelines under the LSA and LSCA was program planning. The LSCA stressed long-range planning based upon evaluation which resulted in the Humphry (1969) study and the five-year plan of the Louisiana Advisory Council on Libraries (1972). Another important effect was the evaluative review of the services and procedures of the Trail Blazer Library System (Dalton, 1972) by an out of state authority in library systems management.
7. The planning and establishment of federally funded projects appeared to be highly centralized in the Louisiana State Library. Although advisory bodies were created for planning purposes, these were open to substantial influence by the State Library because of the participation of its staff members and its leadership role in public library development in the state.

8. The Louisiana State Library employed federal funds under the LSA and LSCA on a long-term availability basis, although the legislation was terminal. Federal money was employed for the operation of all phases of the in-house operations of the State Library as well as for its library development activities. Federal money was used to keep the Trail Blazer Library System operating after the termination of its pilot period.

9. The review of the annual program plans, reports, and related materials of the Louisiana State Library since fiscal 1957 indicated that, while the general goal of providing quality public library services to all residents of Louisiana remained constant, the procedures for achieving this goal changed. Until 1969, the major emphasis under the LSA and the early LSCA was the establishment of public libraries through the use of demonstrations in parishes previously without such. In 1969, after the establishment objective was achieved and due to changes in the LSCA and its guidelines, emphasis was placed upon improving the quality of established programs and services through a centralized processing center at the State Library for local libraries and the development of cooperative regional library systems involving all types of libraries. Also, attention was turned to services for special groups of patrons such as the physically handicapped, the aged,
the economically deprived, and the institutionalized in state hospitals and penal institutions.

10. There was no apparent variation between the preliminary objectives and the functional objectives of the federally funded projects of the Louisiana State Library under the LSA and LSCA during the years 1957-1973. Complete documentation was not available in the State Library records that identified established projects as unnecessary or not measuring up to the stated purposes.

11. Federal funds under the LSA and the subsequent LSCA had a slight impact upon Louisiana state funding for public library programs and services. The state stabilized its support between 1956 and 1973 due to the availability of the additional federal funds. There was little possibility that the Louisiana legislature would totally replace the loss of federal funds by the State Library, although the purchasing power of the 1973 state appropriation was less than the appropriated amount in 1956.

12. The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) did generate additional state financial support for libraries in Louisiana's health, custodial, and penal institutions. Nothing significant in the way of institutional libraries in Louisiana had been done previously, until the use of certain federal funds was designated for institutional libraries under the LSCA.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to identify some selected effects of federal funds from the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library
Services and Construction Act (LSCA) upon state and local public libraries in Louisiana from 1956 through 1973. Specific considerations were the identification of those public library programs on the state and local levels receiving federal aid, identification of the planning procedures employed in determining the applications of LSA and LSCA money, identification of the budget concepts and techniques employed in disseminating LSA and LSCA funds, identification of short and long-range concerns affecting the uses of LSA and LSCA money, identification of the rationale for developing specific public library programs, and determination of whether differences existed between the initial and operational objectives of LSA and LSCA programs.

The importance of the study included the fact that public library services were a vital segment of the educational process in America. The public library and the formal educational programs complemented one another in their educational work with the virtue of each being that it was not the other (Lee, 1966: 122).

An Overview of the Library Services and Construction Act—Title I by Jules Mersel (1969: 3) was intended as a comprehensive analysis of the effects of federal funds under the LSA and LSCA on public library services in eleven states. Because of the superficiality of the study and the diversity of programs from state to state, the Mersel noted that the project clearly demonstrated the necessity for a broader and more systematic analysis of the overall impact of federal funds upon state and local expenditures. Specifically, the suggestion was made that future research consider corresponding decreases or increases in state or local support related to the LSA and LSCA, the impact of federal funds upon planning, and the effect of federal funds upon budget
procedures of public libraries.

The research process for this study was a combination of history and documentary analysis. The annual program plans and annual reports filed by the Louisiana State Library under the LSA and the LSCA were reviewed and reported in summary fashion chronologically and topically. Related correspondence and memoranda were also examined. Also, interviews were conducted with those State Library staff members responsible for the planning and development of federally funded public library projects.

In support of the historical and documentary narrative, a table provided a comparison between the allotted funds by local, state, and federal sources and the adjusted values of these funds to determine the effect of economic inflation. The Consumer Price Index with the base year 1967 was employed as the adjustment factor for deflating the annual allotments by source and was done for each year from 1956 through 1973.

Another table indicated the effort index scores for all the parishes over a period of eleven years. The effort index score is a numerical score computed by dividing the total personal income of a parish or group of parishes into the total operating budget for a public library or several public libraries in an area. The purpose of the effort index score was to provide a numerical measure of the fiscal effort that was being exerted in the provision of public programs and services.

Several inferences were drawn from the materials examined for this study. The Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) had no direct effect upon local Louisiana public library budget procedures which continued to be the traditional line-item format, and there was no identifiable effect upon local support for
public library services. There was no discernible evidence related to possible effects of federal funds upon local public library planning in Louisiana. The Louisiana State Library emphasized the employment of public library demonstration projects under the LSA between fiscal 1957 and 1969 as the best means for establishing public libraries in parishes previously without them. The funds available under the LSA allowed the State Library to accelerate its long-term demonstration plan begun several years before. Federal money under the LSA and LSCA allowed the State Library to conduct surveys and program evaluations for use in future planning. The LSCA especially stressed long-range planning and evaluation of federally funded projects. Two major developments were the Humphry (1969) study, which made recommendations for systems development and the five-year plan for library improvement and development of the Louisiana Advisory Council on Libraries (1972). Another significant activity during the period of this study attributable to federal money was the evaluation of the Trail Blazer Library System by Dalton (1972).

After the last demonstration project, the Louisiana State Library turned its attention to the improvement of established public library services through a centralized processing center at the State Library and placed emphasis on improving services to the blind and physically handicapped and services to those persons in state health, custodial, and penal institutions. LSA and LSCA funds had no effect upon the budget procedures of the Louisiana State Library since its budget procedures were prescribed by state regulations and were uniform for all state agencies, and there was no apparent variation between the preliminary objectives and functional objectives of the federally funded projects reviewed in the study. All projects were considered by the
Louisiana State Library as being valuable. The availability of federal money under the LSA and LSCA had a negative impact upon legislative support of the Louisiana State Library, because of the stabilization of state support while dollar values declined.

There were several recommendations based upon the material examined. The Louisiana State Library should review its procedures for maintaining records of its federal projects and should formulate a contingency plan in case of future fiscal crises. The State Library should begin weaning the cooperative library systems of their total dependence upon federal money, and should allow and encourage critical participation of outside professional and lay persons in planning its future developmental activities. Future federal legislation for public libraries should include incremental matching requirements in the guidelines for maintenance of fiscal effort and include advanced funding for the federal appropriations. Additional research should be conducted to determine the fiscal effects of the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) upon public libraries in Louisiana and other states. Research should also be done to determine the perceptions that local public librarians have toward the Louisiana State Library's role in supervising federally funded projects relevant to public library services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Louisiana State Library should review its procedures for maintaining records of its federal projects so that the material can be made available as resource material.
2. A definitive contingency plan should be developed by the Louisiana State Library in the event of sudden major and drastic reductions in federal money available for state and local public library services. Adjustments should be well planned and done systematically and those personnel involved made aware of the security of their positions in possible fiscal crises on the federal or state levels.

3. For evaluating the services of the regional cooperative systems in Louisiana, research should be done to determine how the unit costs of specified system services compare with that for similar services in the participating libraries. This would suggest the relative efficiency of the systems and possibly provide a public relations vehicle for eliciting increased support for the systems from local and state sources.

4. The Louisiana State Library should provide for positive as well as critical participation in the future identification of needs and planning of programs and services affecting the general public and special groups of library patrons. Involved in this would be a critical self-analysis of the Louisiana State Library's strong influence over local public libraries in the state and the great respect it enjoys in light of the development of local library programs and the growing expertise of the local library administrators.

5. The Louisiana State Library should review its objectives in terms of reducing its dependence upon the decreasing availability of federal funds and begin moving towards more local supported cooperative library systems. Consideration should be given to the use of federal public library money for non-recurring expenses and the establishment of services with the operational funds
coming mainly from state and local sources.

6. Future federal legislation for public libraries ought to include an incremental matching requirement in the guidelines for maintenance of fiscal effort. This might discourage state legislatures, as was the case in Louisiana, from using the federal funds as a replacement for state and local money. Also, advance funding of the required appropriations could be considered for reducing the uncertainty of the actual amounts that would be available.

7. Further research into the fiscal effects of federal funding under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) should be continued in Louisiana and other states. Coverage of a shorter span of time, three to five years, would provide the opportunity for more detailed and indepth analysis than possible with a sixteen-year period, as was the case with this study.

8. Research should be conducted to ascertain the perceptions that local administrative librarians have toward the Louisiana State Library's role in supervising federally funded projects and its leadership responsibilities for public library development.
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Appendix A

Legislative Chronology of the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), 1956-1970*


P.L. 84-896. Organic Act, added Guam to the list of Territories.


P.L. 87-688. Added American Samoa.


July 19, 1966 P.L. 89-511. Extended LSCA five years. Added Title III, Interlibrary Cooperation; Title IV-A, Institutions; and IV-B, Physically Handicapped. Added the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.


December 30, 1970 P.L. 91-600. Library Services and Construction Act extended for five years. Consolidated Titles I, IV-A and IV-B. Emphasized services to low-income families, provided for strengthening state library administrative agencies and metropolitan libraries which served as national or regional resource centers, removed matching requirements for interlibrary cooperation under Title III, and streamlined state plan procedures.

* Source: Kee, 1974: Appendix B.
Appendix B

Abstract of the Library Services Act, 1956*

An Act

To promote the further development of public library service in rural areas. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That This Act May Be Cited as the "Library Services Act."

Declaration of Policy

Sec. 2. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to promote the further extension by the several States of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services. (b) The provisions of this Act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this Act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this Act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the $7,500,000 which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner of Education State plans for the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services, or with inadequate services.

Allotments to States

Sec. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 to the Virgin Islands and $40,000 to each of the other states, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the rural population of the United States, according to the most recent decennial census. (b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year remaining unpaid to such State at the end of such fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State under section 5 until the end of the succeeding fiscal year.

State Plans

Sec. 5. (a) To be approved under this section, a State plan

for the further extension of public library services to rural area must——

(1) provide for the administration, or supervision of the administration of the plan by the State library administrative agency, and provide that such agency will have adequate authority under State law to administer the plan in accordance with its provisions and the provisions of this Act;

(2) provide for the receipt by the State treasurer (or, if there be no State treasurer, the officer exercising similar functions for the State) of all funds paid to the State pursuant to this Act and for the proper officer, provide that such funds shall be expended solely for the purposes for which paid, and provide for the repayment by the State to the United States of any such funds lost or diverted from the purposes for which paid;

(3) provide policies and methods of administration to be followed in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State plan, which policies and methods the State library administrative agency certifies will in its judgment assure use of such funds to maximum advantage in the further extension of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services;

(4) provide that the State library administrative agency will make such reports as to categories of expenditures made under this Act, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require; and

(5) provide that any library services furnished under the plan shall be made available free of charge under regulations prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The determination of whether library services are inadequate in any area within any State shall be made by the State library administrative agency of such State.

Payments to States

Sec. 6. (a) From the allotments available therefor under section 4, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under Section 5 an amount computed as provided in sub-section (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions under such plan during the period for which such payment was made, 1956.

(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time, but not less often than semi-annually, and prior to the period for which a payment
is to be made, estimate the amount, within the balance of the allotments for each State, which may be necessary to pay the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out the approved State plan for such period.

(c) For the purposes of this Section the "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such state bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum or less than 33 per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Hawaii shall be 50 per centum and for Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum.

(d) The "Federal Share" for each State shall be promulgated by the Commissioner between July 1 and August 31 of each even numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(e) No portion of any money paid to a State under this Act shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or for the purchase of any land.

(f) No portion of any money paid to a State under this Act shall be used, directly or indirectly, to provide or improve library services in any area other than a rural area; except that nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit the utilization of such money by public libraries in nonrural areas for the exclusive purpose of extending public library services to rural areas, if such utilization has been provided for in an approved State plan covering the areas affected.

Withholding

Sec. 7. If the Commissioner finds after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this Act, that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of this Act or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with the provisions required to be included in the plan, he shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, he shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State: Provided, That any State or State agency is entitled to judicial review in the United States District Court wherein the United States District Court wherein the State or State agency is located of any such withholding determination in accordance with applicable provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.
Administration

Sec. 8. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and shall, with the approval of the Secretary, prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make such studies, investigations, and reports as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, including periodic reports for public distribution as to the values, methods, and results of various State demonstrations of public library services in rural areas undertaken under this Act.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenses of administration such sums as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary and the Commissioner under this Act.

Definitions

Sec. 9. For the purposes of this Act—
(a) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands;
(b) The term "State library administrative agency" means the official State agency charged by State law with the extension and development of public library services throughout the State;
(c) The term "public library" means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds;
(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and
(e) The term "rural area" does not include an incorporated or unincorporated town having a population of more than ten thousand persons.
Appendix C

Summary of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), 1964*

(1) By increasing federal financial assistance to promote the development of public library service (Title I) to all areas, urban and rural, without public library services or with inadequate services.

(2) By providing for federal assistance for the construction of public library buildings (Title II) in areas lacking the facilities necessary for the development of library services.

Funds were allotted to the states in proportion to their population and were matched by the states in proportion to their per capita income with two-thirds as the maximum federal share and one-third as the minimum federal share.

The state library administrative agency in each state prepared state plans and submitted them to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. The determination of the best uses of the funds provided was reserved to the states and their local subdivisions.

Services (Title I)

Title I, effective during fiscal 1964 only for rural areas (places of less than 10,000 population), after July 1, 1964 became effective in urban as well as rural areas.

Authorized $25 million for fiscal 1964 and such sums as Congress may determine for fiscal years 1965 and 1966. The minimum allotment which must be matched was $100,000 for each of the states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia; and $25,000 each for American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

To remain eligible for a federal grant, a state had to maintain its expenditures for all public library service at least at the same level as in fiscal 1963; and state and local expenditures for public library service could not fall below the 1963 level.

Funds could be used for salaries, books and other library materials, library equipment and other operating expenses, including costs of administering the state plan for construction. Information on state plans for public library services and construction could be obtained from the state library extension agencies.

Construction (Title II)

Title II included, for both urban and rural areas, the construction of new public library buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings for public libraries.

and the initial equipment of such buildings. Architect's fees and the cost of the acquisition of land were also included.

Authorized $20 million for fiscal 1964 and such sums as the Congress determined for fiscal years 1965 and 1966. State allotments for fiscal 1964 could remain available in fiscal 1965. States were not required under Title II to match a minimum basic allotment.
Abstract of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), 1967*

To promote the further development of public library services.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to promote the further extension by several States of public library services to areas without such services or with inadequate services, to promote interlibrary cooperation, and to assist the States in providing certain specialized State library services.

(b) The provisions of this Act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public library services. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this Act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this Act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

TITLE I—PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 101. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $35,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $45,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $55,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $65,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $75,000,000, which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the Commissioner) State plans for the further extension of public library services to areas without such services, or with inadequate services.

ALLOTMENT TO STATES

Sec. 102. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and

the Virgin Islands and $1000,000 to each of the other States, and
shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums
as the population of the State bears to the population of the
United States, according to the most recent decennial census.

STATE PLANS

Sec. 103. (a) To be approved under this section, a State
plan for the further extension of public library services must---

(1) provide for the administration, or supervision of the
administration, of the plan by the State library administrative agency,
and provide that such agency will have adequate authority under
State law to administer the plan in accordance with its provisions
and the provisions of this Act;

(2) provide for the receipt by the State treasurer (or, if
there be no State treasurer, the officer exercising similar functions
for the State) of all funds paid to the State pursuant to this Act
and for the proper safeguarding of such funds by such officer, provide
that such funds shall be expended solely for the purposes for which
paid, and provide for the repayment by the State to the United States
of any such funds lost or diverted from the purposes for which paid;

(3) provide policies and methods of administration to be followed
in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State
plan, which policies and methods the State library administrative
agency certifies will in its judgment assure use of such funds to
maximum advantage in the further extension of public library services
to areas without such services or with inadequate services;

(4) provide that the State library administrative agency will
make such reports as to categories of expenditures made under this
Act, as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require;
and

(5) provide that any library services furnished under the plan
shall be made available free of charge under regulations prescribed by
the State library administrative agency.

(6) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the
conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The determination of whether library services are inadequate
in any area within any State shall be made by the State library
administrative agency of such State.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 104. (a) From the allotments available therefor under
section 102, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time
pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 103 an amount computed as provided in subsection (b) of this section, equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions under such plan during the period for which such payment was made.

(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which a State is entitled under subsection (a), and such amount shall be paid to the State, in advance or by way of reimbursement, at such time or times and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment.

(c) For the purposes of this section the "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of all the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands), except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum or less than 33 per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum, and the Federal share for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be 100 per centum.

(d) The "Federal share" for each State shall be promulgated by the Commissioner between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of each of the States and of all of the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands), for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: Provided, That the Commissioner shall promulgate such percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act.

(e) No portion of any money paid to a State under this title shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or for the purchase of any land.

TITLE II—PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION
AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $40,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $50,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $70,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $80,000,000, which shall be used for making payments to States, which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner, State plans for the construction of public libraries.
ALLOTMENTS

Sec. 202. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $20,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, $80,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States, according to the most recent decennial census. A State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payments with respect to the administration, during such year and the next fiscal year, of its State plan approved under section 203, and for payments with respect to construction projects approved under such State plan during such year or the next fiscal year.

STATE PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 203. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan for construction of public libraries must—

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

(2) set forth criteria and procedures for approval of projects for construction of public library facilities which are designed to insure that facilities will be constructed only to serve areas, as determined by the State library administrative agency, which are without library facilities necessary to develop library services;

(3) provide assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276c-5), and shall receive overtime compensation in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581); and the Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 204. (a) From its allotment available there for under section 202 each State shall be entitled to receive (1) an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104) of projects approved under its State plan (as approved by the Commissioner pursuant
to section 203) during the period for which such allotment is available, and (2) an amount equal to the Federal share of the total of the sums expended by the State and its political subdivisions for the administration of such State plan during the period for which such allotment is available.

(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to which a State is entitled under subsection (a), and such amount shall be paid to the State, in advance or by way of reimbursement, at such time or times and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine, after necessary adjustment on account of any previously made overpayment or underpayment.

TITLE III—INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION
AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and maintaining local, regional, State or interstate cooperative networks of libraries.

ALLOTMENTS

Sec. 302. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 303. From the allotments available therefor under section 302, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 304 an amount equal to the federal share which for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be 100 per centum of the total sums expended under such plan (including costs of administering such plan), and for any fiscal year thereafter shall be 50 per centum of such sums, except that the Federal share for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be 100 per centum.

STATE PLANS FOR INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

Sec. 304. (a) To be approved for purposes of this title a State plan must—
(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a).

(2) provide policies and objectives for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and special information centers for improved services of a supplementary nature to the special clientele served by each type of library or center;

(3) provide appropriate allocation by participating agencies of the total costs of the system;

(4) provide assurance that every local or other public agency in the State is accorded an opportunity to participate in the system;

(5) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this title and in assigning priority to project proposals; and

(6) establish a state-wide council which is broadly representative of professional library interests and of library users which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

TITLE IV—SPECIALIZED STATE LIBRARY SERVICES

PART A—STATE INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY SERVICES

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $7,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $12,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $15,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and improving State institutional library services. For the purposes of this part the term "State institutional library services" means the providing of books, and other library materials, and of library services to (A) inmates, patients, or residents of penal institutions, reformatories, residential training schools, orphanages, or general or special institutions or hospitals operated or substantially supported by the State, and (B) students in residential schools for the handicapped (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons who by reason thereof require special education) operated or substantially supported by the State.
ALLOTMENTS

Sec. 402. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 401 for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot $10,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, and $40,000 to each of the Other States, and the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 403. From the Allotments available therefor under section 402, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 404 an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be 100 per centum) of the total sums expended by the State under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

STATE PLANS FOR STATE INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY SERVICES

Sec. 404. (a) To be approved for purposes of this part a State plan must—

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of State institutional library services;

(3) provide assurance that all eligible State institutions will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that expenditures made by such State in any fiscal year for State institutional library services will not be less than such expenditures in the second preceding fiscal year; and

(6) establish a council which is broadly representative of State institutions eligible for assistance under this part which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) No portion of any money paid to a State under this part shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any
building or buildings, or the purchase of any land.

PART B—LIBRARY SERVICES TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED
AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 411. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $3,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $4,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $6,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $7,000,000; which shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner State plans for establishing and improving library services to the physically handicapped. For the purposes of this part the term "library services to the physically handicapped" means the providing of library service, through public or other nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations, to physically handicapped persons (including the blind and visually handicapped) certified by competent authority as unable to read or to use conventional printed materials as a result of physical limitations.

ALLOTMENTS

Sec. 412. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 411 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $5,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, and $25,000 to each of the other States, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of the United States according to the most recent decennial census.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Section 413. From the allotments available therefor under section 412, the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time pay to each State which has a plan approved under section 414 an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 104, except that the Federal share for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be 100 per centum) of the total sums expended under such plan (including costs of administering such plan).

STATE PLANS FOR SERVICES TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Sec. 414. (a) To be approved for the purposes of this part a State plan must--

(1) meet the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(a);

(2) provide policies and objectives for the establishment or improvement of library services to the physically handicapped;

(3) provide assurance that all appropriate public or nonprofit
libraries, agencies, or organizations for the physically handicapped will be accorded an opportunity to participate in the program pursuant to this part;

(4) provide criteria which the State agency shall use in evaluating applications for funds under this part and in assigning priority to project proposals;

(5) provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that funds available from sources other than Federal sources in any fiscal year for expenditures under State plans for library services to the physically handicapped will not be less than actual expenditures from such source in the second preceding fiscal year; and

(6) establish a council which is representative of eligible agencies which shall act in an advisory capacity to the State agency.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve, after consultation with the Librarian of Congress where appropriate, any State plan which meets the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) No part of any money paid to a State under this part shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase or erection of any building or buildings, or the purchase of any land.

TITLE V--GENERAL WITHHOLDING

Sec. 501. If the Commissioner finds after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under this Act, that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the applicable requirements of this Act or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with the provisions required to be included in the plan, he shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this Act (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made with respect to portions of or projects under the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State for carrying out such State plan (or further payments shall be limited to parts of or projects under the plan not affected by such failure).

ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 502. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and shall, with the approval of the Secretary, prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this Act.

(b) The commissioner is also authorized to make such studies, investigations, and reports as may be necessary or appropriate to carry
out the purposes of this Act, including periodic reports for public
distribution as to the values, methods, and results of various State
demonstrations of public library services undertaken under this Act.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenses of
administration such sums as may be necessary to carry out the functions
of the Secretary and the Commissioner under this Act.

(d) (1) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State
plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without
first affording the State submitting the plan reasonable notice and
opportunity for a hearing.

(2) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final
action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under
Title I, Title II, Title III, or part A or B of Title IV, or with
respect to his final action under section 501, such State may appeal
to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the
State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty
days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith
transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer
designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall
file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his
action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(3) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1)
of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the
action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part,
temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the
Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the
Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence,
shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand
the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the
Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and
may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record
of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact
shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(4) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in
whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject
to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari
or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States
Code.

REALLOTMENTS

Sec. 503. The amount of any State's allotment under section 102,
202, 302, 402, or 412, for any fiscal year which the Commissioner
determines will not be required for the period for which such allotment
is available for carrying out the State plan approved under section 103,
203, 304, 404, and 414, respectively, shall be available for reallocation
from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner
may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments for such year to such States under such section 102, 202, 302, 402, or 412, as the case may be, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the amount which the Commissioner estimates the State needs and will be able to use for such period of time for which the original allotments were available for carrying out the State plan approved under section 103, 203, 304, 404, or 414, as the case may be, and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101, 201, 301, 401, or 411 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year under sections 102, 202, 302, 402, and 412, respectively.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 504. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or the Virgin Islands;

(b) The term "State library administrative agency" means the official State agency charged by State law with the extension and development of public library services throughout the State;

(c) The term "public library" means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds;

(d) The term "construction" includes construction of new buildings and acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings; including architects' fees and the cost of the acquisition of land;

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Appendix E

Abstract of the Library Services and Construction Act, 1970

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Library Services and Construction Amendments of 1970.

PURPOSE; AMENDMENT TO THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Sec.2. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to improve the administration, implementation, and purposes of the programs authorized by the Library Services and Construction Act, by lessening the administrative burden upon the States through a reduction in the number of State plans which must be submitted and approved annually under such Act and to afford the States greater discretion in the allocation of funds under such Act to meet specific State needs and, by providing for special programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged persons, in both urban and rural areas, for library services and for strengthening the capacity of State library administrative agencies for meeting the needs of all the people of the States.

(b) The Library Services and Construction Act is amended by striking out all that follows the first section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec.2. (a) It is the purpose of this Act to assist the States in the extension and improvement of public library services in areas of the States which are without such services or in which such services are inadequate, and with public library construction, and in the improvement of such other State library services as library services for physically handicapped, institutionalized, and disadvantaged persons, in strengthening State library administrative agencies, and in promoting interlibrary cooperation among all types of libraries.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of library services. The administration of libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials, and insofar as consistent with the purposes of this Act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this Act shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions.

DEFINITIONS

Sec.3. The following definitions shall apply to this Act:
(1) Commissioner means the Commissioner of Education.
(2) Construction includes construction of new buildings and acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such

activities. The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them.

(3) Library service means the performance of all activities of a library relating to the collection and organization of library materials and to making the materials and information of a library available to a clientele.

(4) Library services for the physically handicapped means the providing of library services, through public or other nonprofit libraries, agencies, or organizations, to physically handicapped persons (including the blind and other visually handicapped) certified by competent authority as unable to read or to use conventional printed materials as a result of physical limitations.

(5) Public library means a library that serves free of charge all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

(6) Public library services means library services furnished by a public library free of charge.

(7) State means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(8) State Advisory Council on Libraries' means an advisory council which shall---

(A) be broadly representative of the public, school, academic, special, and institutional libraries, and libraries serving the handicapped, in the State and of persons using such libraries, including disadvantaged persons within the State;

(B) advise the State library administrative agency on the development of, and policy matters arising in the administration of the State plan; and

(C) assist the State library administrative agency in the evaluation of activities assisted under this Act;

(9) State institutional library services means the providing of books and other library materials, and of library services to those patients or residents of state health, mental, correctional, and custodial institutions.

(10) State library administrative agency means the official agency of a State charged by law of that State with the extension and development of public library services throughout the State, which has adequate authority under law of the State to administer State plans in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(11) Basic State plan means the document which gives assurances that the officially designated State library administrative agency has the fiscal and legal authority and capability to administer all aspects of this Act.

(12) Long-range program means the comprehensive five-year program which identifies a State's library needs and sets forth the activities to be taken toward meeting the identified needs supported with the assistance of Federal funds made available under this Act.

(13) Annual program means the projects which are developed and submitted to describe the specific activities to be carried out annually toward achieving fulfillment of the long-range program.
AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 1. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act the following sums are authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the purpose of making grants to States for library services as provided in title I, there are authorized to be appropriated $112,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $117,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $123,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, $129,675,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $137,150,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

(2) For the purpose of making grants to States for public library construction, as provided in title II, there are authorized to be appropriated $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $81,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $88,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, $92,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $97,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

(3) For the purpose of making grants to States to enable them to carry out interlibrary cooperation programs authorized by title III, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $15,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $16,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, $17,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $18,200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 5. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall allot the minimum allotment, as determined under paragraph (3) of this subsection, to each State. Any sums remaining after minimum allotments have been made shall be allotted in the manner set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) The Commissioner shall allot to each State such part of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the 'minimum allotment' shall be:

(A) with respect to appropriations for the purposes of title I, $200,000 for each State, except that it shall be $40,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(B) with respect to appropriations for the purposes of title II, $100,000 for each State, except that it shall be $20,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

(C) with respect to appropriations for the purposes of title III, $40,000 for each State, except that it shall be $10,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(4) The population of each State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory
data available to him.

STATE PLANS AND PROGRAMS

Sec. 6. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment for any purpose under this Act for any fiscal year shall (1) have in effect for such fiscal year a basic State plan (2) submit an annual program meeting the appropriate requirements set forth in titles I, II, and III, and shall submit (no later than July 1, 1972) a long-range program for carrying out the purposes of this Act and (3) establish a State Advisory Council on Libraries.

(b) A basic State plan under this Act shall---

(1) provide for the Administration, or supervision of the administration, of the programs authorized by this Act by the State library administrative agency;

(2) provide that any funds paid to the State in accordance with a long-range program and an annual program shall be expended solely for the purposes for which funds have been authorized and appropriated.

(3) provide satisfactory assurance that the State agency administering the plan (A) will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under the Act and to determine the extent to which funds provided under this Act have been effective in carrying out its purposes, including reports of evaluations made under the State plans, and (B) will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(4) set forth the criteria to be used in determining the adequacy of public library services in geographical areas and for groups of persons in the State, including criteria designed to assure that priority will be given to programs or projects which serve urban and rural areas with high concentrations of low-income families.

(c) (1) The Commissioner shall not approve any basic State plan pursuant to this Act for any fiscal year unless---

(A) the plan fulfills the conditions specified;

(B) he has made specific findings as to the compliance of such plan with requirements of this Act.

(2) The State plan shall be made public as finally approved.

(3) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any basic State plan submitted, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.

(d) The long-range program of any State for carrying out the purposes of this Act shall be developed in consultation with the Commissioner and shall---

(1) set forth a program under which the funds received by the State under the programs authorized by this Act will be used to carry out a long-range program of library services and construction covering a period of not less than three nor more than five years;

(2) be annually reviewed and revised in accordance with changing needs for assistance under this Act and the results of the
evaluation and surveys of the State library administrative agency;

(3) set forth policies and procedures (A) for the periodic
evaluation of the effectiveness of programs and projects supported
under this Act, and (B) for appropriate dissemination of the results
of such evaluations and other information pertaining to such programs
or projects; and

(4) set forth effective policies and procedures for the coordi-
nation of programs and projects supported under this Act with
library programs and projects operated by institutions of higher
education or local elementary or secondary schools and with other
public or private library services programs.

Such program shall be developed with advice of the State advisory
council and in consultation with the Commissioner and shall be made
public as it is finally adopted.

(e) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and
opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering a program
submitted under this Act, finds---

(1) that the program has been so changed that it no longer
complies with the provisions of this Act, or

(2) that in the administration of the program there is a
failure to comply substantially with any such provisions or with
any assurance of other provision contained in the basic State plan.

(f) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final
action with respect to the approval of a plan submitted under this Act
or with his final action under subsection (e) such State may, within
sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States
court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a
petition for review of that action.

(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by
substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause
shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the
Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment
of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the
United States.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 7. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to each State which has a
basic State plan approved, an annual program and a long-range program an
amount equal to the Federal share of the total sums expended by the
State and its political subdivisions in carrying out such plan, except
that no payments shall be made for the purposes of title I to any State
(other than the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) for any fiscal
year unless the Commissioner determines that----

(1) there will be available for expenditure under the programs
from State and local sources during the fiscal year for which the
allotment is made----

(A) sums sufficient to enable the State to receive for the
purpose of carrying out the programs payments in an amount not
less than the minimum allotment for that State for the purpose,
and,
(B) not less than the total amount actually expended, in the areas covered by the programs for such year, for the purposes of such programs from such sources in the second preceding fiscal year; and
(2) there will be available for expenditure for the purposes of the programs from State sources during the fiscal year for which the allotment is made not less than the total amount actually expended for such purposes from such sources in the second preceding fiscal year.

(b) (1) For the purpose of this section, the 'Federal share' for any State shall be, except as is provided otherwise in title III, 100 per centum less the State percentage, and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of all the States, except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum, less than 33 per centum, and (B) the Federal share for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum, and (C) the Federal share for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be 100 per centum.

TITLE I—LIBRARY SERVICES
GRANTS FOR STATES FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

Sec.101. The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making grants from sums appropriated to States which have had approved basic State plans under section 6 and have submitted annual programs for the extension of public library services to areas without such services and the improvement of such services in areas in which such services are inadequate, for making library services more accessible to persons who, by reason of distance, residence, or physical handicap, or other disadvantage, are unable to receive the benefits of public library services regularly made available to the public, for adapting public library services to meet particular needs of persons within the States, and for improving and strengthening library administrative agencies.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Sec.102. Grants to States under this title may be used solely—
(a) (1) for planning for, and taking other steps leading to the development of, programs and projects designed to extend and improve library services, as provided in clause (2); and
(2) for (A) extending public library services to geographical areas and groups of persons without such services and improving such services in such areas and for such groups as may have inadequate public library services; and (B) establishing, expanding, and operating programs and projects to provide (i) State institutional library services, (ii) library services to the physically handicapped, and (iii) library services for the disadvantaged in urban and rural areas; and (C) strengthening metropolitan public libraries which serve as national or regional resource centers.
(b) Subject to such limitations and criteria as the Commissioner shall establish by regulation, grants to States under this title may be
used (1) to pay the cost of administering the State plans submitted and approved under this Act (including obtaining the services of consultants), statewide planning for and evaluation of library services, dissemination of information concerning library services, and the activities of such advisory groups and panels as may be necessary to assist the State library administrative agency in carrying out its functions under this title, and (2) for strengthening the capacity of State library administrative agencies for meeting the needs of the people of the States.

STATE ANNUAL PROGRAM FOR LIBRARY SERVICES

Sec.103. Any State desiring to receive a grant from its allotment for the purposes of this title for any fiscal year shall, in addition to having submitted, and having had approved, a basic State plan under section 6, submit for that fiscal year an annual program for library services. Such program shall be submitted at such time, in such form, and contain such information as the Commissioner may require by regulation, and shall—-

(1) set forth a program for the year submitted under which funds paid to the State from appropriations for that year will be used, consistent with its long-range program, solely for the purposes set forth in section 102;
(2) set forth the criteria used in allocating such funds among such purposes, which criteria shall insure that the State will expend from Federal, State, and local sources an amount not less than the amount expended by the State from such sources for State institutional library services, and library services to the physically handicapped during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971;
(3) include such information, policies, and procedures as will assure that the activities to be carried out during that year are consistent with the long-range program; and
(4) include an extension of the long-range program, taking into consideration the results of evaluations.

TITLE II—PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec.201. The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making grants to States which have had approved a basic State plan under section 6 and have submitted a long-range program and submit annually appropriately updated programs for the construction of public libraries.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Sec.202. Funds appropriated shall be available for grants to States from allotments under section 5 (a) for the purpose of paying the Federal share of the cost of construction projects carried under State plans. Such grants shall be used solely for the construction of public libraries under approved State plans.
STATE ANNUAL PROGRAM FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Sec. 203. Any State desiring to receive a grant from its allotment for the purpose of this title for any fiscal year shall, in addition to having submitted, and having had approved, a basic State plan under section 6, submit such projects as the State may approve and are consistent with its long-range program.

Such projects shall be submitted at such time and contain such information as the Commissioner may require by regulation and shall—

(1) for the year submitted under which funds are paid to the State from appropriations pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 4(a) for that year, be used, consistent with the State's long-range program, for the construction of public libraries in areas of the State which are without the library facilities necessary to provide adequate library services;

(2) follow the criteria, policies, and procedures for the approval of applications for the construction of public library facilities under the long-range program;

(3) follow policies and procedures which will insure that every local or other public agency whose application for funds under the plan with respect to a project for construction of public library facilities is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State library administrative agency;

(4) include an extension of the long-range program taking into consideration the results of evaluations.

TITLE III—INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making grants to States which have an approved basic State plan and have submitted a long-range program and an annual program for interlibrary cooperation programs.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Sec. 302. (a) Funds appropriated of shall be available for grants to States for the purpose of carrying out the Federal share of the cost of carrying out State plans submitted and approved. Such grants shall be used (1) for planning for, and taking other steps leading to the development of, cooperative library networks; and (2) for establishing, expanding, and operating local, regional, and interstate cooperative networks of libraries, which provide for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers for improved supplementary services for the special clientele served by each type of library or center.

(b) For the purposes of this title, the Federal share shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out the State plan.
STATE ANNUAL PROGRAM FOR
INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

Sec. 303. Any State desiring to receive a grant from its allotment for the purposes of this title for any fiscal year shall, in addition to having submitted, and having had approved, a basic State plan, submit for that fiscal year an annual program for interlibrary cooperation. Such program shall be submitted at such time, in such form, and contain such information as the Commissioner may require by regulation and shall—

(1) set forth a program for the year submitted under which funds paid to the State from appropriations pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 4(a) will be used, consistent with its long-range program for the purposes set forth in section 302,
(2) include an extension of the long-range program taking into consideration the results of evaluations.
(c) (1) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall be effective after June 30, 1971.
(s) In the case of funds appropriated to carry out programs under the Library Services and Construction Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, each State is authorized, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner of Education, to use a portion of its allotment for the development of such plans as may be required by such Act, as amended by subsection (b).
Appendix F

Consumer Price Index,
1956-1973*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>100 (Base year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>104.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>109.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>116.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>121.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>125.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>133.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Spencer, 1974: Inside front cover.
## Appendix G

### ISCA Construction Projects Begun in Louisiana, 1965-1972*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>$133,200</td>
<td>$226,800</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>Algiers Regional Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>88,540</td>
<td>140,540</td>
<td>Pointe Coupee Parish Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>170,270</td>
<td>270,270</td>
<td>Mid City Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>53,333</td>
<td>83,333</td>
<td>Bossier City Branch Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>266,666</td>
<td>416,666</td>
<td>Jefferson Parish Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>204,444</td>
<td>319,444</td>
<td>St. Mary Parish Hq. Add.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>44,798</td>
<td>69,998</td>
<td>Lake Forest Regional Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>191,600</td>
<td>287,400</td>
<td>479,000</td>
<td>Lake Forest Regional Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>77,812</td>
<td>116,717</td>
<td>194,529</td>
<td>Grant Parish Library Hq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>8,481</td>
<td>14,135</td>
<td>Grant Parish Library Hq. (Amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>East Houma Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Ouechita Parish Public Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,957</td>
<td>100,436</td>
<td>167,393</td>
<td>Union Parish Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139,054</td>
<td>208,581</td>
<td>347,635</td>
<td>Opelousas Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,946</td>
<td>53,919</td>
<td>89,865</td>
<td>Opelousas Public Library (Amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>112,500</td>
<td>Grand Isle Branch Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>125,950</td>
<td>Catahoula Parish Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,050</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>103,050</td>
<td>Jonesville Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>161,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>St. James Parish Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,992</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>240,992</td>
<td>Richland Parish Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>128,270</td>
<td>238,270</td>
<td>Jackson Parish Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ISCA Construction Projects, n.d.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109,315</td>
<td>72,876</td>
<td>182,191</td>
<td>Bienville Parish Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,578</td>
<td>65,253</td>
<td>112,831</td>
<td>Eunice Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>Beauregard Parish Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203,234</td>
<td>71,766</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>Madison Parish Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$200,000 in Federal Revenue Sharing funds.
Appendix H

Interview Questions

1. What is the present budget format employed by the Louisiana State Library?

2. How is the present budget format of the Louisiana State Library different from that of the past?

3. Is there a relationship between the guidelines under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) and changes in the Louisiana State Library's budget format?

4. What types of budgets have been generally employed by local public libraries in Louisiana and how have they changed during the period 1956-1973?

5. Have local library budget procedures been affected by the LSA or the LSCA during the period 1957-1973?

6. How has the budget of the Louisiana State Library been prepared?

7. What has been the time schedule for preparation of the Louisiana State Library's budget and how has this schedule been affected by the availability of federal funds under the LSA and LSCA?

8. What officials of the State Library have been actually involved in the formulation of the annual budget and what have been their responsibilities?

9. What guidelines and priorities have been followed in developing the Louisiana State Library's annual budget?

10. What guidelines and priorities have been followed in developing budgets for specific federally funded public library projects in Louisiana during the period 1957-1973? Have these guidelines and priorities undergone change?

11. What has been the Louisiana State Library's position in terms of its ability to obtain sufficient financial support from the state legislature?

12. Has the Louisiana State Library employed a "grants" program for distributing federal public library funds to local public libraries?

13. Have local libraries been permitted and encouraged to submit program plans under the LSA or the LSCA? Why or why not?

14. Has the Louisiana State Library made available guidelines and assistance to local public libraries in the preparation of plans for proposed projects?
15. Whenever local proposals have been submitted, how has a decision been reached in approving some and disapproving others?

16. In what way have the spending priorities of the Louisiana State Library changed during the period of federal and under the LSA and the LSCA?

17. How has the decision making process of the Louisiana State Library and local public libraries in Louisiana been influenced by the availability of federal funds under the LSA and the LSCA?

18. To what extent has the State Library and local public libraries been dependent upon the continued availability of federal funds for public libraries during the period 1957-1973?

19. What local, regional, and state level public library services would be adversely affected by a termination of federal funds for public libraries?

20. What criteria has the State Library employed in evaluating those public library programs and services supported with funds under the LSA and the LSCA?

21. Which federally funded projects have been the most successful and which the least successful?

22. What follow-up has been done to oversee the spending of LSA and LSCA funds by regional and local agencies?

23. To what extent have local libraries been included in the planning of federally funded public library programs and services in Louisiana?

24. To what extent have federal funds under the LSA and LSCA been used for short-term and long-term support of public library programs and services?

25. To what extent has a contingency plan been developed by the Louisiana State Library in the event that federal public library funds are abruptly terminated?

26. What have been some effects of federal funding under the Library Services Act (LSA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) upon public library planning and development on the state and local levels in Louisiana?

27. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the LSA and LSCA in Louisiana during the period 1957-1973?
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