

1989

Library Services Improvement Act (1989): Correspondence 01

Patty Sullivan

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_56

Recommended Citation

Sullivan, Patty, "Library Services Improvement Act (1989): Correspondence 01" (1989). *Library Services Improvement Act (1989)*. Paper 7.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_56/7

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Services Improvement Act (1989) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

TO: Rick Jerue
Ricardo Martinez
Michael Lance

Sandy Crary
Susan Hattan
Becky Rogers

FROM: Patty Sullivan *PS*

DATE: April 21, 1989

RE: LSCA Reauthorization

The following list outlines issues raised at the recent LSCA reauthorization hearings or raised by members of the library community and the Department of Education regarding needed modifications to the Library Services and Construction Act.

1) **Technology:** need to provide assistance for the purchase and maintenance of technology in public libraries similiar to HEA Title II-D.

Suggestions: Add Title II-B for purchase and maintenance of equipment, specify that these funds could be used in Title III type activities, and increase authorization.

Amend Title III to include the equipment as a tool to use in resource sharing and increase authorization.

ALA: Concerned about providing access to materials in electronic format.

Note: Costs of technology are not driven soley by the number of users, but instead are also effected by distances. (ex: Phone Lines/Services) Consider modifications to formula that would accomodate funding for technology that would consider size and population.

2) **Preservation:** need to specify (require?) as allowable activity training by the State Library Agency on basic preservation techniques. Perhaps also fund some preservation projects.

ALA: Add Title III-B for preservation activities (training and preservation planning ex: temperature control, storage, ect.) such that all libraries could participate. Permit State Agency to share this information with all sizes and types of libraries as well as other repositories (historical societies) Increase Title III authorization to reflect new program.

- 3) Clarify the relationship between Title I and Title III funds for accounting purposes.

Suggestions: Increase Title III funding.. people use Title I funds for Title III because of the lack of Title III funding.

Tighten up the definition of service to the public in Title III and add to Title I some notation regarding the use of funds for resource sharing.

ALA/COSLA: Amend Title I to allow that subgrants be made to library systems or networks, which may include other than public libraries, provided that the grant will improve services to public library patrons.

- 4) Maintenance of Effort: periodic review and revision of Maintenance of effort requirements.

Question: Should institutions be required to continue services when they are no longer needed? or when the service population has shifted significantly?

COSLA: Review and adjust allocation every five years.

- 5) Literacy: need for state library agency to have the opportunity to comment on application for Library Literacy Grant as it relates to the overall state plan.

COSAL/ALA support this recommendation

- 6) Research and Dissemination: require the Department of Education to compile research on library usage and the impact of the LSCA programs. Require the Department of Ed to disseminate info on model grant projects. Report to Congress? *will not be necessary!*

- 7) MURLS: Ratable reduction of MURLS grants in the event of a reduced appropriations

COSLA: OK..language provided.

I suggest that we use this listing as a starting place for drafting an LCSA bill. It doesn't look like we need to make any major changes in this legislation. I am optimistic that with such minor changes, we can more effectively argue to keep this a clean bill.

authorization levels