ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 873 IR 001 905

AUTHOR Bone, Larry Earl
TITLE The Goals and Objectives Experience; A Report to the Council on Library Resources.
INSTITUTION Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; Community Involvement; Leadership Styles; Librarians; *Library Planning; *Library Surveys; *Management; *Management by Objectives; Objectives; Organizational Change; *Public Libraries; State of the Art Reviews; Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS *Library Administration

ABSTRACT

With funding from the Council of Library Resources, visits were made in the summer of 1974 to the public libraries of ten large cities in order to examine their procedures for setting goals and objectives. Since the goal-setting process implies the selection of priorities and the application of leadership by the library administration, the leadership styles and philosophies and the management techniques of these libraries were also considered. Separate summaries were compiled for observations about the public libraries of Baltimore, Brooklyn, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, the District of Columbia, Memphis, Minneapolis, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Toronto, and Tulsa. It was concluded that it is too soon to assess the overall impact of goals and objectives setting as a management technique in large public libraries, since libraries have come to this process late and many such efforts are still in their initial stages. General observations were made on the goal-setting effort, requirements for its success, and barriers to be overcome. (Author/SL)

ERIC

ED105873

WASHINGTON

Baltimore

PITTSBURGH

Toronto

MEMPHIS

Brooklyn

DENVER

detroit

dallas

NEW YORK

Philadelphia

MINNEAPOLIS

TULSA

The Goals And Objectives Experience

A Report of Research on Library Resources

By
LARRY EARL BONE

THE

GOALS

AND

OBJECTIVES

EXPERIENCE

by

Larry Earl Bone

A Report to the Council on Library Resources

1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTRODUCTION

No member of the American library profession in the 1970's can be unaware that libraries and librarianship are experiencing one of their most intensive periods of self-examination. This occurs approximately one hundred years after the birth of the American library profession -- a period in which tremendous advances have been made in education and in librarianship. It would be better if this self-examination were the result of a logical assessment of the state of the art and a calculated move to determine where libraries are going. In most cases this re-examination is brought on by larger forces of social and economic change which American society as a whole is experiencing. Of the institutions in the American library world most affected by this societal change the public library, and more particularly, the large urban public library is one in an identity crisis. It follows, therefore, that public libraries are actively involved in the refinement of their focus.

To this librarian, after twenty years in the profession, and at the mid-point in his professional career, it has been for some time an important concern of how the large urban public library is responding to the challenges being made to it. Over a period of years through both practice and teaching, I began to feel that a large part of the public library problem was due to a confusion of purpose. Once much clearer in its functions and in the clienteles it served, the public library, when those functions and that clientele changed, seemed to become disoriented. It seemed to me that it was not so much an inability to change in order to meet new needs, as simply a lack of attention being given to determining what these new needs were and the failure of the large public library to address itself to a clearly defined purpose. The concern that I feel is shared by others in the profession, as witnessed by the

attention presently being paid in library literature, as well as the attention being given to goals and objectives by many libraries throughout the country.

Because of my interest in the public library's present direction and in the question of whether we in the profession are indeed capable of identifying clearly a public library purpose, and because of my own strong role in helping one large public library in this process, I desired to look closely at the operation of a number of large public libraries -- both the older established ones and some of the emerging ones, in order to study their experience and to see if any trends were developing.

In making a proposal for a Council on Library Resources Fellowship for this purpose, I indicated my desire to study the management of these libraries and the part that goals and objectives setting played in this management. I wished to determine whether a goals and objectives setting process was taking place in large public libraries, and, if so, why. I wished to see how the process was executed, what effects it was having both on the libraries' services and on their staffs, whether strong obstacles to such activity existed, and what long range effects were resulting from the process if that could be determined at this point.

Moreover, since the formulation of goals and objectives involves selection of priorities, and since the skill of the administrators in institutions such as the large urban public library must be brought to bear in countless ways to provide leadership, it was a particular desire of mine to examine the leadership and the leadership philosophy in the libraries studied and to observe the management techniques used by the administrators in achieving their libraries' goals and objectives.

It should be pointed out here that the terms 'goals' and 'objectives are used interchangeably or reversed in definition by many libraries today. Crum points this out in his review of library goals and objectives literature,[1] and this was found to be true in the libraries which I studied. What one library considers 'goal' another considers an 'objective', and vice versa. Some libraries follow in general the Blasingame and Lynch definition of 'goal' as "a large on-going ambition which may never be achieved or which will be achieved only in the very long run" and their definition of 'objectives' as "more immediate aims. . .anything from a short-term aim to a multi-year aim, short of the overall goals," although Blasingame and Lynch point out that "these distinctions are somewhat artificial and difficult to maintain."[2] Some libraries' objectives are clearly closer to the Blasingame and Lynch definition of 'goals', while other libraries might be said to mix the two. If one keeps in mind, therefore, that the terms are frequently used interchangeably, there is little difficulty encountered.

The report which follows covers only the goals and objectives setting aspect of my study. Needless to say, I observed and learned a great deal which it would be impossible to describe in so brief a report. For example, an attendant area which I was most interested in (not unrelated to the above concerns) was the selection and collection building process. I was interested in knowing: whether the libraries to be studied had selection and acquisition policies; and if so, if one could determine a direct relationship between such

---

[1] Norman, J. Crum, Library Goals and Objectives: Literature Review, (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Library and Information Sciences, 1973). (ERIC Document 082794.)

[2] Ralph U. Blasingame and Mary Jo Lynch, "Design for Diversity: Alternatives to Standards for Public Libraries." PLA Newsletter, Vol. 13, No. 2 (June, 1974), p. 16.

policies and the institutional objectives; if the collection building process was intended as an answer to community needs identified through conscious efforts at community analysis; if public library acquisition policies take into consideration the acquisition programs of other libraries in their areas; and, finally, if the policies are used as blueprints for building the collections. While answers to these questions are not given here, I hope to report on this aspect of my study at some future time.

The Council on Library Resources Fellowship awarded in the spring of 1974 enabled me to visit ten large cities and to examine some fourteen library systems' activity. The tour, beginning August 25 and extending for ten weeks, included the following cities in the order visited: Dallas, Denver, Minneapolis, Detroit, Toronto, New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Pittsburgh. Approximately one week was spent in each library visited. Washington, D. C., originally scheduled for a visit, was eliminated because the administration was in transition. Since the staff of the Public Library of the District of Columbia had been through a goal setting process recently, however, one afternoon of my second week in New York was spent with Mr. Milton Byam, the present director of the Queens Borough Public Library, who was until recently the director of the D. C. Public Library. Also to be reflected in the study are the approaches taken and results received from goals and objectives setting in the Memphis and Shelby County Public Library and Information Center and in the Tulsa City/County Public Library, since these two libraries have had active goal setting activities in recent years which have received national attention. The information on the Tulsa City/County Public Library was not obtained in a visit, but from conversations with the director, Mrs. Allie Beth Martin, who also supplied reports on Tulsa's goal setting efforts.

The principal criteria used in the selection of the libraries to be visited were that the libraries be in large cities, generally serving populations of over 500,000 people, and that they be libraries with strong reputations and past records of good financial support. A definite attempt was made, moreover, to include some libraries that were known to have recently been through the goals and objectives setting process. Generally, those persons talked with in the libraries visited were the directors, assistant directors, personnel officers, heads of main libraries, selected department and branch heads, the materials selection officers, and selected junior staff members. A list of the people with whom I spoke is appended. Whenever possible, board meetings, administrative council meetings and other staff meetings were also attended.

The following report merely covers a few highlights and some of my observations, and by no means reflects completely the many things learned in general about large public libraries, their operation, and their administration.

I should like to express my gratitude to the libraries and their staffs who so graciously received me. All of the individuals with whom I spoke were open and frank and supportive of my study. I hope that they will forgive what they may see as serious omissions or misinterpretations.

I am most grateful to the Council on Library Resources for making possible this excellent opportunity for my continuing professional experience, and to my employer, the Memphis and Shelby County Public Library and Information Center, for the generous allowance of time for the study.

Baltimore

The founding of the Enoch Pratt Free Library through money given by Baltimore businessman Enoch Pratt is a well known story in American library circles, if not international ones. Pratt's philanthropy, like that of his friend, Andrew Carnegie, gave great impetus to the public library movement in this country in the late nineteenth century.

In the eighty-eight years of its existence the Enoch Pratt Free Library has evolved from a Central Library and four branches serving the citizens of Baltimore to the present library system consisting of a large Central Library, serving the entire state, and 24 branches. Under a succession of progressive library directors and good financial support, the public library of Baltimore, along with those of Cleveland, Detroit, and New York, became with its collections and programs one of the best examples of traditional public library service.

Like other large cities in recent years, Baltimore has changed considerably. With the migration of many middle class residents to the suburbs and the departure of many businesses, Baltimore has found itself with shrinking resources to provide the many services needed by its residents, many of whom are underprivileged and under-educated. The frustrations of these urban dwellers were reflected in the riots of the 1960's when Baltimore was one of the cities which was hardest hit.

The Enoch Pratt Free Library is just one of the institutions in the city -- and for that matter just one of the large public libraries of the East and Midwest -- that has found itself with shrinking income being challenged on the one hand to make itself relevant to a population quite different from the one

served in earlier years and on the other challenged to maintain an expensive Central Library operation important not only to many Baltimore residents but also to many others in the region. In the absence of a central state library collection in Maryland, the Pratt Library is making inroads into state and government support not yet achieved by some large libraries. It has attained for the Central Library of the Pratt system the official designation as a State Resource Center by act of the General Assembly of Maryland in 1970. Although it does not pay for the entire Central Library operation, support from the state for this service is now approaching the one million dollar mark.

Pratt Library Director Edwin Castagna, scheduled to retire early in 1975, joins those who see the large public library's greatest problem as being a financial one, and one not subject to easy solution in the present period. For him the most difficult aspect of administration in recent years has been in making the Baltimore urban dwellers, including their governmental representatives, feel the importance of libraries sufficiently and in obtaining enough money to operate these libraries. Like other directors of large public libraries he has found the political forces difficult to cope with. Because of the slowed growth and the shrinking dollar and the community pressures for library service in new areas, he feels that long range planning including goals and objectives are important in helping make the library's operation an orderly one. From his experience, however, he feels that orderly planning based on absolute logic is a dream, since politics in his opinion is indeed "the art of the possible".

The Pratt Library does have various planning devices. One is a plan, revised a number of times, for the development of the overall library service for the Pratt Library, setting forth the kinds of libraries there will be in

Baltimore -- major branches, neighborhood branches, and library centers -- with indication of sizes of branches and collections, and numbers of people to be served. Another is a six year capital improvements plan.

Although in recent years under the leadership of the director a statement of goals and objectives was adopted by the chiefs and coordinators of the library's staff, the statement has never been adopted officially by the Board of Trustees.

The objective setting process was set in motion at Enoch Pratt in 1971, when Director Castagna drafted a statement of goals and objectives for the chiefs and coordinators to consider for the purpose of arriving at priorities. In this preliminary draft the director set forth the historical background and attempted to identify the changes that had taken place in Baltimore and in society generally over the years that are affecting the public library's role. Some of the major changes pointed to were, of course, the changed population of the central cities and the attendant social problems; technological developments, and the information explosion, among others. The director further outlined the goals needed by the Enoch Pratt Free Library to meet the challenges.

This goals statement at Pratt is an example of 'goals' which are practically synonymous with objectives. Divided into two main parts, the Administrative/Technical and Public Service, the nineteen goals deal with such specifics in the former as "air-conditioning and refurbishing the Peabody Library Department," and such broad ones in the latter as "continued intensive effort in the inner city and throughout the entire area to reach those who are difficult to serve..."

Although a statement of goals seems to have been adopted by the staff, the Board of Directors has never acted upon them. The obvious tentative status of the goals is mirrored in some staff members' complaints that no further report was given to the staff on the status of the goals and that this has minimized successful implementation. Director Castagna sees a reluctance on the part of the Board to adopt the goals. He doesn't quite know why the Board has not agreed to them, but he senses that while the Board has no objections to an informal pursuit of the objectives on the part of the staff, it is cautious about such commitments, preferring to rely on the legal basis of the library for its actions. Consequently, the director has not pressured the Board.

In the deliberations themselves on priorities in the goal setting process some committee members thought that the Central Library of Pratt should become more specialized; there was, moreover, some feeling that with the improvement in school library service, the library should withdraw from children's service. Director Castagna, and apparently others who participated in the deliberations did not concur. They felt that it was not the time to withdraw from service to children, since school library service was still inadequate and some children in private and parochial schools were without library service. Director Castagna's own strong feelings about the desirability of a multiplicity of service arms apparently influenced the proceedings. He feels, contrary to the opinion of many in the library and other fields, that institutions which become too highly specialized become out of touch and that the general institution with a number of facets to it is more likely to survive. He feels that the institution that puts "all of its eggs in one basket" and becomes overly specialized is in danger, with changing conditions, of becoming irrelevant and of being bypassed.

It would be natural, therefore, that such philosophy regarding priority setting would influence the type of goal setting in which Enoch Pratt engaged. Whether it be the reluctance on the part of the director to establish priorities that would narrow the library's service role, or the reluctance on the part of the Board to adopt the goals, once formulated by the staff, one senses, that the goal and objective setting process has not had much impact on the library. One senses, moreover, that while the goal setting activity began with enthusiasm among staff members, subsequent factors have caused it to lose momentum. As of the late fall of 1974, there was talk of reviewing the library's goal setting activity.

Brooklyn

In spite of the fact that the Brooklyn Public Library, like the other giant public libraries in the United States, such as the New York Public Library or the Free Library of Philadelphia, has impressive budgets in dollar amounts, the numbers and the diversity of the backgrounds and needs of the people who must be served by those dollars make the library's service priority decisions difficult.

With a population to serve of over two and a half million, the Brooklyn Public Library's geographic area may almost be divided in the middle between north and south with two very different groups of people. The northern section of Brooklyn contains large numbers of black and Puerto Rican residents, many of whom are disadvantaged, while the southern portion is inhabited by the more general mix of urban middle class. These characteristics, therefore, make for a library operation which is quite diverse. In part -- the southern part of the borough -- the library's service is the traditional middle-class library service which is not the type of service needed or demanded in the northern part of the borough where outreach activities involving differing techniques must be pursued. The challenge for the Board and staff of the Brooklyn Public Library, as in other such large metropolitan library systems, is to strike a balance to insure that the library is maintaining the traditional programs in areas where they are needed and yet are able to employ other techniques and devise different programs for the disadvantaged communities where the traditional programs do not succeed.

In the opinion of Brooklyn Public Library Director Kenneth Duchac the administrative problem lies in striking what is not only an acceptable, but a defensible balance between the traditional and the non-traditional service.

Director Duchac feels that it would extremely difficult to select priorities among groups to be served, as some libraries have. In function, however, he feels personally that the public library should serve primarily as an educational institution, with other functions secondary, and that if it does not, there is little reason for it to exist.

Although not specifically billed as an announcement of goals, a "Statement of Brooklyn Public Library" was issued in April, 1968, which concerned itself with future goals and priorities for the Brooklyn Public Library. This statement, worked out between the then director John Frantz and the Board, outlined the many changes taking place in Brooklyn -- social, economic, cultural, and technological -- and concluded that "these trends do not invalidate the basic objectives of the public library. What they do suggest is a re-ordering of emphasis so that the need of each individual for information on which to make his own decisions is fully recognized", and that "special priority is required for those efforts by the library to reach out to those who cannot or do not take full advantage of the public library." A series of long-range goals was then listed. These goals, while broad in nature, without specific objectives or target dates, do acknowledge as the quotation above indicates, a new direction for the Brooklyn Public Library in which a large part of the library's responsibility has to do with what is not the traditional service but has to do with large elements of the population that are underprivileged and undereducated.

Brooklyn Director Duchac feels that a goals statement for a system as large as the Brooklyn one is complicated because of the size of the institution. He feels that such a document becomes a very general statement of intent rather than one outlining any kind of active program. While he does feel that

there has been in the last six or seven years a major redirection in the library's priorities, he is not sure that the goals statement was the catalytic element. The staff, moreover, which was not involved in the drafting of the statement, does not seem to view the 1968 statement as important as some other policy statements such as the materials selection policy, in which the staff took an active part. Director Duchac feels that people feel more enthusiastic about goals and objectives when there are actual targets or specific objectives.

With or without clear goals, objectives, and priorities, Brooklyn is merely representative of the system whose financial problems serve as barriers to long-range planning. Brooklyn staff, as well as the staff in some of the other large systems, feel that it is difficult to make any kind of long term planning for change in such a negative financial climate, when there is a process of constriction rather than expansion of activities. While it was acknowledged that this is perhaps the time when priority planning is needed, the energy seems to be spent trying to keep the present service going without severe cuts. When the question was raised about the possibility of re-structuring, the opinion was expressed that there would be opposition from staff through the unions, from the public if agencies were closed, and from the Board in their reluctance to give up any present services.

Dallas

Dallas is a young city. Its tremendous period of growth has been since World War II. The Dallas Public Library, Director Lillian Bradshaw points out, has grown with it. As a younger library, both in its stage of development and the age of its staff, Dallas Public has been in a real boom period. Directors of many of the older, more established public library systems in the east and midwest would find the Dallas Public Library remarkably free of the problems which beset their systems. Dallas' Central Library, now inadequate, was built 20 years ago, and the majority of the branches in its highly successful branch library program have been built in the last 14 years. A proposal for a new central library of approximately 500,000 square feet in area will be submitted to the voters in 1975. Although no library bond issue through 1974 has ever been rejected by the Dallas voters, the present economic atmosphere is causing some apprehension about prospects for success this time.

Such concern about voter approval of a library request is new for Dallas Public, and legitimately so. A study undertaken by the local government to determine degree of citizen satisfaction with city services showed the library receiving a high degree of approval. Nevertheless, the one strong impression that one receives all over the Dallas system is that belt-tightening is the order of the day. Words heard frequently were 'accountability' and 'productivity', the latter word being used by Dallas city government to suggest that ways must be found to get more for the dollar. While the library administration does not seem surprised at this new mood, staff in general is concerned over the library's ability to continue to maintain a high level of service.

Because of these circumstances the Dallas Public Library's recent goal

setting activity would seem to assume special importance. Clearly one of the most important internal library activities in recent years, in fact, has been the establishment of the "Library Service Goals 1972-1982 for the Dallas Public Library," the statement of which has received wide distribution throughout the country.

To arrive at these goals Director Lillian Bradshaw and her administrative council of eight in 1972 set five broad topics for which they felt that goals should be established. These were: (1) User-Oriented Service; (2) Materials Collection and Selection; (3) Organization of Materials; (4) Staffing; and (5) Management and Communication. Thirty-five staff members were selected from all professional levels to participate in the initial goal setting activity. From the thirty-five member committee, a five member task force for each topic was asked to prepare a position paper which was subsequently distributed to all committee members. After the papers were read, a two and a half day retreat was held by the committee, at which time the goals were debated and voted on. The draft version of these approved goals was then submitted to the staff as a whole. Afterwards a series of three breakfasts broken into six groups each was held at which the goals were discussed and changes were made. A total of approximately 150 staff members from all levels attended. A final copy of the goals was then prepared and sent to the Board, which made minor changes, and finally to the city council. These goals, adopted in 1972, were in the summer and fall of 1974 in the process of being revised.

There is no question that the setting of goals has generated a tremendous amount of excitement among the Dallas staff. The involvement of so many staff members seems to be a particular strength of the Dallas approach. Coupled with the enthusiasm there also seems to be some skepticism on the part of many

staff members who feel that the goals have not been followed by specific objectives and action plans. Moreover, when queried, several staff members expressed the opinion that it is very hard to argue with the goals because they embrace such hign ideals and tend to cover the spectrum of library service. The fact that priorities have not already been set among the fifty-four stated goals seems to be a matter of concern. The complaint heard most frequently was that the library was attempting too much, that no one was clear on priorities. Most staff members point out, however, that there was a greater mood of expansiveness two years ago when the goals were adopted than exists now, an attitude which seemed to suggest that "if Dallas wanted it, Dallas could have it."

Dallas' Associate Director for Public Services, Richard Waters, feels that there will be much "gnashing of teeth" when priorities are established, priorities not yet clearly identified. Yet, the impression one receives is that the Dallas staff is both ready for and anxious about the inevitable priority setting. As suggested before, the goals setting has invoked general staff enthusiasm. Most staff members, not just content with a statement, are now ready for action. Because of this mood Director Bradshaw in the summer of 1974 appointed five three-member committees to assess the five major service goals and submit reports, in preparation for priority setting and implementation steps.

Denver

The city of Denver has many characteristics conducive to a vital public library program. It is, of course, the capital of Colorado, and the largest city in the state, making it an important regional center for that section of the country. Residents of the city enjoy a general high standard of living and an unusually high median income. A look at the area population, moreover, reveals an above average range in educational level. In 1970 the Denver area resident had completed a median of 12.5 years of schooling, as compared to 12.1 years for the U. S. overall. Thus, with education being a prime determinant of traditional public library use, the city is a fertile ground for public library service.

In the years since its establishment in 1889 the Denver Public Library has become one of the progressive public libraries in the United States and the largest public library between Kansas City and the West Coast. The system consists of a large and actively used Main Library, twenty branch libraries, and four bookmobiles.

While some form of goals had been in effect in the Denver Public Library since the 1950's, when the library moved into its new main library building, these were apparently the type of general goals found in many libraries and articulated in a broad statement. As in other libraries, these goals were stated without further elaboration through objectives as to how they would be achieved. And like those of other libraries, they could be stretched to cover a wide range of library activities. Then in 1971, a year after he was appointed Denver's City Librarian, Henry G. Shearhouse, Jr., feeling the need for up-to-date goals and objectives for the Denver Public Library, took a

group of twenty librarians for a three-day retreat to the Lost Valley Ranch in the Colorado mountains for the purpose of drafting goals for the Denver Public Library relevant to the city of Denver in the 1970's. Out of this meeting came a statement emphasizing three goals or purposes for the library: (1) Provide information for all citizens; (2) Provide materials, help, and motivation in the self-education process, and (3) Work with the community to enhance the quality of life.

Between 1971 and 1973 there was apparently no active program aimed at the implementation of the goals. While a number of things were accomplished in line with the objectives, they were not the result of a systematic approach through specific objectives. When the library became involved in the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) in 1973, however, and was urged by consultant Jose Orlando Toro to set forth specific objectives and action plans, the staff saw the value of such an approach for other independent learning programs.

Although implementation of Denver's two additional main goals had not received much attention as of the fall of 1974, a variety of objectives and action plans had been set within the second goal -- services to the independent learner -- and the library staff was using the experience with the CLEP project in developing other objectives and action plans under this goal. Likewise, they were planning to use this approach in implementation of the other two goals. A series of meetings is now being held with the entire staff to discuss that part of Denver's policy dealing with goals. The three library directors -- deputies of the City Libraries -- meet with these groups. As far as the service to the independent learner is concerned, moreover, each department and each branch is developing further action plans for the further implementation of this goal at every level of the library's service.

The effect of such planning and priority setting in Denver is obvious. The independent learner program, as the result of this kind of careful objective setting, seems to reflect a great deal of vitality. Not only is the library working with the CLEP program, but it has initiated two other successful programs -- one entitled "On Your Own", the other "Time Alive". The setting of objectives for this independent learner goal is helping to lay out a blueprint for its complete implementation. The decisions made at the departmental and branch level should serve to involve all staff in the implementation of this goal at all levels, an ingredient important to the success of any goals and objectives.

As in other libraries there has been some criticism by staff of the goals activity, as well as some lack of acceptance. Most of the criticism is directed against the library's role in service to the independent learner and derives from the feeling on the part of some staff members that they are not qualified to work with the independent learner in any instructional or advisory capacity, while others feel that this service is taking them away from what they feel is the more important priority which they can perform best, that is, the provision of information. As one member of the library's top administrative staff observed: "Librarians don't change easily. When one has worked his whole career in one pattern, it isn't easy to change to another." Apparently, some have not yet seen that the changing society is requiring new roles for the library, but Denver's administrators feel that it will just take time to bring about the necessary change in attitude.

Detroit

The city of Detroit, like Baltimore, Cleveland, and New York, at times in the past has been considered to possess one of the model public libraries in the United States. In terms of traditional library service, its staff, resources, and physical plant, as well as many of its programs, have been emulated by many other library systems.

In the last ten years, however, in a period of great social unrest, the city of Detroit has undergone considerable change, with the result that the Detroit Public Library's traditional service has received declining response from its constituents. From 1962-72, for example, there was a 41.4% decrease in library circulation. A variety of reasons might be suggested for this decline, and it became obvious that new approaches were needed if this library were to be successful in obtaining continued support, and continue to play a meaningful role in the life of the city.

Certainly Detroit Public Library Director Clara Jones is trying to make her library's staff acutely aware of the changing society around that library. Coming to her directorship in 1970 with a conviction that the Detroit Public Library needed to change in order to be more relevant to its community, she has accepted the challenge with rare dedication and complete commitment. Although Detroit's goals and objectives had not been formally written down as of the fall of 1974, there has been considerable activity in this respect since Mrs. Jones' arrival, and no one who visits the Detroit Public Library can fail to sense that here is a library with a mission, one set on a clear course with clear priorities. "We have said it to our staff, and we say it to everyone who comes," says Clara Jones, "that we are involved in an era that demands institutional

change for the relevancy and for the survival of the public library. We feel that the heart of the institutional change here is information and referral. This is our top priority." Detroit is an example of a city where such priority setting has been truly meaningful. To make a successful information-referral service required considerable re-structuring, as well as considerable retraining of staff. This program was effected with little overall increase in staff, but was achieved, especially with the staff in the Central Library concerned with the organizing of the information, by cutting some positions in other areas. The retraining has been directed not only at new work methods, but perhaps more importantly at staff attitudes.

Both the staff and the Board of the Detroit Public Library seem to have become completely imbued with this idea, although apparently the acceptance of this information and referral role for the library was not immediate on the part of the library's staff, where there was initially some anxiety as to how they would be affected, as well as resistance to performing in a different manner. Training in ways to implement this program has been intensive in order to minimize fears. Additionally, the hiring of a social worker trained in the process of organizational change has helped in this respect. Needless to say, acceptance of such dramatic change has not been unanimous, but acceptance is coming slowly, nevertheless.

The Detroit Public Library views this program not as a novel idea, nor a separate special program. It sees it as one built on the firm foundation of information service for which the library has a good tradition and one that is encompassed in the library's total program. Moreover, such a role in information and referral seems particularly significant for the library, since no other agency in Detroit seems to be meeting the need

While the library's intensive efforts in this area have been made since 1970, when Detroit's new director, Clara Jones, was appointed, the identification of such service as a major goal with top priority began in December 1972 when a series of five meetings involving professional staff was held to discuss goals and objectives. Each member of the staff involved in these meetings carried the ideas discussed back to his respective branch or department for reactions; the reactions were sent in written form to the director. In May, 1973, the director closed all libraries for one morning and brought the total staff together to explain the need for institutional change and to suggest the information and referral role as the top priority.

What are the drawbacks to Detroit's approach to goals and objectives? Administrative staff recognize that information and referral had already been made top priority before the staff was actually led through the goal and objective setting process, and that it might have been better to have the staff arrive at this priority by natural means, rather than by direction. They feel, however, that time was running out for the library to prove that it was capable of changing in order to meet the needs of present day Detroit. All concerned, moreover, recognize that for most successful implementation, the goals and objectives should appear as soon as possible as a formal written statement. Such a statement was in the process of being formulated in the winter of 1975.

District of Columbia

Milton Byam, presently director of the Queens Borough Public Library, has a strong belief that the only reason for any public library's survival is that it is filling a distinct need for society. Like many in public librarianship, he feels that the public library is drifting, and that part of the reason is that it has failed to clarify its purpose. Therefore, in 1972, shortly after coming to the directorship of the District of Columbia Public Library, he attempted to lead the library in an identification of its goals and purposes.

Sensing that the D. C. Public Library staff was anxious to know more clearly what the role of that public library should be, he urged the Board of Trustees to identify D. C. Public Library goals by following a pattern somewhat reminiscent of the approach used by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries in its attempt to identify national library needs. Director Byam felt that the D. C. approach should be community oriented as well as staff oriented. Consequently, in 1973 the Board sent out a call for a series of hearings throughout the city to determine what the goals of the public library should be over the next ten years.

As a result of this call, meetings to which the public was invited were held in every branch of the District of Columbia Public Library. Members of public responded in these various communities in groups numbering from ten persons to fifty or sixty persons in some of the busier branches. At each meeting there were two trustees and one library staff member present; a tape recording was made of each meeting. As might be expected, many of the public's suggestions were for more immediate services and lacked long-term perspective (e.g., different branch hours). In addition, however, many suggestions were

broad in nature (e.g., better book collections, better trained staff).

After the gathering of opinions from the public, Director Byan then set up four councils of the staff representing librarians, clericals, support staff, buildings and grounds. The councils' responsibility was to suggest directions for the library in the future. It was Director Byam's opinion that the staff contributions were among the most valuable part of the process. He feels, however, that involving the public also was an indispensable feature of the D. C. goals setting and should be an essential part of any goals and objectives setting process.

A general wrap-up meeting was held at the Martin Luther King Library late in 1972 with many important people in the community attending. As a result of the goals activity, the library published a book consisting of all of the suggestions that came out of these meetings. Copies of the book were placed in every branch throughout the system. Director Byam points out that this was not intended as the final goals statement, but as a proposal, as a document from which the broadly general final goals could be selected.

At the time of his departure from the D. C. Public Library the process had not been completed. For example, the more difficult area of priority setting lay ahead. The success of the D. C. Public Library efforts will depend on whether the momentum of the earlier activity will be continued by the new director and his staff.

Memphis

The public library system in Memphis, like the one in Dallas, is an emerging one. Both library systems have followed a similar pattern of development, the most intense period of which has been in the last thirty years. Before World War II Memphis had a population of 300,000; today there are 750,000 people served by the library system in the city and county. Between 1960 and 1970 twelve branch library buildings and a new main library were constructed.

Once a very homogeneous community, the city now has a more varied population. Over one-third of the county's population is black. There is both considerable wealth and considerable poverty in Memphis, with approximately 225,000 of the population disadvantaged by federal government definitions.

Because of the greater diversity of the community and because it was felt that the library was apparently not reaching a large percentage of the population, the library's administration, headed by Director C. Lamar Wallis, early in 1970 decided that the library's goals and objectives needed to be clarified in the light of changing community needs. The library's Assistant Director for Public Services headed a nine member committee whose directive was to propose objectives for the 1970's. The Memphis process has been reported in the library literature.(3)

This objective setting activity, taking place in 1970-71, resulted in objectives which seemed to cut loose from the Memphis Public Library's past emphases. Supplanting the library's previous stress on recreation and culture

(3) Larry Earl Bone, "Study in Renewal: A Library in Search of Itself," Library Journal, Vol. 97, No. 2 (March 1, 1972), pp. 844-847.

as the library's primary functions were the priorities of information and education. In groups to be served those designated for top priority were adults, the disadvantaged, and the business community.

Following the initial statement of objectives in 1971, an expanded committee for the implementation of objectives was formed; task forces for the different areas of the objectives were asked to recommend specific objectives and action plans. This committee met monthly for almost two years. At each meeting specific objectives and action plans were proposed.

How successful has the Memphis activity been? As of the summer of 1974 there was clear indication that the objectives were having a marked effect on the library system. The library's program for the disadvantaged, previously funded by the federal government, was now completely supported by local funds in the library's operating budget. Progress was also being made in establishing a community information and referral service, with a large system-wide committee operating for this purpose.

Late in the fall of 1975, Shelby County received an unexpected two million dollars from federal revenue sharing funds. A resolution was passed by the County Court pledging one million dollars for human welfare, community information, or crime prevention. When the county appointed a citizen committee to review applications for this money, approximately 50 agencies submitted proposals, but the library's proposal for a community information center was one of three recommended for funding. With $368,000 proposed for this program, many in the community recognized that the library had become truly identified as an 'information center' in many eyes. Additionally, the State Library of Tennessee allocated to the Memphis Public Library and Information Center approximately

$65,000 for the equipping of a television studio in anticipation of the library's informational role in cable television.

Examples of innovation in the implementation of the library's objectives are its contract to operate the Shelby State Community College Library and its securing of a federal grant for a pilot project for public library service to Adult Basic Education. With 10,000 students enrolled in the adult basic education program in Memphis, most of whom are disadvantaged, this latter program fulfills both its objective to serve the disadvantaged and its objective of continuing education. Late in 1970, moreover, during the objectives deliberations, the Library Board added the words "and Information Center" to the library's name in order to denote a major aspect of the library's service.

What problems has the library experienced with its objectives? First, to the sizeable cuts of money for the purchase of recreational materials there has been some staff resistance, although relatively little complaint from the public and no overall decrease in the circulation of materials. On the other hand, some staff are critical because they feel that the library has not moved more boldly and more rapidly in internal restructuring in order to devote even more funds to programs for the disadvantaged. Additionally, some staff feel that the public was not sufficiently involved in the objective setting activity.

One area of the objectives that the library has been forced to re-examine has been its position concerning service to children. While the objectives had stated that service to children would not be greatly expanded in the 1970's because of the improvement of school library service, recent events have caused this position to be re-appraised. The advent of busing, with the resulting emergence of many private schools with inadequate libraries, has caused greater

dependence on branch library collections and staff. To many children now bused, moreover, the public library branch has assumed a greater importance as a neighborhood institution. For these reasons the library is allocating more funds for children's service than the original objectives committee had envisioned, although it still places service to children secondary to service to adults.

Memphis is assuming that, to be viable, goals and objectives must have constant vigilance. The library's Staff Institute Day held on November 6, 1974, was devoted to a review of the library's objectives, with Allie Beth Martin as keynote speaker. A list of achievements and failures with the objectives was presented to the staff as a whole. After the staff had broken into small groups for discussion of the objectives, questions were raised and recommendations were made. At the direction of the Library Board a new objectives committee in early 1975 began a review of the 1971 document.

Perhaps one of the greatest successes of the objectives setting process in Memphis is the heightened awareness of the library's purposes created among the staff. It seems fair to say, although the objectives may still be considered to be in the beginning stages, that the objectives activity in Memphis has had and is having a significant effect on that library system.

Minneapolis

The Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center, the second public library in the country to add the information designation to its name, is a progressive and well supported library program. With 450,000 people to serve, it is one of the large U. S. public libraries with high per capita support. Its Main Library, like the central library in many cities, is a strong regional resource, and has both heavy circulation and reference use. The INFORM service, a free research service, is a recent example of innovation in its Central Library information program. One senses that there is a great vitality in its Central Library service and that a heavy emphasis is placed on the information function.

In September, 1971, Ervin Gaines, at that time director of the library, appointed a thirteen member committee to recommend to the director goals for the library for the next three to five, but no more than ten years. The committee was divided into three subcommittees: (1) for the Central Library; (2) for the branch libraries; and (3) for administration. Unlike some libraries which formed their goals committees with a number of key administrative personnel, Director Gaines excluded administrative staff members from the committee, believing that the Library Board and the director already had easy access to the thinking of the 'top echelon'.

The final recommendations of this goals committee were divided into several subject areas: fiscal relations, collection, services, personnel administration, public relations, Central Library, community (branch) libraries. As is evident, therefore, these topics embraced the major broad areas of operation. However, although the director, in his instructions to the committee,

had suggested that the goals be "large projections, dreams even, of what the library should become," many of the twenty goals were somewhat short-term in nature and had characteristics of more specific objectives (e.g., "Continue to strive for funds to replace Walker branch library in 1972," "Publication of an up-to-date procedure manual," "Additional personnel," etc.).

Although many of the recommendations of the goals committee have apparently been useful, one receives the impression that the goals activity in Minneapolis has not had great impact on that library. Several staff members expressed the opinion that Minneapolis' goals efforts have been a failure. As proof of this, one further senses that the Minneapolis Board and staff as a whole seem not altogether clear on the library's goals and priorities. The chairman of the goals committee, in fact, expressed certain disappointments with the results and certain regrets that the committee had seemed never to have been able to move from its immediate concerns and problems to "the large projections, dreams even," asked for the director.

While the reasons can be easily understood, one wonders whether the decision to exclude administrative staff from the committee completely was a good one. In acknowledging that such exclusion may have caused some committee members to be less inhibited, one staff member wondered if the inclusion of some administrative staff might not have helped move the concerns and the discussions to a broader level. Library Director Gaines acknowledges that the goals as produced were not exactly what he intended, but were useful for what they were. As of the Fall of 1974, close to the resignation date of the director, the institution's clear course seemed to be emanating from the director, who believes strongly in the information function as the priority for the library.

While one might applaud the clear direction furnished by the library's administrator, the danger of the dependence on one person's ideas would seem obvious. Without clearly and formally stated goals and objectives which reflect priorities and which enhance long-range planning, the library would seem to be in a vulnerable position. With the departure of its director, from whom the library's clear direction has come, there is a question of whether the library's mission will remain a clear one or whether the library will tend to drift. The answer may lie with Minneapolis' new director.

New York City

For all practical purposes the New York Public Library consists of two library systems -- the Research Libraries and the Branch Libraries -- the one supported by private endowment, the other by tax funds. In spite of this unusual circumstance, both possess a common paid president of the Library Board and a common director, with a director of the Research Libraries and a director of the Branch Libraries reporting to the latter. For the purposes of this goals study, this report is limited to the Branch Library System since its characteristics are more in common with the other large public library systems studied.

Because of its size, and the considerable community differences among the three boroughs served -- Manhattan, the Bronx, and Staten Island -- it is easy to understand the difficulties in establishing goals and objectives that are equally applicable to all eighty-five branches in the New York Public Library Branch System. Still, as the Branch Libraries Director Edwin Holmgren points out, the need for goal setting has been obvious in recent years because of the continuing discussion among staff of "how you decide what your priorities are when you've got more of the old and more of the new that you are being pushed into and how you arrive at an overall posture for the branches."

For these reasons Director Holmgren in late 1973 asked his six coordinators -- three borough coordinators and three service coordinators -- to consider formal action on goals and priorities. This committee, as Coordinator of Adult Services Bernice MacDonald points out, was fortunate enough to have a number of recently adopted goals statements for its consideration. Although the committee studied these statements carefully, it concluded that most of

them were philosophical in tone without responsibility defined and without going far enough in outlining action plans. The committee also rejected the idea of a centrally set series of priorities for the system because of the size and diversity of the system.

Rather than looking to the kind of goals and priorities list that other libraries had adopted, the coordinators, in discussion with Mr. Holmgren, concluded that what was needed in the New York Public Library Branch Libraries was an analysis and planning process which would become the accepted means of operation out of which goals and objectives would emerge for the various sections of the branch libraries. Such an approach, the coordinators envisioned, would create an entirely new way of running the library.

In 1974 three branches in different parts of the city did a pilot study of this process, in which they engaged in a process of community analysis and branch analysis looking at the resources and needs of their areas on a cluster area basis. After this analysis there was considerable dialogue with borough staffs and central administrative staff as to what should be the priorities for those areas. Out of this a series of options was developed.

Because of the size of the system, it was felt by the director and the coordinators that it was better to begin on a branch and geographic level first, putting the responsibility for community analysis and first priority review on the local level. The next progressions would be to the borough level, central services, and technical services. Throughout the process it is hoped that with continual dialogue with the central administration, an overall consensus will emerge as to what the Branch Libraries ought to be doing.

Edwin Holmgren acknowledges that such an approach is a very lengthy process,

but feels that it is the only meaningful one for a system of this size. Both he and Bernice MacDonald, New York Public's Coordinator of Adult Services, acknowledge that a possible criticism of this strategy might be that the public has not been actively involved in the decisions as to local priorities. Moreover, one branch librarian expressed the opinion that the importance of this process has not been conveyed effectively to all branches and that some branches feel that this is one more activity imposed on the already overextended staffs.

ERIC

Philadelphia

Like many of the largest public library systems, the Free Library of Philadelphia has had to face tremendous change in the last ten years. Very strong from the early 1950's in improving and expanding its traditional library services and programs, it has been forced to make considerable adjustment to the urban problems of the 1960's -- both social and economic. The staff of the Free Library is the first to admit that such adjustment has not come easily, but the administrative officers feel that the library may have come through the worst. A hopeful sign in 1974 was that the library received its first increase in five years -- $1,630,000. It is easy to understand, therefore, why there is an upturn in the morale of the administration. It is also easy to understand the kind of climate of retrenchment in which the library has been operating. In 1970, at the direction of the city, for example, some twenty-five staff members were served notice that their positions were being terminated, a decision later reversed by the city after the notices had gone into the mail. The recovery of overall staff morale has been a slow process because of this incident, and because of the library's loss of positions as they were vacated.

The retrenchment process, unfortunately, occurred late in 1969, just after the senior administrative staff had been involved in a re-definition of the library's goals. This goal setting process took place in 1969 over a six month period as a prelude to the library's development of a master plan which it had been directed to develop by the city government. This master plan was an attempt by the city to reflect changed emphasis in city services on a comprehensive basis for the entire city of Philadelphia. Unfortunately, the library had completed approximately 75% of its master plan when it was caught up in

the city government's overall financial crunch. The library administration admits that from that time on and in the next four years its attention has had to be diverted from the objectives and long-range planning, and that all energies were spent on survival operations and survival planning.

As so many have recognized in the last few years, a public library, such as the Free Library of Philadelphia, has such a heterogeneous clientele comprising such a varied constituency with different demands that it finds it very difficult, if not impossible, to perform satisfactorily in all areas. For example, while Philadelphia has many people either living or working in the city with above average incomes, there are 18-20% of the city's residents on some kind of subsistence. In addition to large numbers in the poverty category, moreover, there are over 200,000 people in Philadelphia over 65 years of age. Each of these groups, and many others, are would-be targets for public library service.

It should be obvious, that if an institution wishes to excel in any area, it must establish priorities. In the process of preparing their master plan for the Free Library, the senior staff members participating acknowledged the necessity for priorities and set as the highest priority the provision of as much staff and money as possible for quality library service at the neighborhood level, including the development of the regional library concept, exemplified by the Northeast Regional Library. According to Director Doms, the master plan, including objectives, although never published, also placed emphasis on the information role of the library.

Like many of the directors of large public libraries that have experienced serious difficulties with financing in the last few years, Keith Doms feels that it is most difficult for the Free Library of Philadelphia to live by

established priorities. "All it takes is one budget reversal," says Doms, "and your priorities go out the window in terms of implementation." In spite of the aforementioned established priorities, moreover, Doms is uncertain about them in the light of Philadelphia's varied constituency. Moreover, he sees institutional change, mirroring new goals and objectives, as coming about very slowly unless there is governmental and community stability.

In Philadelphia, at least, political factors are also effective deterrents to meaningful goals and objectives setting. A particular irony in the Free Library's recent operating difficulties is the fact that branch library construction has not slowed in this period of financial difficulty. The political popularity of new branch buildings in neighborhoods has caused branch library construction to continue at the rate of one per year, at a time when the library is having difficulty maintaining an adequate level of service in existing agencies. This peculiar contradiction is the result of capital improvements decisions being made by the City Council and operating budget decisions by the mayor. Moreover, decisions which might involve re-structing, such as the closing of some little used agencies, are prevented because of political factors.

It should be clear that Philadelphia's success in establishing fresh goals and objectives has been minimized by the economic climate. One detects that the general staff is more concerned with the immediate operation, and possibly survival, of the library than with new directions and long-range planning. With the initial objectives and master planning statement having been an activity of the top administration and having never been published, moreover, the priorities may not be clearly understood by all staff. Obviously, the success of any goal setting will depend on the staff's understanding and acceptance.

The Free Library's recently increased budget may enable the library staff to renew its efforts at goals and objectives setting and to review where it is going and where its chief focus will be in the coming years.

ERIC

Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh's public library system, the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, has some characteristics which distinguish it from many large public libraries today. Within the local government context it operates as an instrument of the municipality but is governed completely by its own Board. Its Board chairman is a paid executive who serves not only as chairman of the Board of the Carnegie Library, but also of the Museum of Natural History and the Museum of Art. Thus, in terms of daily management, policy decisions can be expedited because of the proximity of the Board chairman and the library director.

In philosophy the Carnegie Library historically has differed also from some large public libraries because of its strong school-related ties -- from the elementary level through the academic. For years the Carnegie Library for all practical purposes served as the library for the nearby Carnegie Institute of Technology and the University of Pittsburgh. Although each in earlier years had modest collections of their own, the Carnegie Library's richer resources were essential for these institutions' students and faculties. Until 1946, Ralph Munn, the director of the Carnegie Library for many years, served simultaneously as director of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and of the library of the Carnegie Institute of Technology. Moreover, Director Munn's own strong convictions about service and collections kept the educational role for the library a priority. While this function proved to be a successful one for the library for a long period of time, the development in recent years of the libraries of the Carnegie Institute (now Carnegie Mellon University) and the University of Pittsburgh, along with the

improvement of the public school libraries in Pittsburgh, has changed the character of the service somewhat. The present director, Anthony Martin, sees the library directing its efforts more toward the adult lay person and beginning to function more like some other public libraries. Changes in programming in the Central Library and in the branches, including outreach programs, have changed the library's character tremendously, in Martin's opinion. Fortunately, because of the library's designation as a state resource library in science and technology and its role as a district library center, the serious collections have continued to be built.

Moreover, unlike many other large public library systems in the east, the Carnegie Library as of the fall of 1974 had not yet experienced serious financial problems. As a state resource library, approximately 18% of its support comes from the state. The rest of its support is divided almost equally between city (42%) and county (40%).

In terms of its stable economic situation, the Carnegie Library is in a relatively good position to engage in a goals and objectives process and in long-range planning. As of the fall of 1974, although there had been some activity, such efforts had not had much impact, and the library's director, Anthony Martin, doubted that the staff as a whole was clear on the library's goals.

This is especially ironic because the educational priority and the library's school-related role were so clear in past years when former director Munn felt it necessary to select a priority role for the library in light of limited funds. Related to this was the emphasis in selection and collection building for education rather than recreation. Some staff members cite, as

an example, the fact that in some years in the past only 50 fiction titles were purchased a year. Recent attempts on the part of the present library administration to have more popular material purchased have not been entirely successful. The lack of success in bringing about this change seems to reflect the fact that some staff members are not yet convinced that the school-related role should not still be a priority. The difference in philosophy of an adult coordinator and many branch people in this respect finally caused the library to eliminate the coordinator position.

In an effort to review the direction in which the Carnegie Library was going and to assist it in meaningful change, Carnegie's director, Anthony Martin, in 1971 set up a committee, with Associate Director Joseph Falgione as chairman, to provide recommendations from which goals could be formed. The nine reports resulting from the committee's activity included some short-range recommendations and some long-range ones, but did not include a recommendation of priorities. These reports were submitted to the director. Apparently because of many pressing daily problems and crises, the director never gave any reactions to the staff. This lack of communication back to the committee has caused cynicism on the part of some staff members about the goals process.

Realizing the necessity for clear goals and objectives, however, the director once again in April, 1974, appointed an eight-member committee to draft a statement of goals, using the 1971 reports as a departure point. Associate Director Joseph Falgione has appointed three subcommittees (Audio-Visual, Service to Institutions, Daily Administration) to accomplish the assignment. At the end of this process he hopes that the committee can recom-

mend priorities. In order to make this committee's activity more meaningful, moreover, he plans to have the director meet periodically with the committee. The final reports of the committee are due in the spring of 1975.

Toronto

Although a goals setting activity took place some seven years ago in a six month period at the Toronto Public Library, much has taken place in the intervening years if not to render those goals obsolete, at least to make the need for a review obvious.

Since the adoption of those goals the Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, a regional board, was established by law in 1967, resulting in a separate library administration and, subsequently, in a signed agreement, conveying the Central Library collections, building, and staff from the Toronto Public Library Board to the Metropolitan Toronto Library Board. This move changed the Toronto Public Library from a system on the conventional large city pattern of Central Library and branches to a system of 24 community libraries serving the city of Toronto. The Metropolitan Toronto Library Board, on the other hand, with the Central Library will serve all of the people and all of the libraries in the Metropolitan Toronto region. This region consists of six local government bodies and the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

While such division of responsibility would seem to assist in the definition of purpose and in the clarification of priorites, there have apparently been problems in doing so because of the different perceptions among the boards and the libraries as to what role the Metropolitan Toronto Library Board should plan. At present the Board seems to have chosen a role for the Central Library as a largely non-circulating public research library. Moreover, the impression gained is that the Toronto Public Library seems to be in a period of adjustment to its new structure as a system of community libraries alone. This change, according to Toronto Public Library's Deputy Director Newman Mallon, is forcing

the library to build up more specialized circulating collections than was formerly the case in the branch libraries of the Toronto Public Library.

Metropolitan Toronto Library Board Chief Librarian John Parkhill feels that his board and administrative staff have a clear idea of what role the Central Library should plan, but observes that there has been some difficulty in educating the staff to the metropolitan concept and to an understanding that the Central Library is no longer a Toronto centered library but one with responsibility to the entire metropolitan area. Moreover, there seems to be some general questioning on the part of the six libraries in the region of the Board's and administrative staff's decision that the purpose of the library is to serve the adult user in his specialist role with material not found in his local library and with the idea of the Central Library as largely a non- circulating research library rather than simply a large collection of depth to serve both reference and circulating needs. Furthermore, while there seems to be a general consensus among the Central Library staff as to what the nature of the collection should be, Director Parkhill feels that there may be some lack of understanding and agreement on the part of the staff as to what type of service the library is giving, because of the feeling by some that the Central Library is a library entirely for scholars.

From an outsider's point of view there seems to be a strong need at this time for a coordinated goals and objectives setting activity in the metropolitan Toronto region which would involve staff, public and library Boards. Certainly many in the area have strong individual opinions of what needs the public library should be serving and how, but there does not seem to be a clear consensus. A group effort in deciding overall goals and priorities should help effect such a needed consensus, it would seem.

Tulsa

Although the Tulsa City-County Public Library has considered itself involved in the planning process for a number of years, only since January, 1971, has the staff as a whole and the governing library commission been working together on the process. Before that time most of the planning process was a one-person operation handled by a member of the library's administrative staff. In 1971, however, because of the Library Commission's strong interest in goals and objectives setting, the library initiated a process which has involved a large number of staff members, the public, and the Commission itself.

To begin the undertaking the Library Commissioners requested a series of three orientation workshops for themselves. Staff workshops also were held on planning and evaluation and on management by objectives. These latter workshops included top and middle management as well as representatives from all other levels. Additionally, a public hearing was held to obtain library users' opinions.

Between January, 1971, and November, 1974, Tulsa's Long-Range Plans: A Ten-Year Projection went through eight drafts. Divided into two parts -- "Purpose of the Tulsa City-County Library System" and "Goals of the Tulsa City-County Library" -- the document was the result of a number of activities and efforts, including studies of various library staff members, the evaluations of different services, contacts with community groups and individual citizens, and extensive reading and observation. Moreover, in order that its efforts not be conducted in isolation from its larger community, the library had conferences with representatives of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the Indian Nations Council of Governments, and it participated in the

Chamber of Commerce "Goals for Tulsa" in 1970.

The goals section of Long-Range Plans consists of seven major areas -- improved service patterns, innovative services, resources, personnel, facilities, evaluation, and finance. Under each of these areas, specific objectives were listed.

In 1973, Long-Range Plans was published in its eighth draft. Included were priorities now implemented. Tulsa's Library Director, Allie Beth Martin views this process as a way of life in Tulsa and feels that such an approach has had a revitalizing effect on the library's program. Because the library was not visited, it is not possible to record the opinions of other staff members.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The goals and objectives setting process seems clearly to be an activity whose time has come in many libraries, as the foregoing will indicate. Many libraries, large and small, are undergoing self-examination. At the time of the publication of this report, there is news of additional public libraries, some large, some small, which are actively analyzing their purposes. For example, in the winter of 1975, the Chicago Public Library and the Seattle Public Library were other large libraries involved in the process in intensive fashion. Like the libraries covered in this survey, many libraries in the future will have success to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the method used, the commitment of those involved, and the overall political and financial climate.

The business world for some time has made goals and objectives an essential part of progressive management. Because public libraries have come to such a process late, and because many such efforts are in their initial stages, it is too soon to assess the overall impact of goals and objectives setting as a management technique in large public libraries.

If one searches library literature before 1970, one discovers that there was little documentation before that time to guide the libraries interested in undertaking such a process. Now, however, various reports and articles describe what has been done in particular libraries. Norman Crum's Library Goals and Objectives: Literature Review, published in 1973 as an ERIC report, provides a useful survey of the literature on the subject.[3]

---

[3] Crum, op. cit.

While there are many general guides, moreover, a recent article has reviewed basic principles that should be followed in the setting of objectives within a library context.[4] In addition, most libraries are willing to share their experiences, whether or not they have reported them in the literature. Various approaches, as this report will indicate, have been used to arrive at goals and objectives. Any one of a number of approaches may be valid, as long as it incorporates such basic elements as those listed by Crum:

1. State mission.
2. Write set of guiding principles.
3. Identify and articulate real objectives.
4. Be specific, distinctive, and brief.
5. Use commonly understood terms.
6. Develop meaningful measures of expected accomplishments.
7. Make goals and objectives challenging.
8. Get involvement.
9. Determine objectives for all library levels.
10. Balance set of goals and objectives.
11. Establish order of priority.
12. Produce draft, discuss and then redraft.
13. Agree, recommend and obtain approval.
14. Publish and publicize.
15. Put objectives to practical use.
16. Review and re-examine periodically.
17. Modify as necessary.[5]

Using these basic guidelines the wise administrator may select successful features of a number of library approaches, if he wishes to take his library through the process.

While the experiences of some large libraries' activities are described briefly in the previous pages, some overall observations and conclusions about

---

(4) Ibid., p. 29.

(5) Arthur P. Young, "Generating Library Goals and Objectives," Illinois Libraries, Vol. 56, No. 9 (November, 1974), pp. 862-866.

the goals and objectives setting efforts and the barriers to such efforts are in order.

First, no goals and objectives for a library will ever be successfully implemented unless the library staff as a whole becomes involved. Means must be devised, therefore, to involve staff as broadly as possible and to make the library's goals and objectives a reality at every level. In a number of libraries studied the goals and objectives were still not a reality because many staff members had not become involved. This is especially true in the largest libraries, where as in other large institutions, communication is an almost insurmountable problem. The libraries where the goals and objective setting activity has generated the most interest are the ones where staff have participated at all levels. Libraries where either only the top staff or lower level staff are involved somehow seem to falter. In short, if goals and objectives setting as a management device is most effective, it should be designed to incorporate all elements of the staff. This may suggest a number of simultaneous efforts at different levels on the part of libraries engaged in the process.

Some of the libraries studied have been more successful than others in involving staff. The New York Public Library's present experiment of starting at the library's grass roots level with goal setting will be interesting to watch, although it will ultimately have to be broadened if the staff as a whole is to feel involved. In this surveyor's opinion, the public libraries of Dallas, Memphis, and Tulsa have had the most extensive staff involvement, although even in Memphis, where the objectives have been heavily emphasized, some staff members still feel that it is an administrative activity in which they are not involved. As indicated before, however, in those libraries

where large numbers of staff have participated, considerable enthusiasm and interest have been generated.

Secondly, unless the administrators of libraries electing to go through the process expect to follow it up with actions which will implement the goals, the process should be avoided. Once staff are stimulated by such a process they do expect changes and are most critical if there are none. Even in libraries such as Dallas and Memphis where the goals and objectives have had considerable influence, some staff members have been impatient because change and redirection have not come about faster. In some cases, overall morale has suffered when the staff felt that the goals and objectives setting had brought no results.

Similarly, community involvement in present goals and objectives setting activity has been minimal thus far in the majority of the libraries studied. The most admirable efforts at community involvement have been in Washington, D. C., where actual community opinions through meetings in each of the city's branches were solicited before the staff itself looked at the goals, and in Tulsa, where the community has been involved from the beginning. There may be a number of explanations for this lack of community involvement in many libraries' efforts. One is that librarians feel that the value of such involvement will be minimal. Another is that librarians do not always feel confident in their ability to relate to their constituents. Even if they do relate some may fear that the community's ideas of what the library's role should be may not coincide with theirs.

Moreover, although the library world talks a great deal about community <u>analysis</u>, it is difficult to identify libraries which have engaged in community analysis in intensive fashion prior to or during their goals and objectives setting efforts. While many librarians give support to the idea of community analysis, this surveyor observed no skillful methodology at work. One suspects that many

libraries have not yet learned how to analyze their communities, or even how to use other studies of the community for their purposes.

As pointed out earlier, most libraries are in the initial stages of goals, and objectives setting. Thus, no sophisticated means have been devised to measure success or to gauge whether the right choices were made in any goal setting. Presumably, community response to the library's program would be an overall measure of success, and no library studied has had new goals and objectives long enough to make definite conclusions in this respect. Ultimately, however, libraries with specific objectives will need to develop performance measurements to test the objectives.

Finally, there are some major obstacles which libraries must overcome if their efforts in setting goals and objectives are to be productive. First, large public libraries, like other large institutions, must cope with bureaucracy and with its effectiveness in blocking communication. The greatest problem in library management, if the libraries visited are any indication, is internal communication. Additionally, the bureaucracy impedes change. Large institutions find it difficult to change, and the larger they are, this surveyor found, the greater the difficulty.

Secondly, a recurring complaint of the administrators was that crisis management militated against goals and objectives and most other long-range planning efforts. Ralph Blasingame's examination of the prototype large urban public library further confirms this conclusion.[6] Almost all of the administrators mentioned the barriers that daily problems and crises erect to prevent

---

[6]Ralph U. Blasingame, Jr., "The Public Library as an Urban Phenomenon", (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1973).

creative long-range planning. Ironically, it seems obvious that established long-range goals and objectives, if implemented, would minimize the occurence of situations where crisis management is the order of the day. If a real commitment to a library's goals and objectives exists on the part of those who administer a library, decisions can be made for the organization which will reflect its stated priorities and will minimize the crisis atmosphere.

Thirdly, the directors of the largest public libraries -- Baltimore, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia -- expressed directly and indirectly the futility of goals and objectives setting in the present financial climate, citing examples of programs contributing to the libraries' objectives which had to be scrapped in times of financial retrenchment. The most notable example is the agreement signed in 1973 by Mayor John Lindsay to award a $2,000,000 grant to Brooklyn Public Library to set up a city-wide information and referral system. This program is yet to be funded and some feel it may never be. A degree of cynicism, therefore, exists on the part of some of the directors whose systems have been hardest hit by financial problems.

Although any library system needs money to achieve its goals and objectives, some accomplishment of goals may be made by overall restructuring. Such restructuring seems to come hard for a number of reasons. One of the major problems occurs when new priorities come into conflict with priorities affecting long established services. Even though administrators and staffs believe that they are committed to a new priority, frequently the maintenance of the status quo is so strongly entrenched that it is difficult, if not impossible, to restructure an organization in order to effect meaningful change. Only Detroit, among the libraries studied, has done serious restructing in order to achieve its goals and objectives.

Sometimes political factors negate serious goals and objectives setting

efforts, according to a number of library directors, especially as such factors affect capital expansion. In more than one library, the director indicated that restructuring would be attempted were it not for political repercussions. The closing of branches, for example, cannot be easily accomplished, even in areas where use has declined, because of neighborhood backlash. Moreover, because of the political popularity of new branch libraries, additional branches are sometimes opened when the library system is not able to support existing agencies.

Another factor which may impede restructuring is unionization. This now exists in some of the largest libraries and can create strong resistance to change. Since unions involve people, it is obvious that any goals and objectives setting process may be simplified and even accomplished, if means can be devised to win over those who will be involved in implementing the goals and objectives, whether this be a union or any other strong element of the staff.

Have the large public libraries which have engaged in a goal and objective setting activity totally embraced this process? There seems to be no question that in general, in the present period, consciousness is being raised to the need for meaningful goals and objectives. This survey would indicate that some libraries have become most aware, and some still have not, even though they may have gone through the motions. Some seem to feel a pressure from the profession to identify their goals; others are skeptical of such a process. It goes without saying that unless there is complete commitment to such an approach, usually from the top management of a library, the process may turn out to be an exercise in futility, with little lasting effect or significance.

A similar commitment to the implementation of the goals and objectives must follow their statement if they are to be successfully implemented. Goals and objectives are judged not by their mere statement but by the degree to

which they affect an institution's operation and its ongoing activities, and whether in the final analysis they are successfully implemented. One would hope that the present efforts at goals and objectives setting will not make the same mistakes as some of the past perfunctory efforts. The most serious mistake is the drafting of a hollow, all-inclusive, general statement strong on rhetoric, but short on meaning -- one which can give little real direction to any public library program. No matter how admirable the statement may be -- whether it be called goals or objectives -- it must include action plans. It must include, or at least be followed by, a concrete blueprint which shows how and when the goals or objectives will be achieved. It was this surveyor's opinion that libraries feel less secure with such specifics than with generalities.

Not surprising, only a few libraries seemed to have clearly identified priorities. An inescapable conclusion, moreover, is that librarians continue to resist priority setting, sometimes quite defensively, in spite of the exhortations to do so from such diverse camps as management experts, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries A Strategy for Public Library Change, and prominent library leaders. Even outside the library field management experts counsel that "no business can do everything. Even if it has money, it has to set priorities. The worst thing is to try to do a little bit of everything. This makes sure that nothing is being accomplished. It is better to pick the wrong priority than none at all."(7) A most familiar refrain heard during

(7) Peter A. Drucker, Management (New York, Harper and Row, 1974), p. 119.

this survey was that "I don't believe in putting all the library's eggs in one basket." Translated, this seems to mean that the available money in most libraries will continue to be spread thinly over a variety of functions. Even when this sentiment was not so expressed, it was frequently implied. Lowell Martin pinpoints the problem of such a point of view when he observes:

> . . .The public library seeks to do almost everything. In practice it provides a wide range of services, each to only a fragmentary extent, and each utilized by a very small portion of the population. . . .This eclectic policy was tolerable -- perhaps even best -- in a period when the vitalizing values of the society were not being questioned and when more public money could be expected as the years went by. However, the policy has to be reconsidered when both intellectual leaders and government officials are asking why we maintain each public agency and how much support it should get.[8]

Public librarians should not wait for <u>others</u> to ask why the public library should be maintained. They should ask this question and answer it. If public librarianship has come of age, it must make priority selection a way of life. This selection of priorities may turn out to be the most difficult part of the whole goals and objectives setting process, and may in the final analysis be the best test of the effectiveness of the process.

. . . . . .

The years of the 1970's may be the watershed for the large American public library. This surveyor observed that it is a period of sober analysis and reflection in most libraries he visited. Faced with changing communities and changing needs of the people within these communities, the libraries have two principal choices: they will either change or be assigned an ineffectual role in urban society. The goals and objectives experience could be the dying gasp of the

---

[8] Lowell A. Martin, "Standards for Public Libraries", <u>Library Trends</u>, Vol. 21, No. 2 (October, 1972), p. 176.

American public library movement; it could, on the other hand, effect a veritable renaissance. There seems to be strong indication that the libraries will respond to the challenge, albeit slowly. Unquestionably, the present period's struggle to arrive at viable goals and objectives is a necessary one. Perhaps by trial and error these libraries will get there. But time is at a premium, and it will require commitment and dedication on the part of those who are directing these libraries, not to speak of courage and determination.

APPENDIX

INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED IN THE COURSE OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES STUDY FOR THE COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES

Baltimore (Enoch Pratt Free Library)

Mr. Edwin Castagna, Director
Miss Marian Sanner, Acting Assistant Director
Mr. Henry Callard, Trustee
Miss Marian Bell, Head, General Reference Department
Mr. John Blegen, Adult Librarian, General Reference Department
Mr. John Burgan, Chief of the Central Library
Mr. Nelson Freed, Fiscal Management Office
Mr. Rolf Halverson, Executive Assistant to the Director
Mr. Neil R. Jordahl, Head, Humanities Department

Meetings Attended:

Board of Trustees

Brooklyn Public Library

Mr. Kenneth Duchac, Director
Mr. Larry Brandwein, Deputy Director
Mrs. Dorothy Nyren, Chief of the Central Library
Miss Dorothy Harris, Superintendent of Branches
Mr. J. R. Canham, Personnel Director
Mr. Roy Miller, Coordinator of Adult Services
Miss Merlene Rosenberg, President, Brooklyn Library Guild

Meetings Attended:

Coordinator's Meeting
Administrative Council

Dallas Public Library

Mrs. Lillian Bradshaw, Director
Mr. William J. Slaughter, Associate Director, Management Services
Mr. Richard L. Waters, Associate Director, Public Services
Miss Linda Allmand, Chief of Branch Services
Mr. Tom Bogie, Head, History and Social Sciences Division
Mr. Ervin Eatenson, Adult Coordinator
Mr. Richard Miller, Librarian, Lancaster-Kiest Branch Library
Mrs. Mildred Williams, Personnel Officer

Meetings Attended:

Municipal Library Advisory Board
Central Library Division Heads
Administrative Personnel Meeting

Denver Public Library

Mr. Henry C. Shearouse, Jr., City Librarian
Mr. Joseph Kimbrough, Director of Public Services
Mr. Thomas LeFree, Director of Planning and Evaluation
Mrs. Ruth Newman, Assistant Director of Public Services
Mr. Cyril Coverley, West Regional Coordinator
Miss Julia Dees, Head, Sociology and Business Department
Mrs. Priscilla Finnell, Public Relations
Mrs. Eleanor Gehres, Head, Western History Department
Mr. Gene Kane, Head, Circulation Department
Miss Kathryn LaRose, Head of Sociology
Mr. Melvin Vanderhoff, Personnel Officer

Meetings Attended:

City Librarian's Advisory Committee
Materials Selection Committee

Detroit Public Library

Mrs. Clara Jones, Director
Mr. Robert Croneberger, Deputy Director
Miss Louise Keller, Coordinator of Technical Services
Mrs. Helen Sisson, Coordinator of Ref. Services and Head, Sociology and Economics
Mrs. Kathryn Steadman, Head, Order Department
Miss Michele Kapecky, Head, TIP Clearinghouse
Mr. Norm Maas, Head, TIP Central
Miss Florence Tucker, Research and Grants
Miss Jane Morgan, Head of the Main Library
Miss Margaret Sellers, Personnel Officer

Meetings Attended:

Detroit Public Library Commission
General Staff Meeting

Queens Borough Public Library

Mr. Milton Byam, Director ---- (formerly Director, District of Columbia Public Library)

Metropolitan Toronto Library Board

Mr. John T. Parkhill, Director
Mr. Anthony H. Wingfield, Secretary-Treasurer
Miss Margery Allen, Head Central Library
Mr. Allan Suddon, Head, Fine Arts
Mrs. Laura Murray, Audio-Visual Coordinator
Mr. Leonard Wentheimer, Languages Coordinator
Mr. Bruce Fairley, Head, Production and Equipment Department

Meetings Attended:

Administrative Council

Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center

Dr. Ervin Gaines, Director
Miss Marion Huttner, Head, Central Subject Departments
Miss Patricia Dahl, Head, Community Libraries
Miss Ingrid Pedersen, Community Services Book Selection Librarian
Miss Elizabeth Shelver, Personnel Officer
Miss Martina Brown, Head, History Department
Miss Betty Engebretson, Adult Book Selection Librarian
Mr. Robert Pignatello, Head, Business Department

Meetings Attended:

Minneapolis Board of Trustees
Director's Administrative Council
Citizens Capital Improvements Planning Committee

New York Public Library

Mr. John Cory, Director of the New York Public Library
Mr. Edwin Holmgren, Director of the Branch Library System
Mr. Don Allyn, Administrative Assistant
Miss Bernice MacDonald, Coordinator of Adult Services
Miss Katherine O'Brien, Chief, Mid-Manhattan Library
Mr. Robert Sheehan, Librarian, History and Social Science Department
Bronx Branch Librarian

Meetings Attended:

Coordinators' Council Meeting

Philadelphia (Free Library of Philadelphia)

Mr. Keith Doms, Director
Mr. Donald Hunt, Deputy Director
Miss Marie Davis, Associate Director
Mr. David Coolley, Branch Librarian
Mr. Henry Kapenstein, Chief, Central Library
Mr. Harry Reiff, Book Selection Specialist
Mr. Geoffrey Wilson, Head, Adult Book Selection

Action Library

Mr. John Benford
Mrs. Verna Shamovian

Meetings Attended:

Board of Trustees
Director's Advisory Council

Pittsburgh (Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh)

Mr. Anthony Martin, Director
Mr. Don Potter, Senior Associate Director
Dr. Ann Hall, Associate Director for Administrative Services
Mr. Joe Falgione, Associate Director for Central Readers' Services
Mrs. Leonore Bayus, Head, Public Relations
Mrs. Helen DeWind, Head, Downtown Branch
Mr. Al Kamper, Coordinator of Technical Services
Miss Judy Kunco, Junior Staff Member
Mr. Dan Pfoutz, Head, Science and Technology
Miss Claire Pyle, Head of Branches

Toronto Public Library

Mr. Newman Mallon, Assistant Chief Librarian and Secretary-Treasurer to Board
Miss Catherine Toles, Head of Public Services