

PROCEEDINGS
of the
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

**Steering Committee
on the
Implementation of the Management Survey**

**January 30, 1956
Edgewater Beach Hotel
Chicago, Illinois**

The MASTER REPORTING COMPANY, Inc.
Law Stenography • Conventions • General Reporting

CHICAGO
105 WEST ADAMS STREET
Franklin 2055

CLEVELAND
STANDARD BUILDING
Main 0894

NEW YORK
51 MADISON AVENUE
LExington 2-5588

WASHINGTON
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
National 8558

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Monday Evening Session January 30, 1956	
Opening remarks by Miss Lucile Morsch.....	1
Report by Mr. States Mead on SCIMS.....	8
Discussion.....	52
Adjournment.....	57

MONDAY EVENING SESSION

January 30, 1956

The Council Steering Committee of the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting convened at eight thirty-five o'clock in the Grand Ballroom, the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, with Miss Lucile Morsch, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

CHAIRMAN LUCILE M. MORSCH: This, as I assume you all know, is an open meeting of the American Library Association Council Steering Committee on implementation of the management survey called rather late and consequently not on the program.

I feel very gratified that this many members of the Association were able to be here for this. It was impossible at the late hour at which we decided this would be a good thing to do to schedule it within the Tuesday to Friday schedule, and we wanted to have an opportunity to answer some of the questions that would be in many people's minds before all of the various division and other group meetings devoted to the discussion of the report or the American Library Association reorganization took place this week.

We thought that you would all have had an opportunity to read the report because of the wide distribution that we gave it two weeks ago. However, unless you had the time and the inclination really to study it, it would be probably desirable to have a chance to find out just how well it had gotten across,

what questions you had, and so we asked Mr. Mead to come tonight to make an analysis of the report in the light of the management survey to see to what extent he thought we had gone along with the spirit and intent of the survey, to what extent we might have deviated from it intentionally or unintentionally.

Before I turn the meeting over to him, however, I want to tell you about a few changes that the Steering Committee has already made in the report.

As you read it, you saw that this was not intended to be the report that we will be making to the Council on Thursday night.

The intention of putting this out in advance was not to let you know what our thinking was at the time of the preparation of this report, but to let you know that we were trying to keep open minds on a number of things until you had had a chance to see it, to think about it, and to let us have your reactions.

We also have worked under as great pressure as we have been able to because we thought that it was your wish that the survey be implemented as soon as possible. Consequently, we put out this preliminary report before we were entirely satisfied on some points, and knowing that we would want to have another meeting to settle some details.

This, we have done, and as a result we are ready to

tell you about a few changes.

I won't go through the report line by line to tell you what the changes are, but just in general explain that in regard to the machinery for nominating members of the general assembly, we agreed that we had given the Nominating Committee too much power, and we had given the divisions too little opportunity to name their representatives in the general assembly.

We had been looking to the recommendation of having the divisions suggest the people to the Nominating Committee to be nominated, but the Nominating Committee would have the final saying of which one of those suggested would be put on the ballot was made because we were trying to carry out the recommendation of the management survey that the general assembly should be more widely representative of the Association and the other recommendations you will remember about it.

However, in further consideration, we have decided that the divisions should nominate rather than merely suggest the names of their representatives in the general assembly, but to keep the provision in the preliminary report that the election shall be by the whole membership.

We also decided to eliminate the alternates entirely so wherever there is reference to alternates, we deleted this.

Now, just a word to explain how that came about. We

have had a good many proxies serving in the place of members of the Council. This, every one agreed, was bad because people came up prepared to act as councilors. In order to have an informed substitute, when it was necessary to have one, we had considered this alternate system.

On reconsideration we have decided that was looking back to the days of the Council, not ahead to the responsibilities we were putting on the general assembly, that here we expect the members to be a more responsible group, to make more of an effort to get there, and that we believe that with a group as large as approximately 200, the assembly being about the same size as the Council, it would not be necessary to have either alternates or proxies.

A second change is in respect to the Executive Board. We had recommended in the report that when a member of the general assembly was elected to the Executive Board, he would stay as a member of the general assembly because all of the Executive Board are to be members of the general assembly, but that his place would be filled in the same manner in which his election took place at the next election.

We realized it would be a year lapse in there, but we had an alternate who could step in. In throwing out the alternates, we reconsidered this and decided that it was better not to replace him until the expiration of the term for which he was elected to the general assembly, even though

this might mean that having been elected to the Executive Board, for a four-year term, his time in the general assembly would be extended.

He would then become an ex officio member of the general assembly at the time that his term for which he had been elected to the general assembly expired, until the term for which he was elected to the Executive Board had expired.

In regard to the associations and councils, we explained that there would be some overlapping between associations and councils that would be taken care of by the groups formed as a result of dual membership, that is, the groups of people represented by the dark shaded areas on that organization chart that was attached to the report, and we said but we had not worked out clearly enough how these groups would function.

We have now agreed that these groups would function either as interdivisional committees or as sections of the councils.

This means that the councils might be subdivided into sections by type of library if they have any need for such an organization, but the associations would not subdivide by type of activity. The reason for this being to keep the activities of each group, the responsibility for the activity of each group, in a single channel.

I think this will come out more clearly as we go along

if we don't understand it right now.

In the councils the preliminary report deviated from one of the recommendations of the management survey by recommending that a single council be established for the acquisitions and cataloging and other technical services. Since this was reproduced, we have agreed to go back to the recommendation of the management survey with a separate council for acquisitions and resources and another for cataloging and classification.

Just one more word before I turn the meeting over to Mr. Mead, and that is in regard to terminology.

We hope that none of you will be disturbed by terminology in the report.

If you don't like the name that we christened your division with, it wasn't with any intention of exercising your will. We think that every division should have a chance to choose its own name. The names of committees should be studied by the Committee on Boards and Committees, and we haven't tried to go into this.

We have merely used either present names or names that came out in the management survey. The only place where we do intend to make a recommendation in this respect at the present time is in regard to the use of the name "Council."

There has been considerable discussion of the use of the word "Council" for divisions by type of activity. It has

been a very useful thing for the committee, and I am sure for every one studying the reorganization to get clearly in mind the difference between the two types of divisions in the association that will be available for membership, one by type of activity, the council type and the other type by library type called associations in the report. We think that this terminology, however useful it has been in the study of reorganization, is not something that needs to be perpetuated in the names of the divisions or used in any way. In other words, if one of the councils wants to call itself an association, it should have that right, that all of the divisions should be able to decide on their own names.

However, we all agree that the word "Divisions" does clearly represent the status of a division in the American Library Association, and that if that word "Division" does not appear in the name, it should be used in conjunction with the name as the ACRL, for instance, now calls itself an Association of College and Reference Libraries, a Division of the American Library Association, to make this relationship clear.

If, then, the word "Council" is not to be reserved for a type of division, in the opinion of the Steering Committee there would be no reason not to retain it for the American Library Association Council rather than to call the Council a General Assembly.

There was also some fear among some of our members--

I don't mean Steering Committee members, but the Association members--the term "General Assembly" would be confused with the general membership meeting because it is often so used.

I am going to ask, however, that in our discussion tonight -- and you probably will agree that it would be desirable for the discussions throughout the week--to stick to the terminology that appears in the management survey, and the preliminary report, because I think you will all agree we will know what we are talking about better if we talk about the general assembly, the councils and the associations, and especially because we want to emphasize the changes that we are making in the general assembly that are not just change of name, but I think for this presentation, and because you will be referring to the survey report and to the preliminary report, it would be well for us to continue on with this terminology.

I will now turn the meeting over to Mr. Mead and at the conclusion of his presentation, we will have time for some limited discussion. I warn you that it will have to be limited because I know it could go on until tomorrow morning. We won't be able to answer everybody's questions on everything, but after all, that is the reason you are having all these meetings all this week. Mr. Mead. [Applause]

MR. STATES MEAD: First, I would like to say that it is very nice to be here in your midst this evening again this

year after having been privileged to be with you at your midwinter meeting last year and at your annual conference.

I would like to address a few words to my role, as I see it, as your consultant in this instance.

Following the action at Philadelphia, your Executive Board saw fit to, you might say, keep me within reach. I think that there was a little malice of forethought here because, after all, this meant I had to stick around and face the headaches I gave you, [Laughter] but I think they recognized that the "proof of the pudding is in the eating," and although the pudding looked very nice, you have to dig into it.

Your Steering Committee has dug into it, and there are some problems that have to be faced and some interpretations that are required, and as they have gone more deeply into many of the areas, that the survey could only, you might say, scratch, it behooves me to follow with them their excursion into these areas, and attempt to interpret and continue the thinking that was established in the basic survey to the depth of the additional study that they have made.

I am not unhappy with this continuation even though I find a great many problems that must be faced in resolving the details. I am not unhappy because first, I am very personally interested in your association, and in this problem that you have tackled.

Secondly, I have such great confidence in the basic principles which you have adopted and in the capacity of your members, and in particular, your leadership in the divisions and the American Library Association as a whole, to apply these principles successfully, given the time and opportunity to do so.

So I am here, and I might divert a little, to say in spite of a change in my own status. When I was here last, I was engaged in the professional consulting area of our firm's work, and today I am engaged in the internal management of our own firm because we found that we had grown a good deal like Topsy. [Laughter] The shoemaker's child was suffering, and so we directed one of our principles in the field of our consulting work to the internal administrative management planning in our own firm, and that is what I am doing now except for such demands as a very valued and enjoyable client as the American Library Association calls for my services.

I might say also that it was a break, personally, to step out of the great traveling that is involved in the professional consulting area of our firms, and that played a little part in my willingness to get into these headaches inside of our own firm.

Now, as I see my role, it is not to explain the basic report. That was done, and by your action the basis has

been laid almost, it seemed, unanimously for action on it.

I am not here to justify or to sell you the Steering Committee's preliminary report or its continuing revision through the week, as Miss Morsch has explained, nor to sell you my views on their report, but merely to give them to you for your consideration.

I would endeavor to provide an objective analysis of this report to check its interpretations, to advise them, as I have had some opportunity to, and to advise you here, and at any time through to Thursday night on any matters related to the basic study or to their report.

I had an opportunity at the request of ASL to be with their Executive Board at their meeting this afternoon for that purpose, and am scheduled to do the same with the ACRL and the HLD and will be more than happy to accept any other requests for such attendance.

I think in this way I can aid in your arriving at a continuation of the progress on this course you have set toward implementation of an improved organizational relationship throughout the Association.

In the Armed Forces and in all military, naval, Air Force planning, it is necessary that a plan, any course of action leading to a plan for decision, be suitable, feasible, and acceptable, and that is the problem that you are faced with here, is to develop the details of your management

plan in a way that continues its suitability as I thought, and as you agreed to your needs, to continue that suitability to retain its acceptability and to in all events to continue its feasibility.

I am going to present a few slides simply because it is a means of outline or guide to the discussion I would like to offer. We will stop in the middle of them because there we are going to discuss the basic report proper, and I would like to just discuss it without any further indexing.

This will be informal. I don't consider this a formal presentation, and I hope you will treat it afterwards with your questions and answers as informal discussion to clarify current thinking and to provoke more thinking where more thinking appears to be needed either on your part or mine.

[Slide] This is an index to the presentation. Briefly, I would like to summarize the problems that were identified by the survey and the solutions recommended, then to make a few introductory comments with respect to the Steering Committee's role and its approach, as I saw it, then to get to the core of the evening's presentation which is an analysis of the preliminary report of the Steering Committee, and then to conclude with respect to this report and to offer a few over-all considerations for your thinking in taking action on the Steering Committee's report.

[Slide] The reason for suggesting a summary of the problems that were identified again is that I think at the risk of being a little repetitious, we would dwell for a minute on the circumstances that you wish to improve upon because unless you have in mind clearly what you were seeking to solve in the way of your problems and bring improvement to, I am sure you will lose some of the purpose and resolve that you will need to take necessary action.

This is a very natural tendency, and of course, when time passes over a period that it has since you have last addressed yourself to the survey report proper, it is a good idea.

As you will note, we have just summarized these points with respect to the survey. We found an increasing tendency to divide and subdivide in such a way as to destroy the unity essential for the successful pursuit of the broad common objectives of the American Library Association.

We found a lack of a central governing body and operating top management suitably representative. The lack of a clear definition and a sound integration of the responsibility and authority throughout the organization, and an inadequate delegation of authority and responsibility for the simple reason that what you could not define, you could not delegate, and insufficiently incomprehensively organizational framework, one that had gaps that left areas unattended, and yet areas in

which librarians were interested, and inequitable and unnecessarily complex dues structure and a lack of program evaluation and a sound scheme for utilization of your funds.

It certainly is true that despite favorable circumstances in some areas, those could be anticipated as perhaps temporary in the face of a long term, and in effect, your fiscal seas might be a little choppy ahead.

This was disturbing many of your members, as you know.

Now, the basic element of the planned solution with first and foremost a reorientation of membership viewpoint to give greater emphasis to the American Library Association as a single organization and to its broad objectives in which all members have a common interest.

Now, without this orientation viewpoint, your members individually or collectively are not going to be able to resolve the problems that your Steering Committee has addressed itself to in working out details, and that you have, many of you, addressed yourself to, and that we discussed this morning in a meeting, and that you will be discussing this evening.

The premise for it all is this reorientation of viewpoint and the assumption that others throughout the organization will have the same reorientation. Secondly, a simplified, logical and clearly defined organizational framework

within which there is a strong and representative central governing body, and also within which there would be a suitably comprehensive scheme of divisions and other units, and at least, a dual focus of member interest among divisions as between type of library interest and type of work. Also, a more complete and deeper delegation of authority throughout this organization and an integration of the responsibility between organizational levels meaning that those having responsibility for the government of activities in a division would share in the government of the association and vice versa, you might say. A sound provision for program evaluation and an unidentified headquarter's organization that would serve each element of the American Library Association.

This would also be an organization within which all facets of library work then could find representation and an organizational form in accordance with the expressed member interest, not just as perhaps leaders might think it should be set up, but rather, or when it should be set up, but as the members so dictated by their interest, and also would be one within which the competence and the experience and the judgment which is present among the American Library Association members may serve most effectively the objectives of the Association.

The elements also included a recommended simplification and readjustment of the dues structure, and a recommendation

relative to the distribution of funds for use on the basis of need governed in part by the over-all objectives of the American Library Association and in part by the special interests of its component groups.

So much for that little review.

The Steering Committee's role and approach.

I would like to say that the Steering Committee identified itself as a creature of the Council which is, as I remember, from your Philadelphia meeting, quite correct. They are reporting to and making recommendations for action to the Council and keeping the Executive Board informed.

I think that the principles of the survey which were adopted by the Council with the foundation point from which the Steering Committee embarked, and they sought to plan the implementation of the recommendations, it endeavored to spell out the implications of these recommendations, to interpret them, and to define them where definition was needed, to amplify them, and in some instances to revise them where it was necessary to do so, and in all instances to translate or to make the start at a translation of these recommendations to a course of action.

They were not inhibited by the details of the survey report, and I am very glad of that because our details, as we said, in Philadelphia were subject to not only amplification, but to revision.

They were properly inhibited by the principles and the concept that your Council approved and adopted.

They stayed within the spirit of it, as I see it, and I think they set up the interpretations within the over-all ground rules, and they have planned the application of those ground rules in terms of specific activities and relationships.

Now, the survey, I can say with frankness, did not endeavor to spot all of the organizational elements, particularly the committees and round tables and perhaps even the boards with surety as to their proper position in the recommended new organization, and it was known at that time that your own group with greater knowledge of these activities than we could get during our survey and with more time to consider the functions of these activities in the light of the over-all structure, recommended would do a better job of working these details out. Therefore, they have clarified a good deal of this and carried it further, and the revisions they have made in this respect are quite in keeping with the spirit of the survey.

I think the approach was excellent. Certainly their activities were most thorough. Their thinking -- and I have read through the minutes of their November meeting and December meeting, and some of the correspondence that went back and forth, and communications is a big problem in accomplishing something like this. Very logical. Quite

imaginative, and all in all I would say very excellent committee work.

The fact that I may vary a little from some of their conclusions in the course of my analysis this evening does not at all detract from my admiration for the job they have done.

I met with the Steering Committee on January 2 which was at the conclusion of their, you might say, primary fact finding and work and exchange of information and development of recommendations, and I think that they have accomplished something surprising in the way of communications because they were able to get this preliminary report out to you in time for review by a great many of your key people before this session.

Much credit is due to the committee and certainly to the chairman.

The next little point that I had in mind was to say that your midwinter meeting procedure here, I would hope, would lead to your coming to an additional and further step toward implementation of the broad principles and concept that you have adopted, and I feel sure that notwithstanding the problems and even some of the confusion that may exist with respect to the details, that you will so do.

I would like to turn the lights on and drop the slide presentation. Immediately after this next slide, which is merely an outline of the discussion concerning the preliminary

I would like to discuss the recommendations of the preliminary report first as they concern the American Library Association general assembly and its Executive Board, addressing myself to the nature and functions of the assembly and the board, their composition and the supporting committees, and then to the associations and councils, their nature and functions, the composition and identification of them, and the organization and interrelationships. Then to the round tables and boards and committees respectively with respect to nature, composition and identification, and then the American Library Association headquarters.

We do have for projection, should it be needed or helpful in the course of the presentation or in the course of discussion afterward, a slide of this organization chart that you have with the preliminary report. It is already out of date because as Miss Morsch has explained, there have been some revisions in line with further thinking of your Steering Committee.

This just points out that it is a dynamic situation, a moving situation. The Steering Committee felt that it could hardly arrive at a final report until it had obtained the thinking of the members that would be here at midwinter and the groups that would have a chance to gather here.

The changes between yesterday and today, and now I am sure the refinements that will develop in the course of the

next few days.

Since some of you may not agree with the preliminary report of the Steering Committee as it was, or as it is, or as it may be as the week grows along, it is my purpose in the course of this presentation to point out wherever I think there is significant room for variations or revisions of their report which can be made, if you wish to do so, without prejudice to the basic concept or the workability.

The general assembly, certainly the nature and the functions, are clear, both from the survey report and the preliminary report of the Steering Committee. I see no variation whatsoever there.

I think there is really no room for variation within the basic concept that we had suggested and adopted. The nature of the general assembly as a strong and representative and central governing body is, of course, of paramount concern.

It would determine the objectives and policies and programs of the Association and would be the final authority on all matters concerning it.

The composition, on the other hand, opens some room for debate. The Steering Committee has developed the necessary amplification of our basic recommendations, or at least one amplification of them, to suggest that the composition include non-voting members, that the general assembly approve non-voting

members and voting members, the voting members being in several categories and arrived at through several ways.

The general provision is that no person might be nominated for or serve in the general assembly unless he is a member of the American Library Association. I think that is a very sound provision. [Laughter]

I want to start from something that everybody agrees with. [Laughter]

I think we will agree, too, that no candidate may accept nomination from more than one group. This, of course, is to disperse and broaden the activity of all concerned.

The very important provision here is that every member of the general assembly elected upon nomination of a group shall automatically become a voting or non-voting -- the Steering Committee would give you your choice, although I would suggest that it be a voting member -- of the governing body of that group.

This is that important integration of responsibility between levels. It isn't going to mean that a member or two members of the general assembly who by virtue of which they have membership in the governing board of a division -- it doesn't mean they are going to govern the division, but it means they are going to be responsible to take part in their divisional deliberations. They are going to have a part in them at a level of responsibility rather than just the level of

getting information or in an advisory capacity.

It means they are going to have a real basis for interpreting the requirements and needs and programs as they are being developed in their division and interpreting those within the general assembly in which they are members, and likewise, it will give them opportunity to interpret some of the responsibility that they share at the general assembly, right in the upper councils of the division in which they are acting.

I might first just dismiss the question of non-voting members. They were to include the chairman of all American Library Association committees which would certainly be in accord with your tradition. The past Presidents of the Association and one representative of each affiliated association.

The voting members, on the other hand, would be developed from both on the basis of direct representation, proportional representation and at-large. In addition to the ex officio basis, namely, that your elected officers of the American Library Association would be members of the general assembly. They would be the officers of it.

The reason I say you have a direct basis is because there is the provision that the presidents of associations and councils shall automatically be members of the general assembly. This gives one member per division to begin with. Also, on page three, under the provision for 48 members to be

elected at large, based on nominations by the divisions in proportion to the number of members of each division, there is the proviso, however, that it shall provide that each division have at least one membership in this 48. This takes off 13 of those, and means one per division. It means one per division, and if you have 13 divisions, six associations and seven councils, as it would appear here, that would provide an additional one per division or additional 13 on that basis, so there are 26 members of this proposed general assembly on a direct representation basis. The other 35 under this recommendation would be developed on a proportional basis, governed by the number of members in each division.

As they have revised their initial preliminary report, the divisions would submit two names for each spot they were to fill, and the membership at large would elect one of these names in each case. They would not have the designation of divisional representation on the ballot, but the biographical information would make it quite clear to those who examined it what the background of the individual was and give them an idea of their divisional association.

The third basis for electing the voting members of your general assembly in sub-paragraph (d) on page three, suggests that 48 members be elected at large for four-year terms selected from the general membership by the Nominating Committee.

I think that it is very important that your membership of the general assembly include some members developed by each of these methods. I might also add there is one element in the direct representation, and that is that each of the chapters would have one representative. That is on page two where it says, one member to represent each state chapter, so there is another group of perhaps 55 or 60 in addition to the other 26 that I have mentioned, would have been developed by direct representative method.

I think that the idea of having your composition developed in this way is very important. Now, the actual relationship, the formula, is open to debate, and I point out to you that if it would seem more appropriate to the majority of your Council members voting on this subject, if, as, and when they voted -- if it would seem more appropriate that these numbers be varied, I think that that would not necessarily destroy the intent of the basic recommendation.

By that I mean that if it was felt that 48 members elected at large was too large or too small a number, that, for example, it might be better to have a few more elected by the proportional method than the 35 that were provided here. Whether you had 48 there and 48 in the other spot, or 36 in one and a few others in the other is really a matter for your adjudication when you consider the question of getting all the talents and interests of the American Library

Association as a whole represented in your general assembly.

The Steering Committee believes -- and I think soundly so -- that the Nominating Committee will take care of this balancing out as it may be needed geographically or by interest by reason of having as large a number as 48 elected at large by their nomination rather than from divisions, either whether proportional or direct.

The Executive Board, as far as its nature and functions are concerned, I think is quite clearly identified as developing from within the membership of the general assembly which has the key point in the survey recommendation, since it would represent the general assembly and act for it in the implementation of all activities and efforts and management within the over-all policies set by the general assembly.

The composition, the officers of the Association as they are now, of course, and the eight recommended at large.

The recommendation here of the Steering Committee does not include a recommendation made by the management survey report. I am not sure how significant this may be, but I would point out that this report suggested that there be a limitation that no more than three members of the eight at large that are on the Executive Board be from one type of library division or

one association.

I think that it may be that your Steering Committee felt, and perhaps quite rightly, that this safeguard of limitation would be unnecessary, at least unnecessary to spell out.

We also suggested that at least one of the eight at large at all times be one of the general assembly members who was representing a state chapter. That, too, seems desirable still as I see it, but if it is unnecessary to spell it out, then, of course, I would not suggest that it be retained just because we had put it in the original report.

The matter of the term of the members of the Executive Board -- and I might say here there is no issue with respect to changing the title from Executive Committee as recommended in the management survey to Executive Board.

The Executive Board may be even more helpful, particularly if you have no other voice at the ALA level. The matter of the term is an interesting one, and open to some question for this reason, and although your Steering Committee has made no direct comment on it, I know it has been raised in the minds of some, and it has occurred to me, that if a general assembly member on a four-year term is in the last year of that term elected to the Executive Board, he in effect gains

an additional three years in the general assembly which is not at the behest, you might say, of the membership which elects the general assembly or elected him to it, but rather is generated from the general assembly itself.

This may be an unwise thing, and I submit it for your consideration, not with a view that it is necessarily unwise. It does seem to define a principle, that your members of the general assembly should be there by virtue of their election to it from the membership at large, and not be there by virtue of some action they took themselves to place themselves there for an additional two or three years.

That would be the end result of it. The person might spend seven years in the general assembly on what was initially a four-year term. Perhaps a compromise would suggest that a member be elected even, it be possible that a member be elected to the Executive Board even before he served a year in the general assembly.

This isn't too practical, though, because your elections are so held from the timing standpoint that you wouldn't know who was going to be on the general assembly at the time you were electing the Executive Board. Therefore, it is best that you be only permitted -- you wouldn't know who the

new members might be in the new group coming in that year. It is best you select only from those who had been on the general assembly for a year, so maybe one solution would be to have a two-year term for your Executive Board member. Another one might be to vary the provision to allow with a two-year term only one additional year beyond the four. This means that someone on the general assembly for a four-year term, let's say you could have a three-year term on the Executive Board, and perhaps nine members at large, and if you were elected to it after two years on the general assembly, that would give you five, one additional one which I think might be a compromise of having seven.

I just throw this out since it may come to the minds of some of those present.

I just throw this out since it may come to the minds of some of those present.

The supporting committees, I think, are quite important, and the suggestion that the Advisory Committee on Budget and Program Evaluation have a little different title. I think, the title is better taken as recommended by your Steering Committee. Program Evaluation and Budget.

Likewise, the suggestion that the President-elect of

the ALA also be a member of this committee in order that there would be representation of the interests of the ALA committees.

I think that is a very good revision, and it stems from the recommendations of the Committee on Boards and Committees.

Advisory Committee on Appointments is as proposed. The Steering Committee has suggested that a third advisory committee be established to counsel the Executive Board in respect to the Association's publishing programs and operations.

This seems to be a very good suggestion to meet the need for counsel to your governing body in a very large and significant area of concern to the Association, and I think that there would be no issue to take with that. It is quite within the scheme of the recommendations.

Now, on Associations and Councils, we have the question of what are associations and what are councils. Your Steering Committee has concluded that the associations might be those of the public libraries, the type of library divisions, the college and reference libraries, the school libraries, the institution libraries, to include as I note here the hospital libraries and other libraries whose interests are covered at present only by a Committee on Institution Libraries.

This would cast the Hospital Library Division in the association role rather than the council role as suggested by the survey report. On the other hand, I think we made it clear at that time that just where the Hospital Libraries Division might best rest would depend almost entirely upon the member interest orientation of that division.

There is proposed an association of State Library Agencies. This is, I think, an improvement over our recommendation in the report which was a little more limited and dealt only with the state libraries.

I think this term is a much better one and provides a much more comprehensive approach to this matter. The recommendation of this being an association of specialized libraries would certainly provide for all ALA members who have a primary interest in a type of library that interest represented by one of the other associations, and I think this is very sound, and yet I say this and the other, the State Library Agencies and the institution one even will depend, of course, on being put to the trial test of member interest.

If you have a sufficient response when you circularize your membership as to their selection of a type of library division, then, of course, such should be formed.

Now, the same is true with respect to the councils. I think it was very wise that your Steering Committee sorted out of our initial recommendations the note that you might have divisions by form of material. I think it is best they have brought that down just to type of work and let the form of material matter be covered by organization through committees, and if necessary, interdivisional committees within the councils and associations. Thus to attend to such matters as your audio-visual aids.

The seven councils that your Steering Committee recommended, the Acquisition and Resources and Cataloging, Library Reference Services, Children's Services, Young People's Services, Adult Education, Library Education, all follow the recommendations of the survey report. That is Adult Education and not Adult Services, since certainly the Library Reference Services will be engaged in the area of adult services as will some of the others.

The proposed council on Library Administration is perhaps a moot question in the Steering Committee's report, and I would like to give you a little background with respect to our initial report.

In our earliest thinking we concluded that we would

recommend a Council on Library Administration as the focal point for the interest of library administrators, as it would be expressed on the matters of broad ALA-wide concern where coordination and exchange of information, exchange of ideas was necessary between the types of library divisions. And, yet, we omitted it from our recommendations to you, not because we didn't think it was a good thing, because we think it is, and it could be, but because we did not feel that it was something that you could embark upon with all the other organizational change that we were suggesting.

We felt you weren't ready for the change, frankly, from the standpoint of viewpoint or from recognition of what it could do for you, and therefore, it wasn't in our recommendation.

It is interesting that the Steering Committee came around to recognizing this opportunity and a potential need for this sort of a council. We left it as a board. We recommended a Board on Library Administration which we felt would bring together initially a few library administrators who would wish to give the time and attention particularly to the subjects that were of over-all concern to library administration generally, and through such as we had suggested, sort of sub-committees and

board committees, cover matters related to buildings, finances, budgets, statistics, insurance, things like that, when those things were of broad concern, but we intended that your committees within the divisions and particularly within the types of library divisions would continue to attend to the matters of statistical compilation with respect to all their libraries and things like that, leaving the definition of perhaps terms within statistics that are common to all libraries to this ALA-wide board.

Now, your council and library administration could be and would be, if you had it, would accomplish this same thing at the ALA level without impinging upon the prerogatives and functions and duties and activities in the divisions, but I would only say that while I think it is a good thing and could be, we didn't recommend it in the survey report only because we felt that maybe it was too big a mouthful to bite off to begin with, and it has apparently caused some concern amongst the members as to its impact upon the associations.

If that is the case, I certainly wouldn't let this stand in the way of your implementation of the survey generally. It began here. The proof of the puddin' is in the eatin', and the proof of interest in this and need for it, and benefits to

be derived from it will come as you get the total reorganization coming along, and the members themselves appreciate what might be done in this regard.

Perhaps the most significant area for discussion -- and therefore, I am going to leave most of it to the discussion period -- is with respect to the organization and the inter-relationships.

I think that it would be well to note the suggestions on page four and five that the councils are identified as being limited to relatively narrow fields.

That is because the responsibilities of a council deal with type of work or function will be the easiest to define, because certainly if the council is concerned with cataloging, then it is the area of cataloging and it is not adult education. And if it is children's services, it is that, and it is not the acquisition, so I think the definition in councils, because they are going to be limited to relatively narrow fields, will be the easiest, and these are the proper agencies to assign specific functional authority.

The associations, the report reads, on the other hand, being not limited to relatively narrow fields, but being concerned with all fields for their type of library, are necessarily going to be the agencies for broad over-all

responsibility and authority for policies and the professional programs. When we use the term "program" here, it is not the conference program. It is the professional programs, the ones for which you are seeking money and budget, and the operations from the type of library point of view.

Certainly the efforts in many of these functional areas, when brought to actual application and implementation, are going to have to be right in with everything else that is taking place in the type of library. Therefore, the Steering Committee has said, and I think quite correctly, that the associations would have three major areas of responsibility.

Now, this is just a broad cut, and it doesn't identify all the things within these areas, but I think they are well taken. The stimulus that results from the close association of librarians representing particular type of library, and secondly, the synthesis of the activities of all units within the ALA that have a bearing on the type of library represented by the association. Certainly no one council can synthesize the functions, both those that it is concerned with and all other functions. No council could as it relates to any type of library.

This will be the big role of the type of library

division or the association, and thirdly, the operation, the actual operation of all the programs that are in the exclusive interest of the association or which because of the application in the particular instance are going to be primarily their interest, and therefore, should be specifically assigned to that association.

The dual membership will mean that your members as represented by the dark shaded areas at the cross points between association and councils is that they really have a very important function as a group because they represent the common denominator on any function between the type of library concerned with that function and the types of libraries that are concerned with all functions.

They are the common denominator between that type of library which they represent and people concerned with the same function in all other types of libraries. I mean, they tie in with them. Therefore, the suggestion that the groups will function, these groups will. Common membership between division and council will function as interdivisional committees or as sections of the councils as the need is determined by the respective associations and councils, and this would not preclude the associations having additional members on such

committees when that association had insufficient individuals as may be the case in say ASL on some functions, who were associated with that council.

Interdivisional committees could be formed, and it would not have to be limited to the people who had the common membership there.

Now, I think it is quite important that we recognize that when you talk about fields of interest, you are trying to define the fields of interest of your division, that you recognize that its fields of responsibility that we are talking about because when I looked over the field of interest as expressed by the Public Library Division, for example, they are interested in all these fields, and rightfully so. I think that would go for most of the other associations.

The question is, what will they be responsible for, and right away the answer would be, we will be responsible for this field, this functional field as and when it applies in our area because that is what we are in a position to be and endeavor to be responsible for and contribute to.

Well then, that being the case, for each of these types of library associations, and when the matter relates to all of them, then they must all come together on it though the

people that would come together on it are those who have selected that particular function, and they would come together at the point of a council.

Now, let's remember that the fields of responsibility, if we use that as a term, it will limit your definitions because there is one thing to be interested in everything, and there is another thing to assume a responsibility for it.

The people involved are the clue to this. That is, it is the people who are in both the association and the council and if you look at this from the standpoint of the individual in ALA rather than the governing board of one present association or what some of the leaders might feel should be the individual's viewpoint, I think the individual's viewpoint will be that although he is interested in all these areas and would like to be acquainted with what is going on with this and hopes ALA, the Association to which he belongs is doing something in them, the individual will recognize he can't assume responsibility in all of these as an individual, and if he can't as an individual, then he isn't going to assume responsibility in all of them in concert with other individuals.

He will pick certain ones of them and assume a

responsibility, and the responsibility involves two things. One, time and attention to it; and two, financial support, so when the individual says, "Well, it is a shame I can't. I am interested in all these councils. It is wonderful. We are separating those out, and I would like to, but now it is going to be so expensive."

You can be interested in all of them without having to be in all of them because you are not going to be able physically to attend all of them, so if you can't attend them all because it is physically impossible, it goes also that you can't afford to give them all the financial support that they should have if you want a voice in them, so you will have an interest in them, and you will be acquainted with it, but before you have a voice in it, you must agree that you are going to give it the time, and you are going to give it the financial support.

So we have this word "responsibility" pretty importantly in the forefront on these considerations. It is only those in a position to translate their interest into support personally and financially should have a case for wanting to belong to more than one council or more than one type of library association.

I think it is important that the associations have the responsibility to identify the need or the opportunity for action by the ALA in any function as it exclusively applies to their type of library.

They might also plan action so long as the matter on that function relates to their type of library, but when this same term, say it is adult education or it is cataloging and so forth has an impact throughout all the types of libraries or more than one of them, then they must get together with people who have that function, that interest in these other associations, and the place for them to get together on that is at the council point.

The round tables are discussion groups without responsibility so they do not seek a budget from the American Library Association. They might make recommendations to a committee which has a responsibility and would be able to seek implementation of it or to a council or possibly an association.

The boards and committees. Your Steering Committee has suggested we eliminate the term "board" and let there be the general committees. So long as those general committees as need be tie in to the committees of various divisions and develop an interrelationship of some mutual membership between

them, I think that would be quite sound and eliminates the need for the so-called board committees.

I think all the recommendations with respect to the boards and committees are pretty much up to the resolution of you people because you know them and understand them better than the management survey could have had any understanding.

I think a better disposition of most of them has been made by the Steering Committee's report. Now, running quickly here because I think I spent a little bit too much time on that central organization subject, the American Library Association headquarters. I think the organization of that which the Steering Committee suggests rests for implementation with the Executive Board. The organization of that must follow, let's say, hand in glove with the organization of American Library Association as a whole, and they are all part of the same story, but the headquarters one can follow and should be the responsibility of your Executive Board to implement with the advice and counsel of its Advisory Committee on Program Evaluation and Budget.

The matter of the executive secretaries is one that will concern the divisions and also the matter of the publications. I think the need for executive secretaries should be

examined, having in mind that it's the planning, the policy, the programming side of all these activities that your volunteer members should have the major role and should be the focal point of carrying responsibility.

The minute your association gets to the point where you are relying more and more and more upon your paid staff to develop and suggest and recommend policy or programs or plans or stimulate thought and all the rest of that, then you are just losing the life blood of your organization and putting it beyond the membership.

I think this is something you must guard against now because any of your staff would seek to bring it about that way because there is a tendency to rely upon staff if you can just find the way to have the money to have that staff.

Now, if you will, instead, rely upon executive secretaries and staff for the carrying out, the exchange of your communication with others on the subjects that you are stimulating, the carrying out of action, once you have arrived and planned and developed plans, programs for it and the implementation of policy that members have set forth, that is the role for your executive secretary. If this is the case, then there is going to be more need per division for time of an

executive secretary, I think, by the associations and by the councils because I think that the implementation of all these functional efforts in the proper framework and environment of any one type of library is going in the end to come to rest upon that library association, and it is on the implementation side that you need the follow-through of your executive secretaries, and the coordinating efforts and the councils on the other hand should be the points wherein these functional spheres, your member interest, individual member interest in these spheres will be backed up or at least the expressed member interest will be backed up by actual member participation to the point where your planning and programming and effort and stimulus and policy in those areas is done largely by your members and with minimum support of executive secretaries.

On the matter of terminology, the Steering Committee has advised me of their interest in leaving this matter quite open, and as Miss Morsch has indicated, of considering that perhaps the term "council" might not be used for the type of work divisions.

Now, when I was first advised of this, I felt this was really not too significant from the standpoint of what we called the divisions on that left-hand side, but a little bit

significant from the standpoint of abandoning a change in term for the ALA Council to general assembly.

I still think, and I submit for your consideration, that you might weigh rather carefully abandoning the recommendation of the survey that you do have this change of terminology for your council coincidental with your change in the very nature of it.

I think there is a lot to it as I could logically, and I wonder if you are not going to have enough trouble re-orienting your thinking without dropping back to an old term which has a very definite connotation of the past of what it is, what it can do.

I am not in opposition to the Steering Committee on it, and I think the Steering Committee is open on it, or is opening this question to the membership.

You have another practical problem, and that is unless you deny the term "council" to the divisions, you might have an instance where a type of work division would want to call itself a council, and then if you had the ALA Council, too, there would be a confusion.

Now, the recommendations concerning the dues and allotments to divisions, we can dismiss that rather quickly.

The preliminary report indicated that they felt it was necessary that the study go forward in this area on the dues structure.

I think that is quite so, and I think it is important that it keep abreast of our developments in the implementation of the rest of the survey.

It is quite important that you some time, I would imagine before July, obtain a consensus from your membership as to where they would designate their interest, in how many different divisions, if they had their choice of this list of councils, and this list of associations. That would give you a basis for financial planning and forecasting which you need. Even though it isn't binding upon them at this time, it will certainly give you an implication that will turn out to be 90 per cent correct.

Lastly, I think it is important that you note that the basic allotment proportional to the number of members which is suggested by the survey report would not be a very large one necessarily because your general ALA headquarters budget would be providing most of the services now, or almost every service now, provided through the salaries, and salaries is the biggest element of the present divisional expenditures, and that likewise some consolidation in other areas would be accomplished

and savings through it in the miscellaneous office expenses of postage and mailing and mimeographing and so forth, so that wouldn't need to be covered by this basic allotment.

In addition, some consolidation in your publications and particularly with respect to the publishing of administrative information on the going and comings and doings of your associations and councils and boards and committees and ALA as a whole which might best be all in one ALA bulletin would, of course, leave the technical field of publications to handling through another method.

I think that if you will recognize that we are speaking now of just a minimal basic allotment which would cover maybe the word "administrative," administration isn't the right term, but it would cover such things as basic travel expected of any division president, the basic committee work that would be necessary before you could even develop and justify programs which would then gain you money for the committee work related to those programs.

I mean, just the going concern requirements, and that might surprise you in terms of the amount per head that that might be, but I think it is important. It may later prove to be not vital, and you might go to a valuation for all your

allotments.

Now, lastly, my conclusion with respect to the preliminary report. It does adhere to the principles and concepts approved by the Council, as I see it. It refines and it amplifies the management survey recommendations concerning basic organization and clarifies the interrelationships.

That is, it refines and amplifies them. In addition to that, it properly revises the tentative proposals of the management survey concerning the details of organizational transition, and it leaves the opportunity for further change, if dictated by consensus at the midwinter meeting here. It establishes a basis upon which the American Library Association Council at this midwinter meeting can take action that is necessary for prompt continuation of the progress that has been made toward implementation of the survey.

It sets a course of positive action, the one we recommended last July towards strengthening the unified capacity of the ALA to fulfill its broad mission.

In the interest of time I won't project these points. I am just going to speak them here, the over-all considerations that I commend to you in taking your action on the Steering Committee's report.

First remember there is a great interrelationship with respect to these recommendations of the basic survey, and as they have been brought forth by the Steering Committee, and to change radically -- I say radically one or the other, requires a close examination of most of the others. Some revisions in one or the other would not be a problem, but still should be viewed in the light with respect to any of the other recommendations.

Certainly if you don't have a council on library administration, you have the disposition of some relatively significant committees to consider so you can't just abandon that suggestion of the Steering Committee without going back and working out the matter. Secondly, the essentiality of effective communications within the new organization structure. This is very important because you may get it set up, and it will fall apart later if you haven't the communications, and that is why we recommend it very clearly, and it may have missed some of you because it was back in that appendix in the report that came out with the September Bulletin, and wasn't stressed at Philadelphia that your ALA Bulletin become primarily an instrument for the internal communication within the ALA relative to the agenda generally and separately throughout the

ALA, the names, the places, the activities, the days to keep people in one division if they are interested, and even though they are not members acquainted with what is going on in other divisions, here is the opportunity for people with interest but without the time and funds to be on the mailing list of some other division to know what is going on throughout ALA as a whole and to approve.

I think it would be very important that this be done. This would leave the technical, the scholarly articles, the technical journals and needs strictly to the divisions to justify by budget and to implement. There would be serious doubt -- at least, I would say certainly our survey report did not recommend for or against combining them, although there has been discussion for it.

The important thing is to combine news element in one ALA Bulletin. The time factor is important, and this is a bad time for me to be talking about the time factor because your chairman has been looking at her watch almost as much as I should have been looking at mine, but I think that you might recognize that you must keep a steady pace of progress, and your timing with respect to the requirements on your constitutional changes and bylaws are significant. They are long. It

is a long, drawn-out process, and it warrants your serious attention with respect to getting some positive action on your course during this midwinter meeting.

Lastly, a continued requirement for perspective. You will pardon me if I come back to the question of reorientation of your viewpoints. After all, you are going to have the same groups of people working toward the ends that you have in common. They are just going to be headed a little bit differently. I mean, headed in a little different direction and more in the same direction than they have before.

It is a broad ALA viewpoint that you are after, and this need not impinge upon the needs and requirements and effectiveness of the divisions. Actually, I should think that it would make them even more effective.

Remember your autonomous divisions did not bring ALA to the grass roots and also that you will always have the more avenues and means of pursuing your objectives than you will have funds to effectively do so, that the time lag between your application of these projected improvements and the gaining of results from them is there, and you will have to be patient for it, and lastly, that as members of the ALA hierarchy, which most of you are, you must take great pains

to seek a member view since there is a tendency at leadership levels throughout all organizations to be overly concerned with what they believe membership view should be, and not enough concerned with finding out what it is.

Now, if that is an admonition, I hope you will pardon my making it, but it is made in the hopes that it will be beneficial to you in the implementation of your program. Thank you. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN MORSCHE: Thank you. I hope that the explanation of Mr. Mead is going to facilitate the discussions that you are going to have in your divisions.

We had agreed that this meeting should not under any circumstances go beyond ten-thirty which still gives us fifteen minutes, and if we limit our discussion, or rather exclude from discussion any questions that relate to a single organizational unit, that is, a particular division, a particular committee or round table, it might be that some general things that various people would like to bring up for discussion or at least to call attention to assure themselves the Steering Committee would give these problems attention during the week, we might make the best use of this limited time.

I say this because members of the Steering Committee

are scheduled to attend meetings of every group in the whole Association.

That is having a meeting this week to discuss reorganization or the preliminary report of the implementation committee. Consequently, if there are questions or comments that any of you would like to make in regard to the broader issues than those limited to a particular division and so forth, the floor is yours.

Will you, however, come to the microphone, and give your name clearly for the stenotypist.

DR. KUHLMAN: Miss Morsch, I would like to raise one question. From where does the sentiment come to have such a radical reorganization of the ALA as is here proposed? From 1928 to 1945 there was a great deal of very hard work done in the American Library Association to decentralize and to overcome the extreme centralization that we had, and to bring about some sort of a functional organization, so that we could get more effectiveness into the work, and we have made great progress in establishing divisions, in bringing up the financing of the ALA.

Now we face completely about to undo everything that has been done in the several activities reports and the

establishment of divisions, and we are going to overcentralize the ALA more than it ever was prior to the movements to decentralize.

Also, if I have understood the literature with reference to management, one of the main principles has been that the span of management is definitely limited.

I wonder where you can find a person in our profession who can manage all of these diverse interests when we proceed to centralize them the way that is now being proposed in this report. If we had an understanding of what we are doing here and had a straw vote, I wonder how many members in this room would favor undoing practically everything that we have accomplished in reorganizing the ALA from 1928 through 1945.

Maybe I am all wrong, but to me this looks like a very serious mistake, and as for the vote in Philadelphia, I think most of us were paralyzed by the heat. [Laughter]

CHAIRMAN MORSCH: I am not going to try to answer all of that because if I did, no one else would have any chance at all to speak.

I only want to say that there are elements of centralization and of decentralization in this report. The transfer of responsibilities for practically all of the ALA boards

and committees from the ALA as a whole to the various divisions is one of the greatest movements of decentralization that I can imagine for the ALA, but Dr. Kuhlman and I will have to have this out more extended later. [Laughter]

Another comment or question? I guess you are just too tired.

MR. VERNER ELLINGER: I notice that the management survey report includes a number of recommendations, some of which I think are rather foreign and perhaps drastic, on which the report of the Steering Committee has remained silent. As one example of them, I would like to point to the relationship of the ALA committees to the general assembly or to the Executive Board, and the power of the Executive Board to screen committee reports as is proposed in the management survey report.

I would like to raise the question inasmuch as this is called a preliminary report whether there will be still closer consideration of the points not so touched upon which seem to be worthy of discussion, or whether we are to assume that those points on which the report remained silent are considered to be accepted by the Steering Committee.

CHAIRMAN MORSCH: Thank you. I don't know how many things there are. I am not sure that we have done a thorough

job of analyzing the management surveys report to see that we have covered everything.

Mr. Mead didn't point out much that we overlooked although he did a couple of things there. This seems to be another that we should give consideration to. I think it will be well if any of you have questions in this regard that you bring them to our attention so that they can be considered.

As far as the committees are concerned, the ALA Committee on Boards and Committees is meeting more than once, I believe, during this week. I know they are having a meeting tomorrow morning, and I am sure this is one of the things that they will want to consider.

MR. HARRY DEWEY: As I understand it, the management survey report was distributed to the membership in the September ALA Bulletin or bulletin published around that time. I also understand the Steering Committee has revised that report considerably. I believe the revision has not been distributed to the membership, and while the membership has had an opportunity to reports its feelings about the management report, to the Council members, I don't believe the membership has yet had an opportunity to see this revised report and to express

its feelings about it to the members of the Council before the Council will take action on it, and I am wondering what opportunity the membership as a whole, those who are here at this convention and those who are not, who have not seen this report, will have to inform their Council representatives about their feelings about the report, or will the Council not take action on the report at this convention?

CHAIRMAN MORSCH: Did you all here the question? I think this is entirely up to the Council. Things that come before the Council at every meeting are coming to them without having been distributed to the membership as widely as the general principles of this have been, and as Mr. Mead indicated, the Steering Committee's preliminary report does not stray in any important way from the recommendations of the management survey in spirit or intent, and therefore, since there was such an overwhelming acceptance of the management survey's report, I should assume that the Council would feel free to act without further information from the membership, but this will be entirely up to the Council.

Do you want to add anything to that?

PRESIDENT RICHARDS: No, I would think that was in order.

CHAIRMAN MORSCH: I think we have time for one
more.

If there are no others, I will declare this meeting
adjourned, and thank you very much for coming.

[The meeting adjourned at ten twenty-five o'clock.]
