Peter Boyce

From: Mary Accettura [1marac@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 3:37 PM
To: Peter Boyce; Wade Byers; Kari Martinez; Lendon Nelson; Thomas Mersereau; Hal Busch; Ray Jaren; Neal Reisner
Cc: Nancy Eichsteadt; Amy Masgai; Angelika Himmer; colette umbras; Sundhara Linton; Denise Heintz; Irene Green
Subject: Fw: Fwd: Citizens-Save-Libraries press release

Pete and City Council, thought you would like to see this press release from the ALA, we are still supporting and fighting for our library.

From: jneich@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 12:01 PM
To: colette umbras ; Moma Escriva ; Sundhara Linton ; Mary Accettura ; Angelika Himmer ; Amy Masgai ; Denise Heintz ; Irene Green
Subject: Fwd: Citizens-Save-Libraries press release

Hi guys,
Press release: this is from ALA national. I will forward to clackamas review and Oregonian.
Nancy

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Jillian Kalonick <jkalonick@ala.org>
To: kate park <kate.park@fodpl.org>, gopeak2@aol.com, nancy@gpl-foundation.org, tstover@josephinelibrary.org, joraezuckerman@yahoo.com, gwenphoto@msn.com, jfeh@comcast.net, juliem@indelib.org, ajacobsen@selco.info, dhannon@ssldl.info
Cc: Sally Gardner Reed <sreed@ala.org>
Sent: Mon, 13 May 2013 20:34:06 -0000 (UTC)
Subject: Citizens-Save-Libraries press release

Please see the link below for the press release about
Citizens-Save-Libraries advocacy training recipients:

Ten
libraries selected to receive advocacy training as part of Neal-Schuman
Foundation grant to United for Libraries
http://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/news/ala/ten-libraries-selected-receive-advocacy-training-part-neal-schuman-foundation-grant-united-

Jillian

Jillian Kalonick

Marketing/Public Relations Specialist

United for Libraries

The Association of Library Trustees, Advocates, Friends and Foundations

A division of the American Library Association

109 S. 13th St., Suite 117B

Philadelphia, PA 19107

phone 800-545-2433, ext. 2161

fax 215-545-3821

http://www.ala.org/united

like United for Libraries on Facebook: http://www.facebook.com/unitedforlibraries

follow United for Libraries on Twitter: http://www.twitter.com/ala_united

Peter Boyce

From: Stacy Chamberlain [SChamberlain@oregonafscme.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 1:26 PM
To: Wade Byers; jaren@ci.gladstone.or.us; Thomas Mersereau; Kari Martinez; Neal Reisner; Hal Busch; Lendon Nelson
Cc: Peter Boyce
Subject: AFSCME Concerns with LSSI
Attachments: REVISEDSEPT2011_ALAKeepingPublicLibraries PublicFINAL2 - Copy.pdf; outsourcing_doc.pdf

Importance: High

Mayor and Council Members,

I am the Council Representative for Oregon AFSCME and I represent the City of Gladstone employees. As you probably know, we are very concerned with the prospect of contracting out management of the library to LSSI. I understand that the board wanted to get more information from LSSI, but we ask that you review the information from LSSI with a critical eye. Below are some of the major concerns we have:

1. **LSSI has refused to divulge their profit margin to other jurisdictions that have contracted their services**. These are tax payer dollars and should not be used to profit a corporation. See Elizabeth Findell, *San Juan Fires Library Managers*, The Monitor, McAllen Texas, August 31, 2012

2. **Limits on book ordering**. One of the ways LSSI will attempt to demonstrate savings is through their ability to buy books in bulk. However, LSSI orders books that are on the LSSI "approved list". Books should be selected by members of the community and each community is going to differ on the books that are requesting. For example, a book about Oregon fishing may not be on the "approved list" as it is not a book that a majority of their libraries would stock. Books shouldn't have to be best sellers to be in the library.
See David Breen, *Osceola Residents Complain Liberia Lacks New Books Since Outsourcing*, Orlando Sentinel, April 18, 2012. Sherri Drake, *Millington Library Wants to Cut Ties with Contractor*, The Commercial Appeal, Memphis, TN, December 4, 2012.

3. **Tension between profits and services.** LSSI is a for profit corporation with a fiduciary duty to make profits. This duty is in direct conflict with providing the most services for the tax dollar, whether that's books, library programs or hours of operation. Service decisions need to be made without a view on profits.

4. **Loss of Volunteers and Donations.** Currently the Gladstone Library has 18 volunteers that work approximately 2400 hours a year. This is equivalent to over **1 FTE**. These volunteers have informed the library that they will no longer volunteer their hours to a "for profit corporation." This needs to be taken into account in the cost benefit calculation.

5. **Profits come from cutting employees' wages and benefits.** The majority of the savings that LSSI will "find" are from cutting wages and benefits to employees. While LSSI is not obligated to hire back the current library employees, they may hire them back, but only after gutting their wage and benefit packages. Profits should not come from taking wages and benefits from workers. These reductions

also have an impact on the local businesses. If the workers' overall compensation is cut, they have less expendable income to spend on in the local area.

6. **American Library Association (ALA) opposes contracting out library services.** The ALA is a non-partisan group that advocates and promotes best practices for libraries. This Association is opposed to contracting out libraries. Attached are the ALA report on questions communities should consider before they contract out a library and the ALA report on the impact of contracting out library services.

Thank you in advance for reviewing this information. If you have any questions or would like additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at (503)887-6561.

Sincerely,

Stacy Chamberlain
Council Representative
Oregon AFSCME Council 75
6025 E. Burnside Street
Portland, Oregon 97215
(503) 239-9858 X142
(503) 239-9441 (fax)

*****CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE*****
This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.
****

Peter Boyce

From: Toni Krummenacker [krumment39@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Peter Boyce; Byers@ci.gladstone.or.u
Subject: Library

Forwarding a copy of my letter to you.

Dear Honorable City Council Members,

We would like to voice our opinion regarding our Gladstone City Library. We are totally AGAINST privatizing the library. We feel it serves the citizens of Gladstone to best stay in the LINCC system. Please retain this great service for our city.

With sincere hope that you will do this,
Toni and George Krummenacker
6450 Chessington Lane
Gladstone, OR 97027

Peter Boyce

From: Peter Boyce
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 2:54 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Jolene Morishita
Subject: FW: To the City Council: Loss of Chautauqua Festival

---

From: Tami Bannick
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 8:26 AM
To: Peter Boyce
Subject: FW: To the City Council: Loss of Chautauqua Festival

Pete – Would you like me to forward this to the Council since it is addressed to the Council? Tami

---

From: Dianne Lea [mailto:diannelea13@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2013 3:26 PM
To: Tami Bannick
Subject: To the City Council: Loss of Chautauqua Festival

I am sending this email to you because I see no other way to contact Gladstone government on the Gladstone website.

I was stunned to read the Chautauqua Festival has been cancelled. It has long been a generational gathering of Gladstone residents. It is one of the small but integral gems that continues to make Gladstone unique, a true community. If your intent is to make Gladstone just another bedroom community of Portland, continue on this path and you will succeed. If your intent is to make Gladstone just a name on a sign not a place people call home continue on this path and you will succeed. When people lose touch, lose a feeling of belonging there is no reason to support funding of city government, pass bonds, protect the heart of a city they have no connection to.

If this is truly the best the City Council can do, if there is no vision of Gladstone as a community.....there is no hope for our town...shame on Mayor Byers and all who are connected with his administration. Many will say it is well past time to get new blood in city government...I am one who agrees....if it isn't already too late....

You have dishonored the and held too lightly the Spirit of a very special and unique city...so very sad.....

Dianne Lea former 35 year resident who intends to retire and return
Mother of two Gladstone residents
Grandmother of two Gladstone residents
PO Box 716, Boring, OR 97009
503 704 2246

Blue Oregon - http://www.blueoregon.com

Privatize and outsource the library?!

By Bev Anslow of Gladstone, Oregon. *Bev is a retired real estate investment counselor and writer, who now works as a community activist and consumer advocate.*

One can't help but notice the gradual diminishing sense of community as local services are outsourced to distant corporations. This is especially noticeable in small cities like Gladstone. First it was the local drugstore that moved into Safeway. Then it was the local hardware and electric stores that disappeared followed by the bakery and a nearby stationery store

Last year, I heard a human voice on the phone when I called my doctor. Last week, it was a computer that took my message. My doctor retired last year and a corporation took over his office.

I don't usually attend city council meetings, but last month when I noticed a flyer on the front door reminding me about the meeting. I went. There was standing room only. I was shocked when, in spite of overwhelming opposition, Gladstone City Council voted to meet with company representatives to discuss outsourcing its public library.

"A library is the heart and the soul of a community" one resident cried out. This was followed by passionate comments from others who recalled warm memories of librarians and the library. One comment heard in the hallway was, "How dare the city council even entertain the notion of handing over the city's most used, most popular public service to a private for-profit company on the East Coast?"

If council members had done their homework they would know that outsourcing management of their public library would cost them far more than just money.

May 10, 2013 | | 6 comments
Permalink: Privatize and outsource the library?!
Posted in guest column.

Comments

Peter Boyce

From: Jim [mrnewdaddy@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 10:25 PM
To: City Council; Peter Boyce; info@savegladstone.org
Subject: Unable to attend May 14 City Council Meeting

City Council,

Regrettably I will be unable to attend the City Council meeting tomorrow.

However, had I been able, I would have wanted discussion to take place about the following topics:

1) Reorganization of Public Works
2) Enterprise funds and respectful transfers to and from different funds as a part of the monthly bill statement. Borrowing from one fund to pay another and the return of the borrowed funds back to the funding sources.
3) Joining Clackamas Parks and Recreation District for year long maintenance with regulatory oversight management, differently than the current practice.
4) When to engage the Planning Commission and the two way expectations of the Planning Commission - that being from the direction of the City engaging and the way the Commission (when and how) they want to be engaged.
5) Limitations of City distributed information, greater awareness of citizen expectations of transparency and expected efficient work flows, public policy, and fast decision making to increase the speed of service rather than the "fire fighter" method that is currently being utilized- that being a very slow method.
6) Greater ultimate responsibility of the City Administration. Leaders are charged with leading and giving direction and motivation to achieve program goals, this action or lack of should be an accountability issue within the administration. Council should be more advisory and at the same time trusting staff to be professional. It's important that the Council keeps their "eye on the ball" and focus on their vision of Gladstone and align and cooperate with the vision of Gladstone citizens.
7) City design standards. Currently franchises are allowed to work in the roadway as well as the private sector, for example for sewer lateral replacement. Currently there is no uniformity for all to follow as it relates to construction standards, with my greatest concerns being trench compaction and asphalt restoration. Either one or both puts the City in the seat to repair or replace, or wait for potholes to occur. These are very basic Public Works issues and if you drive around you will see various practices and various materials being used, or not at all, like erosion control, sand sealing utility asphalt cuts, and sidewalk replacement standards.
8) Greater public information and progress reports of City Departments on the City website. This will speed up services by holding department managers more accountable for effectiveness. For instance, how many service calls per month is each department receiving? This will also free up Library, Police, Fire, Planning Commision, and Public Works staff from routinely attending City Council meetings and allows for the Council meetings to be shorter.
9) Avoiding micro management of City Administration staff from City Council. Let them steer and lead while holding the Administration accountable.
10) Elimination of the Leaf Pick Up Program and replacing it with sanitary and storm sewer pipeline cleaning.
11) Confidence of City Council Leadership. Council should want to know how they are doing and should consider a public portal for two way improvement discussion and awareness. This would be available for thank you's, good job, as well as criticism leading to positive change for the City. This will also speed up the City's service delivery methods and effectiveness by allowing public participation to occur in electronic means, like email, differently than public testimony at a public meeting- where Council might be blindsided and could have intervened to reduce or counter an occurrence that is against the vision and goals of the City.

Perhaps these items are a result of micro management errors, bad decision making, or the old ways of "this is the way we have always done it" mentality- where doing it wrong has been a part of the culture and taught by City leadership or the act of "looking the other way " when best fitted, rather than doing the right thing even if no one is around.

These views and opinions are my own as a City of Gladstone resident.

James Miller

KEEPING PUBLIC LIBRARIES PUBLIC

A Checklist for Communities Considering Privatization of Public Libraries

ALA American Library Association

Keeping Public Libraries Public

A Checklist for Communities Considering
Privatization of Public Libraries

June 2011

Permission granted to libraries, other groups, and individuals to reproduce this publication for nonprofit use.

This publication was created by the 2010–2011 ALA Committee on Library Advocacy's Task Force on Privatization:

- Patricia A. Tumulty, Chair, Committee on Library Advocacy, Task Force on Privatization, Executive Director, New Jersey Library Association
- Carolyn Anthony, Director, Skokie (Ill.) Public Library
- Audra Caplan, 2010-2011 President, Public Library Association
- Peggy Danhof, Board Trustee President, Fountaindale Public Library, Bolingbrook, Illinois
- Kathleen Hage, Youth Services Librarian, West Palm Beach (Fla.) Public Library
- Christine Lind Hage, Director, Rochester Hills (Mich.) Public Library
- Donna McDonald, Director, Arkansas River Valley Regional Library; Trustee, Arkansas State Library Board
- Barb Macikas, Executive Director, Public Library Association
- Marci Merola, Director, ALA Office for Library Advocacy
- Sally Reed, Executive Director, Citizens for Libraries

The Task Force acknowledges the contributions of Nancy Bolt, President, Nancy Bolt and Associates, and Dr. Karen Strege, Consultant, in creating this document.

Visit **www.ala.org/outsourcingandprivatization** to download this document or to find additional information on this issue.

Office for Library Advocacy
American Library Association
50 E. Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611
Telephone: 800.545.2433, ext 2431
Fax: 312.280.3255
Email: advocacy@ala.org
www.ala.org/ola

ALA American Library Association

Introduction

Privatization of public services, including libraries, has been an issue for many years. In the 1980s, the federal government began to contract with private companies to manage and operate federal libraries. Other special libraries also have a history of privatization. However, only in the last 10 years have city and county governing bodies considered privatization of public libraries.

For over 200 years, public libraries have earned the respect of the residents they serve. It is interesting to note that public library service began in the colonial United States through "subscription libraries," available only to those who could afford to pay the fee necessary to support their existence. With the development of a free education system in the U.S., many communities expanded the concept of public education by establishing public library services for their residents through tax support. Public libraries were viewed as a public good—a common resource available to all, funded by public dollars and governed by local residents. These governing boards were given unique responsibilities within a municipality to act on behalf of the community. Trustees were charged with a public trust: overseeing the collective, public assets of the library and hiring the library director, who makes operational decisions for the good of the community and who is directly accountable to the governing body. Even in cases where trustees serve in an advisory capacity only, there is a strong recognition that libraries must be accountable to the residents that fund them. Has the view of the library as a common public good changed in the 21st century?

Recently, questions about the role of government have become the center of national debates. These questions have prompted some government officials to search for options to deliver public services. Officials may entertain the notion of privatization because the presumed cost savings and other efficiencies gained are appealing. Experience has shown that privatization of public services has not necessarily produced substantial cost savings.

As local officials review these choices, they should understand the full scope of services their libraries offer, and the impact that libraries have on their communities. They must also answer the following questions:

- Can a private company maintain the level of public trust that has been earned by the local library?
- Will the library director always make the operational decisions that are in the best interest of the community, even if those decisions reduce or do not contribute to the private company's profit?
- Can or should library services be provided through private companies?
- Does the relationship between a public library and its community change when a library is privatized?
- Does the role of the library as a public good change when the library is privatized?

The American Library Association affirms that policymaking and management oversight of public libraries should remain securely in the public domain. This report is designed to help librarians, trustees, Friends, and other library supporters address the issue of privatization and prepare for any discussions about privatization that might arise in their communities. The report includes:

I. **Current ALA Policy** 5

II. **Definitions** 5

III. **Major Issues in Library Privatization** 6

IV. **Key Messages and Talking Point** 7

V. **A Checklist for Considering Privatization** 9

VI. **A Checklist for Contract Consideration** 11

VII. **Action Steps for Libraries and Their Supporters** 12

I. Current ALA Policy

In 2001, after considering the issues of outsourcing and privatization, ALA Council voted to adopt the following policy:

"ALA affirms that publicly funded libraries should remain directly accountable to the public they serve. Therefore, the ALA opposes the shifting of policymaking and management oversight of library services for the public to the private for-profit sector."

II. Definitions

The Public Library Association used the following two definitions in its report Outsourcing: A Public Library Checklist, issued in August 2000. (For more information, visit: http://www.pla.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/placareers/outsourc.pdf.) The definition of "privatization" was derived from the 1998 deliberations of the American Library Association's Outsourcing Task Force.

Outsourcing involves transfer to a third party, outside vendor, contractor, independent workers, or provider to perform certain work-related tasks involving recurring internal activities that are not core to the mission of the library.

Privatization is the shifting of library service from the public to the private sector through transference of library management and operations from a government agency to a commercial company.

The distinction between outsourcing and privatization deserves some additional discussion. Some people suggest that there is no difference between outsourcing and privatization. After all, they argue, in outsourcing, a third party provides a service and makes a profit, just as in privatization.

One of the main differences between the two is that in outsourcing, the contract is typically narrow and for a specific service that can be easily defined and monitored. For example, a library might contract with a regional cooperative for cataloging, standing orders, or continuous services with a book jobber. In each of these cases, the private company decides how a service is delivered but the publicly funded library staff controls what that service is through a contract.

Privatization takes outsourcing to another level. Privatization encompasses all library services and controls not only how services are delivered but what services are offered and delivered. Privatization brings to light a variety of issues that will be covered in the following section of this document. All of these issues hinge on the premise that any and all contracts entered into should ensure that profits do not supersede the needs of the community.

III. Major Issues in Library Privatization

Quality of library services: How will a private company maintain or increase the level of service to the community and still make a profit? Who will make the final decision about the addition, reduction, or elimination of services?

Loss of local community control: Community control of the library, its services, and expenditure of tax dollars is at risk. Decisions about library service, operations, and budget are transferred from the public sector to a private, for-profit company. Will a private company be receptive to community feedback about the library?

Governance: Will policy remain under local control? What is the role of the board of trustees? Will existing trustees continue to have whatever authority is given them in state law?

Loss of control of tax dollars: Public money will go to a business with little or no transparency and accountability. What is the company's profit margin, and how does this impact library service?

Intellectual freedom: Will the company adhere to local polices such as protection of user privacy, requiring a court order prior to reveal user information, a collection development policy, intellectual freedom, and the Library Bill of Rights? (See the Library Bill of Rights: http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/index.cfm.)

Collection development: Library staff buys materials that reflect the needs of its local communities. In many privatized libraries, off-site staff at the company's headquarters selects materials. Will a provision for local input be part of the contract to ensure that local needs are being met?

Loss of community involvement with foundations, nonprofits, Friends groups: Will the library have difficulty receiving grants from private foundations or soliciting donations from private individuals because the library is now managed by a for-profit company and thus the contributions help a private company make a profit? Will Friends, foundations, and other bodies continue to raise funds for the local library if it is privatized? Will any percentage of funds raised go to the for-profit company? Is donated money under the control of the governing board or the for-profit company? If it is under the control of the for-profit company or management, is a Friends group's 501(c)3 status in jeopardy?

IV. Key Messages and Talking Points

These key messages and talking points are for use by library staff, trustees, and other library supporters in talking to media representatives and others about privatization. (See www.inthepublicinterest.org/whats-at-stake for an example of how this can be graphically presented.)

Key Message 1: There are certain community services that should be held by the public. Libraries are one of them.

Talking point: Democracy depends on a well-informed and well-educated society in order to be self-governing. Public libraries provide access to an infinite array of ideas both present and past, our world's history, our literary heritage, and learning resources for people of all ages. Today, access to 21st-century technologies has become increasingly critical for global networking, information access, and the routine tasks of individual commerce. Public libraries provide this access to all who use them without regard to means or background. Without access to these technologies, the digital divide grows deeper; more people are left further behind, and the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots" widens. Libraries continue their traditional role of connecting people with the resources they need to be fully participating members of society. Because libraries are critical to the public good, they should remain in the public domain.

Talking point: Public libraries are accountable to the public for the money they spend and the way they operate. They are governed by officials who answer to the voters. Private companies answer to the need to make a profit.

Talking point: A resident can see exactly how much money is spent on public library services. Depending on the contract, this same accountability may not be available under a private company, which shields its profits from public view. Use of public funds should be transparent.

Key Message 2: Will privatization save money?

Talking point: These are tough times for cities and counties, but library privatization has hidden and uncontrolled costs and may not save money in the long run.

Talking point: Like all contracts, privatization contracts for the public library must be carefully scrutinized to ensure that the community is receiving top service for a fair price. For example:

- Administrative costs and other fees should be clearly stated, including potential handling fees on materials or staff recruitment.
- The contract should address capital improvement and replacements, and address who is responsible for unexpected costs that may occur mid-contract, such as utility increases, repairs, or unexpected maintenance needs.
- Check to see if the company takes a percentage of any grants received.
- Who is responsible for administrative errors and associated penalties?

Key Message 3: Apparent reductions in labor costs may be offset by increases in legal costs resulting from employment actions.

Key Message 4: The public should be kept in public libraries. Privatizing the library threatens two pillars of public control: accountability and transparency.

Talking point: Private companies may not be obligated to disclose earnings. Governing bodies should insist on seeing current audited financial statements and information on the profit margin of a privately held company in order to maintain transparency.

Talking point: Public libraries are subject to the Freedom of Information Act. This same level of accountability is not required in privately held firms. Private companies can shield vital information from public view by claiming that such information is "proprietary."

Talking point: Public officials make decisions about library operations in public meetings open to everyone. Privatization may close the door on public meetings and shut the public out of decision-making.

Key Message 5: Decisions made regarding public library services should be driven by the best interests of the community and not driven by profit.

Talking point: Public librarians view the control of public assets as a trust that must be managed for the long-term interests of the community, not driven by immediate private commercial interests.

Key Message 6: Professional standards and maintenance of quality service may be at risk with privatized service.

Talking point: Private companies have a primary interest in making profit, which can create incentives to let quality slip and assets degrade by cutting corners on maintenance of the community's buildings and other assets, such as computing equipment and furniture.

Talking point: Private companies interested in keeping staff costs low may hire library workers who lack the necessary training or experience needed to provide quality library service.

Talking point: Some city and county governments cancelled or did not renew their privatization contracts after officials realized that they could save money by keeping library services in-house, or that the company failed to pay bills on time or requested to increase the budget.

V. A Checklist for Considering Privatization

Deciding to privatize public library management and operations is a critical decision that can have unforeseen consequences or an impact beyond what is expected, and be divisive within a community. It is important that a governing body (library board, city council, or county commission) consider multiple aspects of this decision. This checklist presents issues that should be discussed by a governing body prior to making this crucial decision. Governing boards should consider each question in light of its relevance to their local communities.

Funding

- How much money will the contract save? Has the library staff been asked if they can produce an equal amount of savings?
- How much profit margin will the company expect?
- Could profit paid to the company, combined with new library efficiencies, preserve public control of the library?
- How will the governing body monitor and verify that the anticipated cost savings occurred without damage to library services?
- Does the proposed contract include costs to fully manage the library—for example, the costs of rent, building and ground maintenance, and utilities?
- What are the costs of exiting any existing vendor or other cooperative contracts if the private company cancels them?
- What are the costs of cancelling the contract if the privatization service is not satisfactory? Can the city retain staff hired by the private company?

Library Services

- Will the same range of services be offered? Will services (including hours and locations) be decreased in number of offerings or frequency?
- Some services incur greater expenses for resources while others are very staff intensive. If forced to reduce, eliminate, or initiate services, will the private company be able to make informed decisions, mindful of the needs of the community? Will community input be solicited?
- What specific improvements in public service will result from the contract? How will the company pay for these improvements?
- Who, specifically, will evaluate that the library is providing the same or better library service? What specific criteria will be used in this determination?
- Will reciprocal borrowing (the ability to borrow from other libraries in the region) be continued, or will local library users be denied quick access to materials in other libraries? If these privileges are removed, will the library still participate in interlibrary loan agreements?
- Will the company engage in strategic planning?
- Will current library staff be retained? Experienced and dedicated library staff is the heart of library services to a community. Staff costs are the largest percentage of any organization's budget. Therefore, how a private company will handle staff costs must be understood before a contract is signed. What will the staffing patterns of the library be when it becomes privatized? How many full- and part-time staff will be employed?
- Will the hours and benefits of current staff be reduced? If so, by how much? Will existing employment contracts be honored?

Community Control

- Will there continue to be a library board, and will it continue to have the same level of authority and responsibility authorized in state law? Who will make library policies regarding such areas as the ability of children to use the Internet, or the setting of fees and fines?
- Will policy remain under local control? What is the role of the board of trustees? Will existing trustees continue to have whatever authority is given them in state law? To whom is the director of a privatized library accountable?
- Who will develop the library's collection to meet the needs of the local community? Will corporate staff at the company's headquarters make decisions about what goes in the library's collection? What input will the public and library staff have?
- What input will the community have when the contract is up for renewal? How will community satisfaction be determined? How will the community be informed of library plans, budgets, and performance? Will Friends, foundations, and other entities be able to continue to operate and provide financial support under their present structures?
- How will the community know where their library tax money is spent and what amount goes to company profit?

Political Questions

- Have library governing or advisory boards been involved in planning and decision-making? Does the library governing or advisory board support the privatization decision?
- Has the local community been involved in the privatization decision-making process? Has the community been asked what library services they prefer? Does the community support privatization of the library?
- How will the library reestablish public management of the library if the private company is not satisfactory?

Organization and Staff

- Does the company propose a change to the organizational structure of the library? Will library staff be retained?
- If current employees are not rehired by the company, what is the city's financial or human resource obligation to them? Who pays unemployment, retirement, or other termination costs? How will the city or county pay for legal defense arising from employment issues?
- Will volunteers replace existing trained staff?
- How will the company train volunteers and pay for any associated workmen's compensation insurance?
- Will company hiring practices include recruiting a diverse population to match the make-up of the community?
- If the contract with the private company ends, can the governing body retain library staff without paying a finder's fee to the company?

Legal

- How will compliance to all library-specific federal, state, and local laws and regulations be addressed?
- How will current collective bargaining contracts, employee benefits, and related issues be handled?
- Has a search of legal records been done to determine if there are any liens or judgments against the company?
- Has the potential impact on directors and officers insurance been investigated?

VI. A Checklist for Contract Consideration

What should be considered when soliciting a proposal and developing a contract for a public library? A private company may indicate that it cannot answer these questions until it has begun to manage the library. However, a discussion with the private company should include the governing authority's intentions. The same questions should be asked of the local library as a competitor for the contract, which would keep the library fully under public control.

Contract Provisions

- Frequency and content of regular reports to the governing body
- Oversight of the contract by governing body staff or officials
- Performance measures to ensure quality performance such as:
  - Circulation and circulation per capita (print, electronic, CD/DVD, etc.)
  - Community presentations
  - Number of individuals served through outreach services
  - Registration as percentage of population
  - Reference transactions and reference transactions per capita (on-site, phone- and virtual reference)
  - In-library use, visits (walk-in traffic, computer usage)
  - Web visits, database usage
  - Interlibrary loan statistics
  - Program attendance
  - Number of programs by month and year
  - Growth or decline of existing services
  - Establishment of new services to meet community needs
  - Hours open, total and by day
  - Status in relation to any state standards
  - The ratio between full-time and part-time staff
  - The ratio between librarians with an MLS degree and staff without MLS degrees
  - Number of volunteers and volunteer hours
  - Holds-to-copy ratio
  - Return on Investment
  - Services offered to different demographics (i.e., teen services, emergent literacy, ESOL)
- Criteria governing cancellation of the contract for performance issues
- Areas of library service where profit may be realized at the expense of quality. Degree to which any state standards must be met, i.e., no less than before privatization or above average for peer libraries
- Ability to retain library staff without paying a finder's fee to the private company if the contract is cancelled
- Company adherence to all applicable state library law, including privacy of library records and use
- Any protections for current library staff jobs, salaries, or benefits
- Degree of transparency that the private company will provide about its financial operation of the library, particularly its profit margin

VII. Action Steps for Libraries and Their Supporters

If Privatization Is Being Considered

Privatization of public libraries has become an option that is being considered by some cities and counties (governing bodies). The American Library Association has taken a position against such privatization, particularly on a long-term basis. Library staff and their supporters—boards of trustees, Friends groups, library foundations—play a major role in keeping public libraries public. Here are four steps one can take if privatization is being considered.

- Be an advocate.
- Be informed.
- Be prepared.
- Be competitive.

Be an Advocate

The best defense against privatization of public libraries is for the library staff and supporters to maintain a good relationship with the library's governing body and operate the most efficient library possible while providing the best possible service to meet the community's needs. Libraries maintain good relations by:

- Demonstrating the value of the library in addressing community needs
- Delivering quality customer service to meet community needs
- Cultivating vocal community support for the library
- Being in regular, positive contact with governing officials
- Sharing good news about library successes
- Involving governing officials in library activities
- Regularly improving library operation and letting the governing officials know about these improvements

Learning advocacy skills is the first step in becoming an effective advocate.
The American Library Association, the Public Library Association, state associations, and state libraries offer training and other resources. If governing officials are pleased with the library and aware of strong public support, the issue of privatizing the public library is not as likely to arise.

Be Informed

The legal authority of a library board of trustees may vary depending on specific state statutes. However, as guardians of a public trust, all trustees have an obligation to understand their duties and obligations to the communities they serve. Citizens for Libraries: The Association of Library Trustees, Advocates, Friends and Foundations has developed a list of 10 trustee competencies that are essential to performing the job of a trustee. The question of privatization is less likely to occur if the library trustees demonstrate their knowledge and expertise of these competencies. The competencies are: general knowledge; board operation; advocacy; decision-making; strategic planning; finance; fundraising; policy-making; lobbying; and professional development. (For more information, visit http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/altaff/trustees/tipsheets/tipsheet9.pdf.) Ongoing board development and education are essential to maintaining a knowledgeable board.

Be Prepared

All library advocates must be prepared for the question of whether or not privatizing the local public library could be in the best interest of the community. In these days of limited financial resources, every public service must justify its value to the public it serves. Transparency and accountability are paramount. Library trustees and administrators must continually document and validate library services and expenditures. This documentation may also prove essential in providing an accurate comparison between the cost of current library service and privatized service.

When the idea of privatizing public libraries arises, library advocates should be prepared to counter the idea in a timely manner and thoroughly analyze why privatization is being considered. Do governing officials lack key information about the library? Do governing officials know the extent of library services?

Some public officials are intrigued with the idea of privatization but do not really understand all that privatization entails or what its implications can be. Library staff should share ALA's Checklist for Considering Privatization. This checklist will give a better understanding of what should be considered in privatization decisions.

The better prepared a library is to show its value to the community, the better the chance of deflecting privatization before governing officials seriously consider it. Advocates should collect and update the information listed below. If one waits until privatization is at hand, there might not be enough time to gather the necessary documentation to show the value of the library. An additional benefit of gathering this information is that it can support current advocacy efforts with governing officials, the public, the press, and other stakeholders. Here are the kinds of information to have readily available:

- A long-range or strategic plan of service that shows that the library continually considers the best way to provide library service for the community
- Recent audits showing improvements in fiscal management that have saved the library money and how the saved money was spent to improve library service
- Staffing levels and responsibilities of professional and support staff
- Data on library use over time for common library uses such as resource circulation, reference, and programming
- A complete list of all library services, including use over time and any information on favorable reception by the public
- Any data profile that is required by the state
- Comparisons of the local library to its peers showing its success in providing service with limited resources, if possible
- Testimonial from library users about their satisfaction with the local library and the quality of service they receive
- Accomplishments of the library over the last two or three years
- Cooperative ventures and partnerships in place to better serve library users
- Involvement of Friends, foundations, and other support groups.

If governing officials are philosophically in favor of working with private companies or cooperative ventures to save money, library staff and trustees might show that they are already seriously involved in outsourcing, but that library governance and policymaking should remain in the public sector. Libraries commonly outsource services in the following areas:

- **Collection development:** Materials may be ordered already processed from a private vendor so that library staff does not have to do this; similarly, databases may be provided by private companies, saving the library money in print magazine subscriptions. However, library staff still have the critical responsibility of collection development.
- **Programming:** The library contracts with private performers and speakers to provide programming for adults and youth.
- **Building maintenance:** Janitorial and building maintenance might be outsourced.
- **Ancillary services:** Technology support, accounting, payroll, benefits management might be outsourced.

Be Competitive

If the library's governing body has released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for library services, a response on behalf of the library should also be submitted. If the library responds to the RFP:

- Read the RFP thoroughly. Be ready to respond to every section in the RFP as comprehensively as possible. Try to determine the reason for the interest in privatizing the library. Is it to save money? If so, demonstrate that the current library administration and trustees can be responsive to the continuing need for efficiency in library operation. Is it lack of awareness of the performance of the library in the community? If so, document this performance in the RFP response.
- Review the documents collected in "Be Prepared" to see if they contain information necessary to respond to the RFP. Add whatever additional information is missing.
- Review the RFP and responses to ensure that the proposal answers all the questions in the RFP.
- Create a calendar and a work plan to respond to the RFP. Pay attention to deadlines. Also plan to implement any changes in library services and operations that are mentioned in the RFP.
- Solicit letters of support from influential community members, representatives of important community groups, Friends groups, the library trustees, and demographic groups. Follow the RFP process closely. If a private company is given an opportunity to submit additional information or a revised budget, ask for the same privilege for the library. If possible, obtain legal advice on the required RFP process and procedures and verify that the governing body is following these correctly.

If Privatization Is Being Pursued

If the governing authority has decided to privatize the local public library, the new goal is to ensure quality library service for the community. Here are two steps one can take if privatization is being pursued.

1. Insist on accountability in the contract

First, share the checklist on what should go into a contract with governing officials, executive staff, and appropriate legal counsel. Assuming the contract is a public document, library supporters can raise issues about the contract content to ensure the highest possible library service.

Second, the contract should specify performance-measurement indicators prior to privatization and require that those measurements are compared in regular increments throughout the contract period.

2. Monitor all new library policies and administrative activities.

Monitor any privatization contracts to make sure service to the public does not suffer. The contract should specify areas that should be monitored on a regular basis, including:

- Adherence to and adoption of library policy
- Payment of bills
- Adherence to all library contracts
- Adherences to state library law and standards
- Adherence to or development of a strategic plan
- Appropriate use of grants
- Cost-cutting measures do not negatively impact service
- Community comments or suggestions and the company's responses to them are forwarded to the governing board

If the state library or state library law have standards for public libraries, monitor the company's performance to ensure that the library meets or exceeds these standards, and that library performance in relation to the standards does not deteriorate after privatization.

Make sure that each board member has a copy of any recently developed long-range or strategic plan and watches to see that all elements of the plan are being addressed and that positive progress is being made, or that the for-profit company is providing information relative to any deviations. Be sure that the governing board is involved in any revisions in the plan.

In addition:

- Be sure that staff receives continuing education or on-the-job training to ensure quality public service.

- The company should receive an annual performance review based on the contract. If deficiencies are found, an action plan for remediation within a specific time frame should be developed.

- Watch for cost-cutting measures such as employing mostly part-time employees and/or using volunteers for work that should be done by paid staff. When such measures are noted, be cognizant of how they affect library services and activities.

- Require that the for-profit company provide monthly copies of all community input received and an explanation of actions taken by the company in relation to each. Develop other methods for monitoring community response to the new library set-up and related actions taken by the company.

- Review all points above and determine exactly what action will be taken by the board or by city or county government in the event that the for-profit fails to meet requirements and expectations. How long will the company be given to correct any problem? Will there be any penalty fee charged to the company if there is a problem but it is corrected? How will the board establish an appropriate level of correction in each case?

Conclusion

This report is designed to help communities understand the implications of public library privatization, and to provide the tools to help assess the issues surrounding it. There are many other resources available about such privatization. We encourage additional research.

Remember, no decision is ever final. At the time this document was created, approximately 20 privatization contracts for libraries or library systems had been signed nationwide. Six of those were later terminated or not renewed.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization On Library Services and Management

A Study for the American Library Association

Robert S. Martin, Ph.D., Principal Investigator

and

Steven L. Brown, Jane Claes, Cynthia A. Gray,
Greg Hardin, Timothy C. Judkins, Kelly Patricia Kingrey,
Clara Latham, Thomas K. Lindsey, JoAnn Rogers,
Roberta Schenewerk, Kathleen G. Strauss, Suzanne Sweeney,
Marleen Watling, and Lea Worcester

Texas Woman's University
School of Library and Information Studies

June 2000

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management

Executive Summary

I. Introduction 1

Background of study 1
Overview of project 2
Plan of Work and Methodology 2

II. Literature review 7

III. Outsourcing of Cataloging 21

IV. Outsourcing of Selection 27

The Hawaii Public Library System Case 27
The Fort Worth Public Library System Case 30

V. Outsourcing of Management 37

The NASA Case 37
The Riverside County Library System Case 41

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations 53

VII. Works cited 56

VIII. Bibliography 63

IX. Appendices 79

X. Notes on the Research Team 119

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management
© 2000 American Library Association

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was funded by a grant from the American Library Association (ALA) to the Texas Woman's University School of Library and Information Studies. The study was carried out within the context of a regularly scheduled doctoral seminar on Trends and Issues in Library Management. Grant funds covered the cost of tuition and fees for students in the seminar, facilitating the recruitment of a number of special non-degree students, librarians from the Dallas-Ft. Worth professional community. The fifteen students in the class comprised the research team and carried out the study.

The team conducted a thorough review of the literature on outsourcing and privatization. The review covered not only the library literature, but also the literature of public education and private sector management. The resulting bibliography is an exhaustive listing of the literature for the decade of the 1990s.

While the team intended to adopt the definitions of outsourcing and privatization that had been posited by the ALA Outsourcing Task Force (OTF), in the event we found the definition of privatization rendered the establishment of operational definitions impossible. Noting that the OTF itself was unable to adhere to its own definition, we elected to limit the definition of privatization to instances where control over policy was relinquished to a vendor. In that we found no such instances in our study, we limited our focus to outsourcing in its various forms.

The team examined in detail outsourcing of cataloging, selection, and management of library operations. The study of cataloging was limited to reviewing reports in the literature and aggregating the information to assemble an overview of the current state of outsourcing in so far as it could be determined. Selection and management were studied by investigating two case studies of each, the Hawaii Public Library System and the Fort Worth Public Library System for selection, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Riverside County Library System for management.

We found no evidence that outsourcing *per se* represents a threat to library governance, or to the role of the library in protecting the First Amendment rights of the public. We found equivocal evidence with regard to the maintenance of a quality workforce. It appears that the issues we identified may be more indicative of broader trends of library staffing than byproducts of outsourcing. We found no evidence that outsourcing *per se* had any significant negative impact on interlibrary cooperation.

In general, we found no evidence that outsourcing *per se* has had a negative impact on library services and management. On the contrary, the evidence supports the conclusion that outsourcing has been an effective managerial tool, and when used carefully and judiciously it has resulted in enhanced library services and improved library management. Instances where problems have arisen subsequent to decisions to outsource aspects of library operations and functions appear to be attributable to inadequate planning, poor contracting processes, or ineffective management of contracts.

We make a number of recommendations for future action that the American Library Association might take to improve the practice of outsourcing and enhance library services and management.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000
American Library Association.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

For many years libraries have contracted with outside agencies to perform tasks and functions that are necessary to library operations, but not necessarily part of the library's core services. Examples of such routinely-accepted "contracting out" include not only such obvious non-library functions as janitorial services and photocopying services, but also services more characteristically associated with libraries, like binding services. Even functions commonly regarded as "core" to library operations, such as cataloging, have long been procured through contractual arrangements with outside service providers. As early as 1901 the Library of Congress began mass-producing catalog cards and providing them to other libraries, in the process becoming perhaps the first vendor of cataloging services. Over the years, libraries have contracted out not only cataloging services, but other functions as well, including the development of automated systems and the acquisition of materials. These practices were not generally labeled as outsourcing when first adopted, and they are common practice today.

Several events in the mid 1990s led to growing concerns within the library profession about increasing outsourcing of library functions, to the point that some librarians were concerned about the complete privatization of publicly funded libraries. These concerns led the American Library Association to establish in the fall of 1997 an Outsourcing Task Force (OTF). The charge to the OTF was to:

- Advise the association on issues related to outsourcing, subcontracting and privatization of library services;
- Gather data, examine the literature on outsourcing and evaluate the impact of outsourcing on library services and operations;
- Examine past ALA positions and determine how these issues relate to the ALA Code of Ethics and other association policies;
- Provide ALA Council with a comprehensive report with recommendations at the 1999 Midwinter Meeting.

The OTF reviewed the literature, examined ALA policies, held hearings at Midwinter 1998 and Annual Conference 1998 and prepared a report to the Executive Board with recommendations which were presented as motions to the ALA Council at the 1999 Midwinter Meeting. Among the recommendations of the OTF was that ALA should commission a formal study on the impact of outsourcing and privatization on library services and management. The recommendation was adopted by the ALA Council (American Library Association 1999a, 1999b). ALA issued a Request For Proposals and this study was funded and carried out in response to that RFP.

Overview of Project

As part of its normal curriculum, the School of Library and Information Studies at Texas Woman's University regularly offers a Doctoral level seminar in Trends and Issues in Library Management. Subsequent to receiving the grant from ALA to carry out the study on outsourcing

and privatization, the Project Director, Dr. Robert S. Martin, the instructor for the course in the Spring 200 semester, established outsourcing and privatization as the major focus of the course. The majority of the readings and discussion for the course were on the topic of outsourcing and privatization, and the required class project was to carry out the study.

We used part of the funding provided by the contract to underwrite tuition and fee waivers for all students registered for the course. This served as an inducement to assist in recruiting experienced practitioners to the project team, and provided compensation for all of the participants (except the Project Director) for their contributions to the work of the project. To ensure equity, tuition and fee waivers were provided to current students and special students alike. Registration in the course was limited to fifteen students; consent of instructor ensured all who enroll were qualified to participate in the project.

An assertive public information campaign was focused on the public, academic, and school libraries in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area, advertising the opportunity to participate in this important study by enrolling in the course. Fifteen students were admitted to the course. Four were students already enrolled in the doctoral program at TWU SLIS. Of these, two are pursuing doctoral studies full-time and two remain employed as librarians full-time while they pursue their studies on a part-time basis. One advanced student in the TWU SLIS master's program also enrolled. The remaining ten students–two-thirds of the class–were special non-degree students drawn from the professional community in the Dallas-Ft. Worth metropolitan area, recruited specifically to participate in the research project. The resulting research team was made up of experienced librarians, representing in aggregate more than 250 years of varied library experience. (see X. Notes on the Research team).

Work Plan and Methodology

As the ALA Outsourcing Task Force's report noted, there is nothing new about outsourcing. The proximate cause for the work of the Task Force, however, stems from major outsourcing and privatization initiatives, in Hawaii and California, dating from 1996 and 1997. We therefore limited the scope of the study to assessing impact of these recent major outsourcing and privatization efforts, focusing on events in 1997 and later. We limited the scope of our literature review to the decade of the 1990s.

Upon notification of award of contract on November 5, the Project Director immediately finalized the syllabus for the course, incorporating the study as the core element of the course. Together with TWU Libraries staff, and assisted by a graduate assistant provided by the SLIS, we compiled a comprehensive citation list of publications on the topics of outsourcing and privatization (see VIII. Bibliography on Outsourcing), and prepared copies of relevant articles and other materials to distribute to the research team.

We anticipated that to fully understand outsourcing and assess its impact on some aspects of library services it was necessary to conduct field visits to actual outsourcing sites. The Project Director identified and contacted selected library organizations in which outsourcing has been initiated and secured cooperation for the project. These included the Riverside County Library System, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Fort Worth Public Library System.

The project team met for the first time on Wednesday, January 19, 2000, and met weekly thereafter through May 10. At the first class meeting on January 19, the Project Director

established project work teams, with separate teams for outsourcing of cataloging, selection, and management. Literature to be reviewed was divided topically and assigned to relevant teams. All members of the research team reviewed the report of the ALA Outsourcing Task Force, as well as other relevant literature on outsourcing and privatization, not only from the field of librarianship, but also from the literatures of management and public administration. The literature review was completed by February 9.

The project teams proceeded to develop definitions for the key concepts, terms and variables to be assessed. This was one of the most important and difficult steps in carrying out the project. For purposes of consistency and continuity, we tried not to deviate from commonly accepted definitions whenever possible. We had intended, therefore, to accept the definitions of outsourcing and privatization as written in the Outsourcing Task Force's report. These definitions were as follows.

- *Outsourcing* is the contracting to external companies or organizations, functions that would otherwise be performed by library employees.

- *Privatization* is the shifting of policy making and management of library services or the responsibility for the performance of core library services in their entirety, from the public to the private sector.

- *Core services* are those professional activities that define the profession of librarianship. These include collection development and organization; gathering and providing information; making the collection accessible to all library users; providing assistance in the use of the collection; and providing oversight and management of these activities (American Library Association 1999a, 2-3).

We found the Task Force's definition of *outsourcing* to be similar to many in the literature and agreed to accept it. We found, however, the definitions of *privatization* and *core services* to be unworkable in the research context and completely unamenable to the development of operational definitions. First, from the literature, there appears to be a complete lack of consensus about what constitutes a "core service"–what is core in one institutional context may well be considered to be peripheral in another. Even if there were agreement about the definition of "core services," there would still be difficulties with "privatization." For example, would the shifting of one "core service" to the private sector be sufficient to constitute privatization? Our team thought not. Given what the literature review revealed about the probable extent of outsourcing in American libraries, it seemed to us misleading and unhelpful to label the majority of American libraries as "privatized." What then was an adequate extent of outsourcing of "core services" to constitute "privatization"?

We were not surprised to find that the Task Force itself found its definitions inadequate:

> It is acknowledged that the distinctions between the terms "outsourcing" and "privatization" are not exact and are subject to arbitrary interpretations. Within the context of this report, the Task Force has utilized the term "outsourcing" for contracting for specific services; and the term "privatization" when the responsibility for day-to-day management of a library or for establishing or altering policies that affect the delivery of

> service, is delegated to an external commercial agency (American Library Association 1999a, 3).

In other words, in spite of its own definitions, the Task Force recognized that a library could in fact contract out "core services" such as selection or cataloging, and still not be considered as "privatized." Only if the library contracted out for day-to-day management of operations, or relinquished control over policy to a contractor could it be considered "privatize." From at least one perspective, however, "day-to-day management of a library" might be construed as a "specific service" to be contracted out, and from that perspective, a library that contracted out its day-to-day management but retained control over policy could not be construed as "privatized." We determined that the only consistent factor that seemed to enter into a definition of privatization was control over policy. We established, then, the following operational definition of privatization:

- *Privatization* is contracting out for services in a way that shifts control over policies for library collections and services from the public to the private sector.

This definition renders moot the debate over the definition of "core services."

Operational definitions of the other elements to be studied were difficult to develop, and occupied considerable time in the project schedule. We determined that different operational definitions to were needed to assess different aspects of the outsourcing landscape. Each work group developed its own definitions to assess the factors in its milieu, and then established the specific qualitative and/or quantitative data needed for assessment were established. Given the time constraints for the project, these data were limited to what might reasonably be collected and analyzed. For example, the work group studying the Riverside County Library System determined to use quality of library services as an indicator of the success of outsourcing, and established an operational definitions based on hours of service, measured by reported hours, and user satisfaction, measured by survey of library users.

The project teams then identified sources for the needed data, and constructed the survey and interview instruments needed. Data collection commenced in late February.

As the project developed, the teams were further subdivided to focus on specific aspects of their topic. For example, the management outsourcing team was divided into two teams, one focusing on NASA and one on Riverside County. The Riverside team visited Riverside, California, during early March to carry out on-site evaluation. This team conducted on-site interviews with library managers, professional and support staff, library users, and elected officials. Other project teams will conduct site visits in the Dallas-Ft. Worth metro area.

During March the project teams began to process incoming data and survey returns. Follow-up contacts were required to ensure adequate data returns on surveys and other data collection procedures. Follow-up letters and phone calls were carried out through March and into April.

In April the work teams completed data analysis and begin drafting the report. Follow-up contacts with respondents to clarify information were made by members of the work teams. Analysis of quantitative data was carried out utilizing standard statistical software packages available at TWU. The initial draft of the report, with the final input from the work team members, was completed by May 10. This report constituted the final examination for the course. The Project Director completed the report for submission to ALA.

The Project Director will attend ALA Annual Conference to make a presentation on the projects results to ALA Executive Board and/or Council, and to respond to questions.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Definitions of "outsourcing" vary widely, ranging from the simple–getting someone else to do your work for you–to the complex–the acquisition of services from external service providers. Basically defined, outsourcing is the transfer of an internal service or function to an outside vendor (Bordeianu and Benaud 1997). Outsourcing is a new name for the old practice of "contracting out" for services that organizations chose not to provide internally with their own staff. Whatever the definition, outsourcing has become a standard practice in both the corporate and the not-for-profit worlds. A 1995 survey indicates 40% of Fortune 500 Companies outsourced some department or service (Lancaster 1995).

In the corporate sector, outsourcing became popular in the 1980s primarily as a way to reduce costs and increase profitability. The automotive industry led the way in outsourcing by contracting with companies specializing in a particular aspect of the manufacturing process. Both Ford and Chrysler significantly reduced inventories by outsourcing component manufacturing for their cars. Their profits remained steady, while General Motors, which chose to remain a wholly in-house operation, saw profits plummet. This scenario lent credibility to outsourcing as a positive and strong cost cutting measure (Marcum 1998).

First a cost cutting measure, outsourcing exploded in the 1990s and became identified as a method of spinning off unnecessary work in order to focus the organization on its primary goals. Processes and functions identified as not central to the enterprise are contracted out to other firms that specialize in providing those products or services, in theory enabling the contracting organization to concentrate its resources on the core business. Retail credit, marketing, information technology systems, and human resources management are examples of functions that are increasing procured through contracting with outside service providers. In the 1990s outsourcing thus was transformed from a simple efficiency tactic to an innovative management strategy focused on streamlining the company. Following this transformation, interest in outsourcing significantly increased. The literature reflects this change. A 1980s survey of the business periodical literature reveals an average of three articles per year about outsourcing. This number increases dramatically in the 1990s to more than six hundred articles annually (Marcum 1998).

Libraries have followed the general business trend. Routine non-library services, like janitorial services and photocopying, have long been procured through contracts with outside vendors. In the early part of the 20th century, the Library of Congress began mass-producing catalog cards and providing them to other libraries, in the process becoming perhaps the first vendor of cataloging services. Over the years, libraries have contracted out not only cataloging services, but other functions as well, including the development of automated systems and the acquisition of materials. These practices were not generally labeled as outsourcing when first adopted, and they are common practice today.

Outsourcing is a topic of interest to most librarians in all types of libraries. The library literature reflects a continuing discussion of outsourcing of such routine library operations as collection development, materials selection, materials processing, cataloging, and management. A search using Library Lit and ERIC databases yielded 103 articles related to outsourcing published during the 1990s. This literature consists almost exclusively of either opinion pieces commenting on the pros and cons of outsourcing, or else "how we did it good" reports of specific

outsourcing projects. There is almost no quantitative research concerning the impact of outsourcing on library operations or on the quality of library services.

Opinion articles range from those that present outsourcing as a wonderful strategy for improving both efficiency and effectiveness, to those that posit a more moderate wait-and-see attitude, to vehement denunciations of the practice as inimical to the values of the profession. Ronald A. Dubberly, retired director of the Atlanta–Fulton Public library, states that only the outsourced will survive in lean economic times (Dubberly 1998a). Leaving no question concerning his attitude, Dubberly titles his article in *Library Journal*, "Why Outsourcing is our Friend." Dubberly argues that libraries caught in the economic crunch of having to provide more services with reduced revenue can do so only by utilizing outsourcing. Also, Dubberly predicts government will merge tax-supported service oriented departments, including libraries. Those public libraries that fail to adapt will cease to operate. Librarians must consider outsourcing as a tool to provide better service using less money and to insure continuing library service to their communities.

Clara Dunkle in her article, "Outsourcing the Catalog department: A Mediation Inspired by the business and Library Literature," notes a variety of businesses effectively use outsourcing to become more effective and reduce costs. While not a good idea to totally outsource cataloging functions, Dunkle suggests cataloging by vendors may provide greater accuracy and consistency of cataloging records (Dunkle 1996).

Kevin Miles provides a law librarian's perspective on outsourcing in his 1996 survey. With a relatively small sample of respondents, he concludes that law firms–regardless of size–are "aggressively outsourcing parts of their libraries" (Miles 1996, 12).

"A Tempest in a Teapot." describes outsourcing according to Anne Woodsworth, Dean of Palmer School of Library and Information Science, Long Island University. Library managers use outsourcing as a tool when they implement blanket and standing orders to vendors. Vendors assume the role of acquisitions staff and bibliographers (Woodsworth 1998).

John N. Berry's February, 1998, *Library Journal* editorial questions the wisdom of outsourcing, saying that no systems for measuring outsourcing's impact are in place. Cost cutting and efficiency are not the only issues in a service-oriented venue such as a library. The most important measure of any change is in the quality of library service offered to all users and potential users (Berry 1998).

Michael Gorman is one of the most outspoken critics of outsourcing, especially outsourcing of cataloging and technical services. He state with some asperity that the outsourced catalog is "corruption of the bedrock of library competence" (Gorman 1995). More recently he wrote that library managers who decide to contract with outside vendors for cataloging, selection or acquisition services "are saying, in effect, that professional library skills and experience can be replaced by distant vendors who probably lack the former and certainly lack the latter." He opposes outsourcing because in his view it leads to an "inevitable debasement of service," and because it undermines "the very foundations of our profession"(Gorman 1998, 74).

Pat Schuman, a past president of ALA, is perhaps even more vehement in her opposition to outsourcing. In Schuman's view, outsourcing and privatization–which considers merely different faces of the same phenomenon–"threaten the profession's very core–perhaps its very 'soul' as a public service." She examines and attempts to refute three assumptions that she believes underlie all outsourcing decisions:

1. The private sector can–and will–do it better and cheaper;
2. Private sector accountability tot he marketplace is more effective than government bureaucracy; and
3. Libraries have always outsourced, and managers should be free to employ this useful tool.

She concludes with a plea for librarians to articulate a clear, passionate, and convincing case for America's premier democratic institutions–out libraries" (Schuman 1998).

There is very little in the library literature in the way of empirical research on outsourcing in libraries and its effects on service. Our survey revealed only two articles published during the 1990s. Katherine Libby and Dana Caudle conducted a survey on outsourcing of cataloging in academic libraries to determine the extent and success of such ventures. The study reveals that out of the 117 libraries responding to the survey, thirty-three were outsourcing cataloging functions and sixteen libraries were considering the practice. Of the thirty-three libraries outsourcing their cataloging, most appeared to be pleased with the results. Each indicated that they would continue outsourcing the cataloging function (Libby and Caudle 1997).

Karen Wilson, Assistant Director at the J. Hugh Jackson Library, at Stanford University, provides some data in her case study detailing the outsourcing of copy cataloging and processing at her library. Blackwell North America, Inc. and Blackwell Ltd. provided J. Hugh Jackson Library staff with catalog records for 86% and 57% respectively for the monographs purchased from them. During the period in which Blackwell North America and Blackwell, Ltd. provided records, library staff accepted 69% and 61% respectively without making changes. Staff edited another 25% of the records slightly to reflect local concerns. Less than 2% of the records contained errors. This project demonstrated that outsourcing reduced costs and reduced the time it takes to process materials, but had no discernable detrimental effect on the quality of cataloging records. Wilson hails the outsourcing at J. Hugh Jackson as a new paradigm for the future of technical services operations in academic libraries (Wilson 1995).

Outsourcing in libraries remains controversial. In the business world, functions that are not central to the organization's perceived core business are those most likely to be outsourced, while core competencies or functions that are essential to the company are kept in-house. The central issue then becomes: what constitutes a core competency or function? Libraries operate in a constantly evolving environment. What they do, what services they provide, and how they organize their resources to provide those services, are all subject to a changing paradigm. That changing paradigm is reflected in the literature.

Outsourcing Cataloging Department Functions

Outsourcing of cataloging functions* in libraries is the area that has seen the most activity and has also provided the largest number of contributions to the literature during the decade of the 1990s. The pattern of publication reflects a swelling of interest in the topic during the middle of the decade, followed by a rapid decline. There were no articles on outsourcing cataloging in the first two years of the decade, followed by a rapid growth to more than forty articles in 1996 and 1997.

---

* For the purposes of this literature review, the phrase "cataloging functions" includes the following functions and processes: authority control, creation and editing of bibliographic records, and processing of materials.

Following Libby and Caudle's comprehensive review in 1997, there was a steady decline in the number of articles. Fewer than ten appeared in 1998 and only two in 1999. This pattern appears to represent a rapid and visible growth in the practice of outsourcing cataloging functions, a brief period of concern and controversy, followed by a recognition that this phenomenon was now "business as usual."

The overwhelming body of literature on outsourcing cataloging functions is focused on the academic community. Since 1995, there have been two articles from public libraries, two from special libraries, and only one from school libraries.

Overviews. In addition to Libby and Caudle's comprehensive survey there are number of excellent overviews on the topic. *Outsourcing Library Technical Services Operations* published by the American Library Association provides sixteen case studies, eleven featuring examples from academic libraries, three are from public libraries and two from special libraries (Wilson and Colver 1997). A more recent survey by the Urban Libraries Council, however, provides data from 72 member libraries, showing that 51% of those libraries responding are outsourcing almost half of their cataloging and 68% are outsourcing at least 40% of their materials processing. These same libraries have been outsourcing cataloging for an average of ten years and materials processing for an average of six years (Urban Libraries Council 1999).

Ruschoff supplies a historical context for outsourcing in technical services operations, reporting and evaluating "the warnings, suggestions, inquiries, and findings" which appeared in the literature (1995, 51). He does this from the perspective of addressing the "forces" shaping libraries; funding, desire of libraries to do more, satisfying the customer's informational needs, and the Internet. Wilson also provides an historical perspective on outsourcing cataloging and physical processing and documents, beginning as far back as 150 years ago. She also notes that "virtually no literature on library outsourcing of cataloging and physical processing existed in 1991" (Wilson 1995).

Outsourcing was such significant issue in the mid-1990s that in 1996 ALCTS devoted a Preconference to the subject. Themes arising in the proceedings of the Preconference included: every outsourcing situation is different, librarians have always adapted and embraced new technology and change, importance of knowing your internal costs, guidelines are needed for evaluating outsourcing services, reorganization can be done in a team-like atmosphere, know what type of service that you want to outsource, importance of collaboration with, and the partnership that exists, between vendors and librarians (German 1996).

Dunkle provides with a different slant to the topic as she highlights the difficulties of outsourcing a cataloging department by contrasting outsourcing in business and in libraries. She begins first with the decision "not whether to outsource–but how much to outsource (Dunkle 1996)." The points out that the work of highly trained, highly skilled cataloging staff can distance them from other professionals in the organization, yet, their work is vital to the success of the organization. Dunkle disputes many of the assumptions of outsourcing. She focuses on the "real" costs, the potential for more flexibility on the part of the staff, the belief that a vendor will provide a high-quality product with little guidance, and the human resources issues. The author outlines the necessary steps to implementing a successful outsourcing project, and, in summary, states that "outsourcing is not a substitute for management's accountability and responsibilities." Dunkle examines the most prevalent reasons for outsourcing cataloging in detail. The first, which always elicits emotional reactions, is that cataloging "performs a process which is not critical to the organization's mission"–or that it is not a "core" department. The

second is that administrators lack the knowledge and understanding of this department's function, and as a result may feel they cannot communicate effectively with the workforce. And, finally, the department may indeed be inefficient, wasting money and resources and lacking the power or will to adapt to the changing environment of its own free will.

The most comprehensive treatment of outsourcing cataloging in libraries is without question the Hirshon and Winters work *Outsourcing Library Technical Services*, published in 1996. It was specifically designed as a step-by-step guide to walk librarians through the steps of reengineering, outsourcing, and the procurement process. In its preface, the authors stress that

> ...outsourcing is not an objective, but a tool. Simply put, a library should not set out to outsource. Rather, the library should look for ways to improve its internal processes and to become as efficient and as effective as possible. Before a library engages the services of an outside vendor, it is essential to first undergo process reengineering to ensure that outsourcing is indeed the best course of action. (Hirshon and Winters 1996, 26)

Perhaps the best and most recent introductory article related to outsourcing technical services is by Barry Baker in 1998. He gives a brief overview and history of reengineering and outsourcing. The most frequent rationale for outsourcing, according to Baker, is its "potential to reduce costs, increase customer satisfaction, and provide effective and efficient improvements." He points out that "the success of the outsourcing project depends on how well the library plans and does its homework before entering into an agreement with a provider. A good contract and a good relationship with the vendor will help the library monitor performance, quality, and maintain control of the operation." (Baker 1998, 38).

Other good general treatments of outsourcing technical services is Joyce Ogburn's 1994 article, which gives an excellent overview, and Gary Shirk, who provides the vendor's perspective, encouraging both vendors and librarians alike to proceed with outsourcing, but with caution (Shirk 1994).

Discussion of outsourcing of cataloging took place not only in the published professional literature, but also provided a major topic of discussion in the online discussion lists. An excellent example on the AUTOCAT discussion list was a posting by Lowell Ashley, listing thirty-six points to be considered before making a decision to outsource (Ashley 1994).

Opinion pieces. Opinions abound on the pros and cons of outsourcing cataloging functions. Many writers, concerned with the ramifications of outsourcing, successfully raised some thought-provoking considerations that should be addressed by administrators who are contemplating outsourcing as *the* solution for their libraries.

Holt tells us that, like automation, "outsourcing does not solve cataloging problems. Instead, it creates a different set of cataloging problems, many of which are quality-control issues that can only be handled by a manager" (Holt 1995, 34).
Holt also challenges libraries to thoroughly evaluate the costs of in-house cataloging to be able to make responsible decisions. Within that context, one must also examine the level and expenses related to customization of cataloging records and determine whether a library can really afford to continue that process.

Harmon equates providing quality library service to applying the highest possible standards to bibliographic records that are contributed to the national databases, and thus

providing thorough access to resources. In his concluding statement he reminds us all that " it is well to keep in mind that we collect and catalog for the future as well as for the present" (Harmon 1996, 307).

In 1993 Sheila Intner highlighted the pitfalls of removing cataloging activities from libraries altogether and simultaneously challenging catalogers to share their expertise, as it relates to the topic of outsourcing, and for administrators to ask and listen to their advice. Since that time, she continues to preach caution, reminds us of the critical role that cataloging plays in the delivery of quality library service, and takes the stand that we still need cataloging expertise to organize information and informational materials for access (Intner 1994, Intner 1996, Intner 1997).

Perhaps most eloquently and visibly, Michael Gorman makes a strong case for preserving cataloging within libraries as a core function, allowing libraries to carry out their mission of selecting, acquiring, providing access to, and preserving records (Gorman 1995).

Most of those who have come out in support of outsourcing cataloging functions are quick to remind us that the decision and process is not "flawless." From a school library perspective, Eisenberg and Repman put it simply:

> ...we have a finite amount of energy and resources. Of course we should fight for those things that are truly central to our mission and to our professional identity. But we must consider when the reality of change suggests that we spend our energy and resources on battles that we can and should win (Eisenberg and Repman 1997, 36).

Fast explains why he believes that libraries can't respond adequately to the demands of increased productivity in technical services departments and how vendors can and do save money for libraries. Basically, it's the "culture" of the library verses that of business–the library is devoted to providing quality customer service while business's goal is to do whatever it takes to make a profit. The challenge of libraries, as he sees it, is to control costs without loosing its mission. Libraries must also continue to work with vendors in outlining our needs and the services we want them to provide (Fast 1995).

Waite has been one of the most out-spoken advocates of outsourcing cataloging. Waite argues that the decision to reengineer technical services departments is a reaction to stagnant administration of those aspects of library administration. It is also a reaction to the changing information needs of library users, and "to rigid professional standards that no longer meet the needs of our patrons" (Waite 1995, 36). Rather than downsizing and doing away with the cataloging department, her goal is to use the cataloging staff to organize bibliographic files more effectively, develop web pages and resource guides, and to restructure the files of uniform titles to local settings.

Varner provides a thought-provoking article on outsourcing from the perspective of managing technical services in libraries. It is her premise that outsourcing presents "an opportunity for leadership...and that the possibilities for structural change will greatly affect technical services personnel (Varner 1995, 445)." Careful analysis is needed to identify the most productive process to use in changing the subculture and that only then can "a new shared vision and mental model" be possible. She contends that staff development is the key to the entire process towards success.

Rider also focuses on the cataloging staff and the new roles that they must assume in the outsourcing process. She reaffirms the importance of paraprofessionals in the cataloging process and encourages libraries to assist them in redefining their roles on the basis of "education, knowledge, and skill levels required to perform certain tasks," not on the actual performance of those tasks (Rider 1996, 29-30).

Janis Johnston and Richard Block both view outsourcing as just another "tool" to use. Both see it as a project-oriented, strategically implemented process, rather than a vehicle for reengineering or downsizing an entire department. Johnston sees outsourcing as attractive because it is an effective way to deal collectively with a range of issues, among them the labor-intensive–and thus expensive–character of cataloging and processing activities; the continuing increase is personnel costs; and the enormous increase in the number and variety of services libraries are now expected to provide (Johnston 1996).

Block provides a good overview as to what libraries should understand about outsourcing and general considerations to focus on prior to the decision-making process. Among those he lists are: knowing what the goals of outsourcing are; understanding what the future might hold in the way of new formats, technologies, etc. that will impact cataloging staff; the implications of loosing local control over bibliographic records; lingering cataloging projects; realistic in-house costs of cataloging; implications of outsourcing on the entire technical services workflow; user impact; and staffing and staff skills assessment (Block 1994).

Walker points out that "the areas of concern with outsourcing can be grouped into two general categories: the "can" and the "should"... One should not talk about outsourcing without also addressing issues like cataloging quality, database integrity, costs, and professional declination (Walker 1996, 16)." With that he also suggests that a good starting point into outsourcing for libraries might be to tack on "value-added services" to already existing contracts and/or price agreements.

Bordeianu and Benaud present the real issues of outsourcing cataloging functions in a concise and straightforward manner. They point out that "two reactions are guaranteed when the topic comes up; librarians always have an opinion about it, and everybody has an outsourcing story to tell" (Bordeianu and Benaud 1997, 1). They provide us with the perspective that outsourcing has evolved "from an impersonal relationship between two companies, to a closer collaboration leading toward a fuller partnership between supplier and buyer." They also surmise that determining what constitutes a core library service is at the very heart of the profession's controversy on the topic. Briefly, they outline why libraries outsource, what kinds of tasks can be, the pros and cons to outsourcing, and outlines trends in various types of libraries today. They conclude by stating that there is no foolproof method of evaluating the success/failure of outsourcing as it is

> ...neither good nor bad. It is only a tool that libraries can use to improve their operations. The library's specific circumstances, and the manner in which outsourcing is implemented are the main factors that will determine success or failure. (Bordeianu and Benaud 1997, 20)

The most recent overview of the decision-making process related to outsourcing cataloging Janet Swan Hill's. After walking the reader through a very concise history of what has been outsourced in the past, she turns to such tasks as original cataloging, database maintenance,

and administrative functions–setting priorities, workflow, and general oversight into the day-to-day operations (Hill 1998).

Outsourcing Projects. Numerous articles outlining "project" outsourcing in libraries appear regularly in the literature. These include reports on outsourcing of cataloging for a specific type and or collection of materials – AV (Farkas 1997), foreign language (Chervinko 1995, El-Sherbini 1995), government document collections (Stomberg 1996), and pre-order titles (Duke 1997).

Case studies on the use of PromptCat and TechPro from OCLC abound as well–most recently, Duke (1997), Leiding (1996), Rider (1996), and Somers (1997). The general consensus appears to be that this service may not be right for everyone, implementing it requires a period of adjustment and problem solving, but where it is being utilized the libraries are generally pleased with it.

Tsui and Hinders (1999) describe the authority control work underway at the University of Dayton Libraries, Dayton, Ohio. This collaborative effort involves the library, its automated online system, and an authority service vendor to provide on-going authority control in an efficient and cost-effective manner. While recognizing that their vendor services are not flawless, they cite the end result of their efforts as accurate, standardized headings, which ultimately enhance the effectiveness of online searching and retrieval by the library's online users.

Wilson and Colver cite four successful examples of outsourcing authority work–Emory University Libraries; Houston Public Library, William Henry Smith Memorial Library; Project Muse for the John Hopkins University Press; and the University of California, Santa Barbara Library (Wilson and Colver 1997). They also provide us with several cases of successfully outsourcing the physical processing of materials. Libraries included are: Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Public Library; Chubb Law & Business Library, Warren, New Jersey; Florida Atlantic University Libraries in Boca Raton; Fort Worth Public Library; Houston Public Library; University of Alberta Library; University of Arizona Library; University of Manitoba Libraries; and the William Henry Smith Memorial Library.

As noted earlier, Wilson provides an historical overview of physical processing in libraries as well as documenting Stanford's successful "pilot project" of the mid-90s. Wilson concluded outsourcing of copy cataloging and physical processing was feasible, it did not have a detrimental effect on the quality of cataloging and processing received by the library, and it did save money. Secondarily, it enabled cost reductions in staffing – through attrition as well as reassignment into public service areas (Wilson 1995).

Easton briefly describes two academic models as she summarizes the ALA Annual Conference in 1996. The University of Akron began receiving all of their approval plan materials fully processed. The two primary motivations for this action were improved productivity for staff and the increased number of 9xx fields made available by the vendor in the MARC record. The need for on-going communication between the vendor and library staff received special emphasis. In edition, a cautionary note not to get "hung up on the dollar cost, but instead to consider the amount of staff time that will be freed by shifting this work," as well the importance of paying attention to personnel issues and morale (Easton 1997, 64).

Easton also reports on Louisiana State University's shift of some processing responsibilities to a vendor "as part of a larger reorganization of technical services" (65). They reworked processing based on "the assumption that outsourcing was a positive opportunity, that

teamwork among technical services units was important, and that cross-training of staff was essential in adjusting to the demands placed on technical services (65)." The acquisitions staff now performs copy cataloging on approximately 90% of their new materials. Very little authority work was done and what was done was treated as a "post-cataloging process of record improvement (65)." Somers (1997) goes into greater depth in describing LSU's experience with the use of PromptCat and shelf-ready materials.

The fact that cost-efficient, vendor-supplied cataloging and shelf-ready services currently exist for libraries is the focus of the article by Giambi (1998). In addition to allowing libraries to relieve cataloging departments from handling newly received items altogether; outsourcing also gives libraries the opportunity to review local practices, eliminating some outdated and, essentially, unnecessary procedures.

The vendor's perspective is represented in several articles. Bush, Sasse and Smith provide the results of a survey relating to the capabilities of vendors for cataloging and other technical services functions (1994) and Shirk provided us with a general rationale approach to outsourcing of technical services (1994). Gordon and Moore (1997) outline the steps involved in establishing a division of Information Systems Management (ISM) in Winnipeg, Canada to provide technical services to libraries. In their view, cooperation between vendor and library staff in implementing a project is critical to the success of outsourcing.

> With the implementation of such projects comes inevitably an intermeshing of the internal procedures of each operation. With cooperation on both sides, it is possible to develop procedures that enhance the efficiency of each party's workplace. (Gordon and Moore 1997, 71)

If the "partnership" between libraries and vendors is truly to be seen as critical in the on-going process, then we will need to hear more from the vendor's perspective, regularly. Such dialogue is crucial in order to keep librarians current on trends and issues – from the vendor's perspective - and remind us constantly that only we, as professionals, can affect the changes necessary to enhance and improve existing services.

Conclusions. Anyone reading the literature today would most likely come to the same conclusion regarding outsourcing cataloging as Wilson reached in 1995. There is not an overwhelming trend of libraries to embark on the total outsourcing of its technical services division. There are, however, numerous examples demonstrating a variety of approaches to outsourcing that are achieving very satisfactory results. The concerns raised by the opponents of outsourcing have been answered by its proponents. From the literature, it appears that outsourcing of cataloging functions is here to stay, and that in selected situations it is an effective tool for managing technical services operation in libraries.

Outsourcing Collection Development Functions

Outsourcing in collection development occurs less frequently than in other library functions, but libraries have increasingly responded to financial and staff constraints by handing over responsibility for selection to private companies. The provision of collection development services by outside vendors can be seen as a further development in a growing trend that started

with centralized selection, the preparation of opening day collections by vendors, and subscriptions to provide first copies of bestsellers (Oder 1997). Although the privatization of selection has evolved gradually, the library world remains in controversy over both the efficiency and the ethics of such an activity.

The decision to contract out always involves complex issues, but perhaps no other outsourced activity inspires as much contention as collection development because many librarians identify it as one of their core professional roles (Schneider 1998, Eberhardt 1997, Oder 1997). Attitudes about outsourcing, whether positive or negative, often depend on perceptions rather than hard data. Library management often decides to outsource based on "the appearance of fiscal economies", rather than measurable standards of cost effectiveness (White 2000, 66).

Crisis situations requiring immediate action often prevent in-depth assessment of the advantages of outsourcing over in-house labor. The Ft. Worth Public Library experienced just such a situation in the early 1990s when it was faced with budget cuts and a moratorium on staff hiring (Dixon and Bordonaro 1997). Initially, Ft. Worth chose to outsource several library functions, including the selection of adult bestsellers and children's books. Upon discovering that the volume of bestsellers purchased did not make contracting out efficient or fiscally desirable, the FPL returned responsibility for this task to on site staff. Children's selection remains an outsourced activity, although there exists little to no data in this particular situation with which to compare the merits of vendor collection development to in-house work.

The outsourcing of collection development attracts controversy in library circles, both in Fort Worth and elsewhere throughout the United States. Perhaps no single outsourcing situation has generated such rancor as the Hawaii State Library's outsourcing of all selection functions to Baker and Taylor in 1997. Facing major budget cuts, then-state librarian Bart Kane conceived of the plan to contract out collection development in all of Hawaii's public libraries in order to avoid firing employees and to divert all existing staff into public service positions (Eberhardt 1997b). Kane envisioned the outsourcing program as both a solution to the state library system's immediate budget difficulties and a model for the future of libraries (Oder 1997). However, problems with Baker and Taylor's performance arose almost immediately, adding fuel to a fire of discontent among Hawaii's public librarians (Olson 1996). Library staff complained about Baker and Taylor's flat rate on all books and about their purchases of duplicates and materials that were unsuitable for Hawaiian collections. For example, Baker and Taylor provided books on sheep herding–a common activity in New Zealand, but not in Hawaii (Oder and DiMattia1996). Eventually, due to public outcry and Baker and Taylor's inability to meet the agreed upon terms, Hawaii dissolved the contract and the legislature passed a bill prohibiting any further outsourcing program that did not provide for local librarians' input into book selection (Intner 1997a). The disaster in Hawaii spurred debate about the nature of public library collections: did they possess similar characteristics that could be sustained and developed by off-site vendors or did they have unique qualities that could only be addressed by the guiding hand of local librarians?

The controversy over outsourcing selection remains a pervasive theme among library scholars and professionals. Critics of collection development outsourcing make the argument that librarian's involvement in the selection process is an important part of maintaining the familiarity with the collection necessary to perform reader's advisory (Eberhardt 1997a). Also, those opposed to contracting out selection claim that surrendering a skill that requires both formal and on-the-job training to outside vendors will devalue the profession and forge a path that will lead to even lower salaries and benefits. Yet, proponents of outsourcing say that patrons

do not "know or care how books get on the shelf" (Oder 1997a, 28) and point to outsourcing as a means of economizing in "a political climate where taxpayers refuse to pay more for government services" (Olson 1996, 11).

The only solutions to the questions and concerns that surround collection development outsourcing lie in further research (Olson 1996). Yet, an extensive evaluation of the literature, employing several databases including Library Lit, ERIC, and Academic Abstracts, reveals only opinion pieces and narratives about the experiences of individual libraries. Unfortunately, as long as there is a lack of reliable research, contention over the merits of collection development outsourcing will continue to reign.

Outsourcing Management Functions

The literature of outsourcing management functions focuses on how best to utilize outsourcing as a strategy, rather than debating the merits of outsourcing. The library literature appears to reflect outsourcing as a common practice. How can outsourcing provide better service to patrons?

As Ronald Baker points out, complete outsourcing of library management is not the norm. Baker traces the events leading to the decision to completely outsource public library service in Riverside County, California, to a private company. Financial woes led to serious deterioration of library services to Riverside County residents. In March 1997, Riverside County issued requests for proposals for library service providers. LSSI was granted the contract and has managed the library system since. Baker describes the situation as a model for the future that resembles nothing so much as pre-World War II library operation (Baker 1998). He does not believe great numbers of public libraries will enter into total management contracts like Riverside County, California.

The question for library directors and managers centers on why and how outsourcing is utilized. As in the business world, outsourcing started as a cost-cutting measure, then emerged as a management strategy for transforming the organization in order to meet future challenges. Outsourcing to gain partnerships, create alliances, and use existing resources to full advantage reflect the positive aspects. However, alliances must be entered cautiously and selectively to assure their appropriateness (Marcum 1998).

"Exploring Outsourcing: Case Studies of Corporate Libraries" is intended to provide information to assist corporate managers to decide if outsourcing will help achieve a more efficient organization. Seven companies representing vastly different business interests were extensively interviewed concerning outsourcing their corporate library functions. Two firms had already outsourced library services, others outsourced selectively. A key finding of the survey was managers cited four main reasons for outsourcing library service. Cost reduction, centralizing services, control of access to information, and a renewed emphasis on business information. Also, no company interviewed had any means of evaluating the benefits of the outsourcing currently being done (Exploring Outsourcing 1997).

Managers do not want to lose control over the organization. Library managers must consider the implications of losing local control. Once a vendor starts providing a traditionally in-house service, it is difficult to change vendors. Also, once the service is no longer provided on-site, historical continuity may be lost and the ability to provide the service no longer exists. Simply stated, the organization has lost the ability to provide the service in a locally unique

fashion. The patron loses the personalized approach to local service. The library staff loses the opportunity to practice an important job skill (Crismond 1994). To maintain control, and keep service standards high, library managers must develop methods of dealing with outsourcing. Three distinct phases are present in an outsourcing project, planning, implementation, and managing. The planning phase takes the most time. The library examines costs and workflow, going through painstaking data gathering. Once the decision has been made to outsource, the bidding process begins and a vendor or service provider is selected. Then the implementation phase begins, leading to the third phase, the management process (Bordeiannu and Benaud 1997).

During the planning phase, basic questions should be addressed. What will be the significance to the library as an organization? Will outsourcing provide better patron service? Will this service be at a lower cost? Will outsourcing allow a renewed focus on core competencies or will core competencies be actually outsourced? What control will be gained or lost? Will outsourcing best serve the patron's needs? Any decision to turn over library functions to a vendor requires extensive questioning and analysis (Bush, Sasse and Smith 1994).

A good partnership with the service provider is extremely important in the implementation phase. Libraries have a long tradition of contracting with vendors and jobbers in technical service and selection areas. Understanding the service provider's capabilities is paramount to a successful outsourcing project. Greater opportunities exist for managers now to explore outsourcing acquisitions, cataloging, and collection development. Libraries need to become full partners in the development of contract services. To do this library managers must understand the risks, costs, and capabilities of contracting with outside service providers (Bush, Sasse and Smith 1994).

Herbert S. White concurs in his article, "Why Outsourcing Happens and What to do About it." There are valid reasons to outsource library operations. Cost effectiveness is often achieved by hiring a firm that already has the skills, equipment, and staff to do the job. They can perform the job better and at a lower cost, without effecting quality. Often, a backlog of work can be eliminated through outsourcing. This is especially true of technical service functions. Then personnel previously assigned to this area can be reassigned to public service functions. However, White warns, the cost savings are not worth much if libraries lose quality of service. "No contractor could possibly match the quality of understanding, caring, interest and pro-activity you contribute to the organization." (White 2000)

What services lend themselves to outsourcing? Much of the controversy stems from outsourcing library core competencies. How do librarians define core competencies? Cataloging, acquisitions, and collection development functions are the agreed upon core competencies cited in the literature.

Michael Gorman strongly opposes outsourcing cataloging functions. He maintains cataloging and a library's bibliographic records form the institution's core. Bibliographic records prepared outside the organization constitute a misuse of the public trust and an eroding of librarianship as a profession (Gorman 1995). Clara Dunkle takes a softer approach, stressing that outsourcing cataloging may be a more efficient and economic way of addressing that function. She also suggests cataloging vendors may be able to achieve greater accuracy and consistency in cataloging than in-house staff. However, Dunkle discourages total cataloging outsourcing. There are still some items and areas better cataloged at the local level and by outsourcing the main cataloging functions, local catalogers are better able to concentrate on the unique local items (Dunkle 1996).

Michael Eisenberg agrees that an understanding of cataloging principles and processes is important, but in the real world most librarians do not put these principles into practice. They do not have time or the inclination to create original cataloging. Eisenberg also asks if this cataloging model could also apply to the selection process. He suggests an outsourced baseline collection while using available discretionary funds for local purchases (Eisenberg and Repman 1997).

Outsourcing as an effective management tool is greatly misunderstood according to Richard Abel, outsourcing pioneer consultant. Library management's slowness to accept the concept is misguided. Libraries must position themselves strategically to maintain a long-term level of functionality. "Core -collection" building is one of the collection development easiest outsourced. After basic core collection, outsourcing collection development is only prudent when the selection criteria can be well defined. Abel warns against giving total control to vendors because the selection function is to closely related to the singular requirements of a particular library (Abel 1998).

Outsourcing has become a common management tool in both the private and public sector. As long as budgets and staffs shrink, managers are forced to creatively seek ways to stretch resources. Outsourcing emerged as one of those ways.

Conclusions

It is impossible to make a general assessment of what the current "trend" is in outsourcing in libraries given that so little public information on the topic. There is no way to determine reliably, on a regular basis, the extent of outsourcing undertaken in libraries today, nor to assess reliably the success of outsourcing endeavors. It would be useful to have a comprehensive, periodic survey of outsourcing in all types of libraries. There is also a need for a regular publication that would summarize and analyze outsourcing trends; highlight vendors and their services; provide examples of successes as well as failures; review contractual issues; and, most of all, provides guidance on outsourcing for librarians in all types of libraries.

Recommendations

1. The American Library Association should encourage the inclusion of data documenting the extent of outsourcing in libraries in the regular annual data collection activities of such agencies as the National Center for Education Statistics.
2. The American Library Association should foster regular treatment of outsourcing trends, vendors and services, and other issues related to outsourcing, in the journals published by the divisions and units of ALA.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

III. OUTSOURCING OF CATALOGING

Describing the collection of a library and making it accessible to patrons is an old and honored core competency of the library profession. This process is cataloging, and it has weathered the change from manual hand written cataloging filed in wooden card cabinets to electronically transmitted machine readable cataloging transmitted via the Internet and accessed through an integrated library management system. Throughout the developments in cataloging, codes have been developed to aid the professional cataloger, and the MARC format has been established as the primary vehicle for sharing cataloging data. Subject analysis and description of materials are accomplished through standards agreed upon with regional variations throughout the world.

Cataloging has gone from a backroom operation with shelves of backlog to streamlined operations with tremendous productivity aided by computerization and communications with extremely large databases of shared records. With the rapid advances in library technology and the competition for funding, libraries have adapted operations to remain competitive in their environment. Spine labels and catalog cards have been purchased for decades to aid in making materials available for use.

Cataloging is considered a core library service along with materials selection, reference and library management (American Library Association 1999a). Cataloging has seen changes in the library personnel performing this core service through the years. The professional cataloger has gone from being the sole source of cataloging, to using services like the Library of Congress cards, to the services of the OCLC Union Catalog database. In addition, as libraries struggled for scarce funding available to them, the professional cataloger enlisted and trained highly skilled assistants. This resulted in increased productivity and reduced personnel costs for professional catalogers.

With the advent of the shared databases of OCLC, RLG, RLIN and other sources, the rise of copy cataloging overtook the original cataloging performed by the professional cataloger. As more and more external sources for cataloging became readily available, the library began to look for means to reduce costs, reallocate personnel, and improve productivity.

Outsourcing of the core service of cataloging began based on sound management study and decisions. Outsourcing is the contracting to external companies or organizations, the functions of cataloging that would otherwise be performed by library employees. Outsourcing is a management tool that allows the opportunity to direct or redirect staff to other core functions of the library while through monitoring and analysis maintaining the quality of the cataloging being provided by the external vendor. Libraries practice sound management in choosing the external cataloging organization through negotiation of an agreement including a detailed schedule of practices that are followed to make the cataloging received acceptable.

The recent activities in this area are simply an out growth of many functions that were contracted out piecemeal in the past. With the decision by Wright State University to outsource its entire cataloging function in 1993, this process has received much attention.

Many libraries of all types have outsourced cataloging in one form or another. For example, most libraries outsourced retrospective conversion of records when developing an online library information system. Many companies exist today to provide individually specified cataloging as well as processing of materials ready for shelving. The outsourcing of cataloging

is a common occurrence. Outsourcing is used as a means to reduce backlogs, increase productivity, and allow for shifts in staff. Outsourcing is also used to gain expertise in foreign languages that is not available from the local staff.

Publishers, book jobbers and companies offering outsourcing of cataloging functions have come on the scene recently. The outsourcing of cataloging has been described and surveyed in the literature. (Bush, Sasse and Smith 1994; Libby and Caudle1997) The future of outsourcing appears to be growing in all types of libraries.

The Urban Libraries Council surveyed 127 member libraries in 1998. Seventy-two libraries responded, for a response rate of 56.7%. The libraries reported that half anticipated outsourcing more functions in the future and 47% would anticipate the same amount of outsourcing. No library anticipated decreasing the functions outsourced. Cataloging was reported outsourced by 61% of the respondent libraries. No respondent library reported that more over half of the cataloging was outsourced. In comparison, binding was outsourced by 82% of the respondents and 97% of the binding was outsourced. Commercial vendors were the source of outsourced cataloging 71% among those reporting outsourcing. Other sources were government agencies (15%), library consortia (5%), other non-profit agencies (5%) and other libraries (3%)

The respondent libraries reported outsourcing is an established practice with all but two of the functions queried having been outsourced an average of five years or more. Outsourcing of Internet service provision, and web page design and maintenance are recent technological innovations and not highly outsourced among libraries responding to this survey. Over half of the outsourced functions have been outsourced ten or more years.

Among the Urban Library Council libraries responding, outsourcing was not significantly driven by government mandates. Those who outsource mandated only three functions: cataloging, payroll and other personnel functions. Outsourcing of cataloging was mandated for 31% of those outsourcing this function. The most important reasons for outsourcing were better use of staff, followed by increased efficiency and better customer service considered at least moderately important. Cost savings were sited as a slightly to moderately important reason. (Urban Libraries Council, 1999)

In 1997 a survey on outsourcing was sent to 109 members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and to 110 medium-sized non-ARL academic libraries. Sixty-nine ARL and seventy non-ARL libraries returned surveys, for a response rate of around 63%. Eighty-eight (63%) libraries report outsourcing cataloging functions, with more ARL libraries doing so (Forty-nine, or 71% of ARL libraries, versus thirty-nine, or 56% of non-ARL libraries). Main vendors listed were Marcive (44%), TECHPRO (25%), and PromptCat (18%). Forty-five per cent of the libraryies reported acquiring U.S. federal document records, followed by unique collections, unique languages and LC records. Twenty-seven per cent were also buying value-added services like labeling (17%) table of contents (12%) security taping (15%). Twenty nine per cent indicated they had no plans to outsource in this area - 40% for non-ARL libraries–while 28% indicated that they did have outsourcing plans. Sixty per cent indicated they did or had outsourced retrospective conversion (Bénaud and Bordeianu 1998).

OCLC has been a major participant in outsourcing throughout its history. In data from the OCLC TechPro Service, PromptCat and Retrospective Conversions, hundreds of libraries have outsourced portions of the cataloging activities.

Retrospective conversion projects have been outsourced by 937 libraries through the services of OCLC. OCLC has performed this service for 391 academic libraries, 85 public, 65

corporate and 164 international libraries among the 937 participating libraries. No total of titles converted was given during a phone conversation. Statistics presented by the OCLC TechPro Service, revised December 1999, report that 461 libraries have used this service. Academic libraries total 213, corporate and special libraries 73, federal libraries 62, public libraries 43, medical and pharmaceutical 37, art and museum libraries 18, and state libraries 15 (Johnson 2000).

The number of titles processed was 1,293,141 through December 1999, of which 776,237 were for academic libraries. The greatest portion of the cataloging provided is copy cataloging 976,234 titles (75%), original cataloging 262,511 titles (20%) and other cataloging 54, 396 titles (4%).

The largest TechPro project is for Wright State University with 78,406 titles reported in an ongoing project. TechPro reports that all formats, General and Medical using LC, NLM and MeSH in the specifications listed. Most of the projects are less than 15,000 titles with only 9 academic, 2 corporate, 2 Federal (with one being a consortium of Army libraries) and one public library from Sweden reported with more titles. The average size of the projects would be 3,022 titles with a range of 0 to 78,406. (Technical Processing Projects, 1999)

The OCLC PromptCat Service reports use by 123 libraries and 15 participating vendors. PromptCat delivers and average of 31,989 records each month with 383,686 delivered in FY 1998/99. Label files are created for 53 libraries with 153,336 labels delivered in FY1998/1999 (Buser 2000).

Similar statistics have not been gathered from other vendors, although the survey of academic libraries indicates that many vendors are being used for outsourcing all or parts of cataloging. Vendors for outsourcing of cataloging request specific individual library specifications for the cataloging and processing they perform. Vendors are doing functions that could be performed by the staff of the cataloging and processing units of a library. Wright State and other libraries have prepared detailed instructions for the services of the vendor. This is truly outsourcing of cataloging services, not privatization.

Privatization involves the shifting of policy making and the management of the library services or the responsibility of core library services entirely from the library to another agent. With the library providing individual specifications for its acceptable cataloging, the policy making remains within the library. Even in outsourced or privatized library operations as Riverside County or NASA, there are standards, specifications and operational requirements for cataloging.

There are undeniably drawbacks to outsourcing cataloging, negative consequences for both the profession and the individual library. There are also advantages to using outsourcing as a management tool. Whether or not to outsource is a decision that can be seen either positively or negatively, depending on the perspective of the beholder. The professional cataloger may see outsourcing as denigrating his/her importance to the organization. The library manager may see outsourcing as a means to control costs of cataloging and to shift the responsibilities of professional librarians. Selectively outsourcing of cataloging can unquestionably provide expertise not otherwise resident in a cataloging unit. Outsourcing foreign language and other specialized cataloging are cases in point.

Copy cataloging is an area were the benefits of outsourcing are especially apparent. Easy access to bibliographic data coupled with the growing expertise of cataloging service vendors has reduced much copy cataloging to the level of rote work. Wright State University and Florida Gulf Coast University are examples of a trend in academic libraries to outsource such cataloging,

and there appears to be a surge to use such services to provide shelf ready materials in libraries of all types (Bénaud and Bordeianu 1998).

Total outsourcing of cataloging means that some other agency outside the library will provide all the bibliographic data needed to describe all additions to the collection. Few libraries outsource cataloging to this extent because most libraries recognize that there is a continuing need for some level of local cataloging. The cataloging staff may be much reduced, however, and those remaining may have very different duties and responsibilities. In addition to addressing the residual local cataloging needs, remaining cataloging staff will probably focus on managing the flow of outsourced cataloging and ensuring quality control.

There are many criticisms of outsourcing of the "core service of cataloging". Although outsourcing in one form or another stems from the LC catalog card service introduced in 1901 and the advent of OCLC in 1967, many objections can be made to outsourcing. The cataloger sees outsourcing as a threat to his/her value to the organization. The analytical skills of the cataloger are seen as no longer valued and given to the vendor, a faceless entity. The benefits of individualized cataloging for a library are removed to some degree by the use of a record seen as acceptable to many, but not tailored to the individual library. Cataloger's duties change from the creation of a bibliographic record to alteration of the record to aid in the use of the record by individual library patrons. Much more care and feeding of an automated library information system and its tables of parameters are required instead of cataloging the individual item.

In a library where outsourcing of cataloging is the norm, the cataloger becomes more of a technician dealing with a system. The focus shifts to helping the patron find material rather than to creating an intellectual record for an item in the collection. The application of cataloging skills in this manner is, from management's point of view, very valuable to the mission of the library. Bu it is different from the traditional idea of the cataloger uninvolved with the patron except in unusual circumstances.

There is a clear need for more research on outsourcing of cataloging. The impact of the shift of the cataloging function outside the library organization, the difficulty in maintaining quality control, and possibility of shifts in materials selection due to lack of locally available cataloging expertise are all areas that should be studied. Change in the place of cataloging in the Library and Information Science curriculum is another potentially fruitful area of study. Any change in the bibliographic network, the result of the shared expertise of many catalogers, from the rare book cataloger to the copy cataloger, should be studied for any effects in the outsourcing of cataloging.

The reasons for outsourcing cataloging have been discussed extensively (Bénaud and Bordeianu 1998). Since Wright State University became the first academic library to outsource its cataloging, more and more attention has been paid to this area. This growth in outsourcing can be attributed to budgetary shortages, technological advances, and maybe the lack of visibility of the cataloger in a library.

Most libraries do not get continuous substantial fund increases to deal with inflation and to provide additional services demanded by the patron. Managers have looked at the high cataloging costs associated with books and serials making cataloging operations a quick target for budget cuts. Technology and the invisibility of the cataloging operation to the library's public have also contributed to making cataloging a target for cuts.

The need for additional reference service and instruction in online searching and the rise of the Internet have brought pressure for additional staff in these areas. Managers have begun redirect their technical services staff, primarily catalogers, to the public services areas as they

outsource cataloging functions. The increase in vendors of cataloging services and the technology to deliver the bibliographic data via telecommunications have provided less costly alternatives to the maintenance of the cataloging unit.

Managers have outsourced cataloging to bring greater efficiency by using a vendor's catalogers, whose primary duties are to catalog rather that participation in the other meetings and other non-productive activities associated with in-house staff (research and other academic or managerial activities). Higher productivity is realized in many cases, as the vendor often integrates the activities of the jobber with that of cataloging and processing.

Outsourcing saves on staff dollars and ties the cost of cataloging to a per item cost. Overhead costs are eliminated by the library and replaced with predictable costs depending on the units of materials acquired. The staff dollars associated with cataloging are shifted to areas where needed. The vendor operates on economies of scale, providing cataloging for mainstream publication many times based on one effort to produce the records. In the instances where original cataloging is required, the vendor charges a premium for this service, but the library still reaps savings in staff dollars. Value added services as tables of contents and other record enhancements again come under the economies of scale and are available to many library customers on the basis of one action.

The shifting of professional librarians from cataloging duties to tasks that involve direct interaction with patrons provides libraries the means to move limited resources to other areas. Staff are often retained within the library, but moved to different duties.

Each reason library management use for outsourcing the cataloging operation has drawbacks. Greater efficiency, as evidenced by reduced backlogs, means greater availability of materials, but does not automatically mean higher quality of bibliographic records. The ability to maintain quality assurance of records is not automatic with outsourcing of cataloging. Attention to this area must be retained or re-allocated as a part of the outsourcing process.

The shift of catalogers to public service duty does not mean that each staff member reassigned will provide excellent service immediately. The skills that are need in public service become skill-building opportunities for the cataloging staff and have associated costs.

The impact on the library operations can be more than just closing or reducing the size of the cataloging unit. Cataloging staff is shifted to the point that a skeleton cataloging unit is left responsible of very different task that performed by a fully staffed unit. Emphasis changes from cataloging to managing the outsourcing operation and bibliographic record management. The remaining staff manages the cataloging contract, oversee the downloading of records, manage the authority control procedures, and concentrate on record maintenance of volume and copy numbers. Deletion of records as materials are lost or withdrawn and location changes are done. The remaining staff is responsible for rush items, and handling local information that needs to appear as gift recognition.

Outsourcing of cataloging must provide for successful operations at the local level. If the basic capabilities described above are not retained, there will be a detrimental effect due to the outsourcing of cataloging. This is an opportunity for study, and the responsibility of management of the library. A pre and post outsourcing research project could be devised to study the effect on the local catalog and access to materials.

Conclusions

Outsourcing of cataloging is commonplace among all types of libraries, but it is a practice that is apparently more prevalent in academic libraries than in other types. Library managers have chosen to outsource cataloging for a variety of reasons. Few libraries have outsourced all of their cataloging functions, but most have at least made arrangements to acquire cataloging copy from vendors like OCLC. Outsourcing appears to be a workable solution to some management issues, and a reasonable response to a variety of local conditions.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

IV. OUTSOURCING OF MATERIALS SELECTION

Selection of Library materials is certainly viewed by most librarians as one of the fundamental tasks of the professional librarian. Although specific instances of contracting out this core function have been infrequently reported in the literature, in many libraries much of the selection function is in fact contracted out by means of vendor approval plans. This approach to building library collections is commonplace in academic libraries, and is not uncommon in many public libraries. Approval plans are generally established with care by expert selectors, monitored carefully during their operation, and reviewed and revised regularly by the contracting library's collection development staff.

Aside from approval plans, there is very little outsourcing of selection reported in the library literature. The most visible and controversial case in recent years was undoubtedly the Hawaii Public Library System's contract with Baker and Taylor to provide materials selection services. The case was widely reported in the public press and the library literature. Concerns arising from the Hawaii situation led directly to the Council of the American Library Association's action establishing a Task Force to study outsourcing and privatization. It seemed important, therefore, for this study to review the facts of the Hawaii outsourcing effort.

Although few similar contracts have been the focus of much public attention, it appears very likely that many libraries contract all or part of their selection functions to vendors. One such instance that merited our inspection was the outsourcing of selection of children's materials by the Fort Worth Public Library.

The Hawaii Public Library System Case

Bartholomew A. Kane, Hawaii State Librarian since May 1, 1982, assembled a Reengineering Committee in August 1995 to examine library structure, determine core services and make recommendations for redesigning the 49-library system of the state. On August 1, 1995, Hawaii's Governor announced budget cuts requiring the reduction of 1294 state employees throughout the state. The library system budget was reduced 25 percent, resulting in a projected elimination of 120 and redeployment of 80 employees. Rather than impose massive layoffs and close at least 20 branches Kane, through the Reengineering Committee, proposed outsourcing all book selection for the system to Baker and Taylor, a book vendor from Charlotte, North Carolina. The proposal, a contract for $11.2 million over five years, was approved by the Board of Education after seven minutes of discussion. The contract, which covered selection, acquisition, cataloging, processing and distributing books, spoken word audio, video and multimedia titles became effective March 28, 1996 (HSPLS 1996).

At the same time Kane decided to convert the library system's automation vendor from Data Research Associates, Inc. (DRA) to Ameritech's Dynix system and add Information Access Company's online serials database. Therefore, rather than begin providing books to branches within two weeks of awarding the contract, Baker and Taylor's shipments were delayed several

months and duplicates were supplied. CARL Corporation of Colorado contested the contract with Ameritech, delaying the transition further.

In order to supply materials of local interest Baker and Taylor signed a partnership agreement with Booklines Hawaii, Ltd. to supply Hawaiiana and other titles relevant to Asia and the Pacific to the statewide library system.

As early as October 1996, complaints began to mount against Baker and Taylor. Specific charges were: unrequested duplication of titles; inappropriate titles, such as *A Practical Guide to Lambs and Lambing Care* and 61 copies of Newt Gingrich's novel, *1945*; cheap books not worth the flat $20.94 per item assessed in the contract; too few reference materials; disregard for profiles provided by branch librarians; and inability to return unwanted titles. Library staff and patrons became increasingly vociferous in their complaints.

Baker and Taylor presented a list of Performance Targets to the Board of Education Committee on Public Libraries. Specific points of selection, acquisition reporting, cataloging, technical processing and distribution were addressed. For example, 90 percent of items purchased will circulate at least once during the first twelve months.

Representatives from the Library Association of Hawaii testified before the State Senate Committee on Government Operations and Housing on January 11, 1997 requesting that an immediate audit be performed on the library system paying particular attention to the Baker and Taylor and Dynix contracts. On January 16, 1997 Baker & Taylor presented to the Board of Education's Library Services Committee a detailed action plan stressing better communication with librarians.

Concern over the situation in Hawaii began to mount within the library profession. Early in January, 1997, the Alternatives in Print Task Force of the American Library Association's Social Responsibilities Roundtable created a Hawaii Working Group to study the performance of the Baker & Taylor outsourcing project. Patricia Wallace, a graduate student at Texas Woman's University's School of Library and Information Studies, was appointed to head the Working Group.

On February 2, 1997, Senator Marshall Ige introduced Senate Bill 1370, which would prevent the board of education or the state librarian from entering into contractual agreements allowing outside firms to select books and other resources for the public library system.

The Board of Education announced in a news conference on February 11, 1997, that it was establishing a Blue Ribbon Committee of library, business and government people to review and make recommendations on Baker and Taylor's performance through June 30, 1997. At the same time Kane sent a letter to Arnie Wight of Baker & Taylor, itemizing nine areas of concern: Standing orders, Hawaiiana, reference books, Library for Blind and Physically Handicapped materials, bestsellers, children's selections, award books, and response to library community profiles. At a news conference on June 6 the Committee recommended that Baker and Taylor's contract be terminated June 30, 1997 due to poor performance. The Attorney General's office would be consulted.

On February 13, 1997 Senators Mike McCartney and Les Ihara introduced Senate Bill 538 requiring materials selection throughout the library system be performed by public service librarians exclusively. After revision to remove the restriction against the State Librarian authorizing outside book selection, adding a recommendation that book selection be handled by state employees, and removing the cancellation of current book selection contracts, the Committee on Ways and Means recommended passage of Senate Bill 538.

On June 10, 1997, the Hawaii Government Employees Association filed a class action lawsuit against the Board of Education, the State Librarian, and Baker & Taylor, Inc. claiming unlawful privatization of public services. Specific consequences were itemized in the suit.

On June 19, 1997, the Board of Education voted unanimously to terminate Baker and Taylor's 5-½ year, $11.2 million dollar contract (Barayuga 1997a). The Attorney General would determine the specific timeframe and procedure. Kane sent a formal letter of cancellation on July 11, 1997. A ten-day extension was granted in which Baker & Taylor must supply 60,000 materials. On July 21, 1997 Kane sent a final letter of cancellation with a notice of non-acceptance of any subsequent materials shipped.

On July 24, 1997 Arnie Wight from Baker and Taylor stated in a press release that they were victims of wrongful termination. He claimed that the alleged failures were a direct result of decisions made by the HSPLS staff. A formal suit was filed on November 10, 1997.

At the same time, the Coalition for Improved Libraries issued a call for removal of Kane and assignment of new leadership, citing an 82 percent vote of "no confidence" in the current State Librarian. The State Board of Education voted 11 to 2 in favor of retaining Kane for six months at its July 25, 1997 meeting. He was tasked with settling all remaining issues concerning the termination of Baker and Taylor's contract and developing a plan to address selection procedures in the future.

In January 1998 the Hawaii state auditor issued a report stating concerns over the management of the library system. Redeployment of technical service personnel to public service did not improve customer service and assigning Baker and Taylor to book selection did not save money.

On February 20, 1998 the Board of Education voted seven to six to remove Bart Kane as State Librarian. On May 18, 1998 Kane announced that he was suing the Board of Education for wrongful termination. June 30, 1998 was Kane's last day as State Librarian.

On July 23, 1999 the state of Hawaii settled their lawsuit with Baker and Taylor agreeing that $75,000 worth of books be selected by the library system. The initial suit charged that $700,000 was sent to Baker & Taylor with no books received in return. On September 7, 1999 the Hawaii Government Employees Association won its suit over the privatization of the state library system's book buying services. Since book selection was customarily and historically provided by civil service employees, it is forbidden to be privatized. Baker and Taylor agreed to pay some of HGEA's legal fees.

Outsourcing of book selection for the Hawaii State Public Library System was a daring experiment that failed due to a combination of circumstances. It appears that Bart Kane did not seek sufficient input from library staff before making the outsourcing decision. Major changes already underway in the library system undoubtedly complicated the situation. Baker and Taylor apparently were not sufficiently prepared for the complexity of the task. From the enviable perspective of today, it appears that several improvements in planning could have lead to better results for the project. However, the resentment and skepticism resulting from the failed experiment render it extremely unlikely that the Hawaii Library System will attempt anything similar in the future.

The Fort Worth Public Library System Case

Historical Background. Since Fort Worth Public Library's inception in 1901, unit librarians have been responsible for materials selection. This changed in 1989 when an in-house task force on selection and ordering recommended adopting a centralized materials selection process as a means to free staff time for other duties and as a quality control measure. A collection development unit was created consisting of an Adult Materials Coordinator, a Children's Materials Coordinator, and three support staff. The unit's title became the Materials Collection Development Unit (MCDU). Collection development staff selected new books from primary review journals for the systems then eleven agencies based on unit profiles. Despite centralization, unit librarians remained responsible for selecting audio-visual materials, new materials not covered in primary review sources, foreign language materials, and duplicate/replacement titles.

The changes made in selection in 1989 were not made with the intention of eventually going to outsourcing, but it did position the library to take that step when confronted with a fiscal crisis. In the 1992/93 fiscal year massive budget cuts throughout the City of Fort Worth resulted in the reduction of library hours, staff and materials budget. The majority of branches went from three to two librarians, leaving only the Branch Manager and the Assistant Branch Manager/Children's Librarian. Taking on the responsibilities of Assistant Branch Manager, the Children's Librarians had little time to spend on materials selection. At this same time the Children's Materials Coordinator position was eliminated along with the MCDU's Clerk/Typist.

Cutting support services staff was another method library administrators economized. The Catalog Unit was cut from six positions to two. The Processing Unit went from nine staff members to five. Additionally, the Support Services Coordinator retired and that position was eliminated. The unit managers in Support Services, consisting of Acquisitions, Cataloging, Processing, the Delivery Team and the Clerical Pool, were trained in functioning as a self-directed work team based on the principles of Total Quality Management. It should be noted that in 1995 all of the above units gained back some staff. The Catalog Unit gained a half-time librarian, the Processing Unit added two clerical positions, and the MCDU gained a half-time librarian and a clerk, but not a Children's Material Coordinator.

Outsourcing some support services functions was another way to reduce costs. Five outsourcing contracts were established in fiscal year 1992/93. The first was copy cataloging of direct orders and gifts. The second was for the provision of adult books including cataloging and processing services. A third contract was for the selection, cataloging and processing of bestsellers. The fourth contract was for adult and juvenile audio-visual materials cataloging and processing, but not selection. The final contract was for selection, cataloging and processing of children's books. In 1995 both the copy cataloging and bestsellers contracts were discontinued when it was determined that staff could do the work more efficiently in-house.

In Fall of 1999 the Assistant Library Director estimated how much it would cost to bring children's book selection and all cataloging and processing services back in house (see Appendix D). She took into account the salary and fringe benefit costs to bring staffing back to the 1992/93 level. Then she added the amount for processing supplies and OCLC fees. From that total she subtracted the amount currently paid for outsourced cataloging and processing services. According to her calculations, Fort Worth Public Library has net savings of $212,825 due to outsourced services.

The decision to outsource book selection in fiscal year 1992/93 was made entirely for budgetary reasons. As mentioned above, selection of bestsellers was outsourced for two years, but discontinued. Administrators decided to outsource children's book selection after finding children's book collections to be more uniform from agency to agency with the major differences being in specific language and cultural needs. Administrative staff wrote specifications for vendor selection of children's books to reflect the existing collection development policies. The selection criteria include review sources to be used for selecting books. Each unit also provides individual collection profiles. Profile information includes the book budget for the unit, a per item cost limit, a budget breakdown by Dewey classification number, demographic information, and a list of authors, illustrators and series titles to be supplied regardless of reviews. Unit profiles and budgets are reviewed and adjusted annually.

Selection of children's audio-visual materials continues to be done in-house. A collection development committee consisting of children's librarians was created to select media and identify books that were missed by the vendor or not reviewed in the journals stipulated in the specifications. Children's librarians remain responsible for identifying and ordering duplicate/replacement titles and are given their own budgets to do this. New children's books cannot be ordered until six months after the date of publication to avoid duplicating titles ordered by the vendor. Award winning books and books on lists such as the Texas Bluebonnet nominees are generally handled outside the vendor selection process. The vendor also provides periodic reports of what materials have been selected for each unit.

In the past eight fiscal years, three vendors for the children's materials contract have been used with varying degrees of success. One vendor lost the contract due to the inability to catalog and process the books according to specifications. Another vendor lost the contract due to extreme delays (5 to 6 months) in getting the materials. Only one vendor has been able to keep the contract for more than one year and has had the contract for six of the last eight fiscal years.

Survey of System Children's Librarians. We surveyed staff to determine their perceptions of outsourced children's book selection. A structured survey instrument was used (see Appendix A), the data was tabulated, and standard statistical software was used to produce frequency tables for each response (see Appendix B). The sample was small consisting of 15 Children's Librarians and 3 Branch Managers who are former Children's Librarians for a total of 18 respondents. All of the respondents have a Masters of Library Science degree and have a cumulative experience of over 155 years in the Fort Worth Public Library System. Eight respondents have more than 10 years experience each with the Library System. Eight also included narrative comments to the survey questions (see Appendix C). The results of the survey indicate that timeliness of receiving materials, communication with the vendor, the ability to reject materials selections, meeting local needs, and the morale of the children's librarians are the biggest areas of concern.

Over three-fourths of the respondents (77.8%) found the receipt of books to be untimely (Question #6). This question resulted in the most written negative comments. One of the most frequent complaints being the six month waiting period before they can order a new book that may not have been ordered by the vendor's selector. Communication with the vendor elicited many negative comments as well. This issue is reflected in questions #5 and #9. A strong majority (88.9%) feels that they have little or no contact or input with the selector (Question #9). The narrative comments were somewhat contradictory with some saying they have annual

contact with the vendors and others indicating no contact at all. They also expressed a desire for the ability to reject materials selected by the vendor (83.2%) (Question #5).

Meeting the local needs of patrons and overall quality of the collection is another major area of concern and is reflected in the responses to questions #7, #10 and #13. Fifty five point six percent (55.6%) of the librarians believe that neighborhood needs are not being met (Question #10) and 66.7% believe that the quality of the collection has not improved due to outsourcing (Question #13). One particularly insightful comment was "Keeping the same vendor over a period of years is important in building trust and understanding of libraries' needs, but is difficult in the current system of low bid wins. Changing out materials selectors several years running is ruinous to a collection as well as to morale." Someone also noted that "It is difficult to work on a 5 year plan of updating and filling in missing information when tied to vendor selection." There is also a lack of confidence (55.6%) in the ability of profiles to meet unit needs (Question #7). Morale also seems to be an issue as stated in Question #15 with 66.6% saying that outsourcing has not improved morale of the children's librarians. Only one written comment was made on this particular question, but when all the comments are reviewed there are definite morale concerns reflected elsewhere.

On the more positive side, 61.1% found that outsourcing allows more time for programming (Question #1), 83.4% feel that they are given time at work to keep up with new publications Question #2), and 55.5% felt that outsourcing did not limit their ability to provide good reader's advisory (Question #3). Additionally, 44.4% feel that working in a system that outsources children's books selection will not hurt their future marketability in the workforce (Question #4), while 33.3% expressed no opinion on this issue. Sixty-six point seven percent (66.7%) feel that the vendor has a commitment to the quality of the collection (Question #14).

There is a less clear majority as to whether there is an effective procedure in place for identifying and ordering materials not selected by the vendor (Question #8). Fifty percent (50%) strongly agreed or agreed with the statement while 36.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed (16.7% had no opinion). A strong majority (77.8%) feels that the selection of children's books by an in-house coordinator would be more responsive than outsourcing (Question #12).

As for community awareness, 66.7% feel that patrons are unaware that children's book selection is outsourced (Question #11). Additionally, 55.6% feel that outsourcing does not make a positive statement to the community about the library's commitment to children's services (Question #16). Thirty eight point nine percent (38.9%) have no opinion on this question.

Some of the written comments reflect a willingness to work with the system and offered constructive suggestions that bear consideration. One suggestion was that the vendor 's selectors make semi-annual phone calls to each children's librarian for input. This would be in addition to on-site meetings with the selector. Another suggestion, mentioned twice, is that the vendor provide selection lists for the children's librarians to mark for purchase. The results of this survey would serve as a good foundation to work from if Fort Worth Public Library decides to evaluate the outsourcing of children's book selection.

Study of Books Received – Methodology. Vendor selection of children's materials is controversial among staff, but its effectiveness has not been studied in depth. Historically, the contract has been monitored by checking that the correct discounts have been applied. There has not been a consistent method in place that monitors the timeliness of the materials received. Naturally, there are times when this is obvious. For example, one year the contract started with a

new vendor in late November and virtually no children's materials were received until the end of the following April. Not surprisingly, this vendor lost the contract.

It was decided that timeliness would be an appropriate issue to target in the context of this study. We looked at both adult and children's materials to see if it is more timely to do selection in-house or to have materials selected by a vendor. We randomly chose 300 titles, 150 adult titles and 150 children's titles, that were ordered and received in the 1998/99 fiscal year to compare the length of time it took to receive the materials. It is worthy to note that both contracts are held by the same vendor. It should also be noted that the vendor both catalogs and processes the books so this is also a factor in the length of time it takes to receive them.

Adult materials are selected and ordered by in-house staff using an automated acquisitions system. Using this database, we were able to obtain the date ordered and the date received for each title. We then used *Book Review Index* to see when each title was reviewed in *Booklist, Library Journal, Publisher's Weekly* and *Kirkus*. Then we went to Amazon.com and Barnes & Noble online to determine the date of publication. Frequently, these databases only listed a month and a year of publication and not a specific date. For quantification purposes, we gave each a publication date of the 15th for the given month when the exact date was not provided. Thus, the resulting figures are not precise, but do provide comparative data. As the children's books were vendor-selected, we did not have access to when the materials were ordered by the vendor. What we did instead was look at when the titles were reviewed, the publication dates and the date received at the library.

Results - Adult Books. Fifty-five percent of the 150 adult titles studied were ordered prior to or in the week of publication. These titles were ordered an average of 5.23 weeks prior to the publication date. It took an average of 6.3 weeks after the date of publication to receive the cataloged and processed materials. The remaining 45% of the adult titles surveyed were ordered after the date of publication. These titles were ordered an average of 6.43 weeks after publication. It took an average of 8.6 weeks after the order date to receive these materials. The total average to receive all adult books (whether ordered prior to publication or after publication) was 7.35 weeks to receive new materials. There are many factors that can account for this length of time to receive materials. In FY 1998/99, the Acquisitions Unit did not have the capability to send purchase orders electronically, so they were mailed to the vendor. Then the vendor has to input these orders once received. Once the books are in hand, they are cataloged and processed before shipping them out. The vendor sends out large shipments weekly rather than as materials are ready. All these factors must be taken into account when looking at this 7.35 weeks. It should be noted that none of these 150 titles are bestsellers which are handled on a separate contract. Orders for bestsellers are phoned in and usually received within 48 hours of release.

Results - Children's Books. As with the adult materials, 150 vendor selected children's titles were chosen randomly from FY 1998/99. Two of these titles were eliminated from the sample due to inability to find valid information. Thus, this sample actually consists of 148 titles. The average time to receive juvenile titles from the date of publication was 9.84 weeks. This time needs to be examined more closely. Due to the way the City's fiscal year is run, the vendor is told to have all funds encumbered by the end of June. Money is not available again until October or November when the new budget is approved. While the selector continues to identify titles for purchase between July and November, the orders are not released until the new budget is in

place. This resulting gap affects the availability of materials and the timeliness in receiving them. When we removed the figures for the 70 titles in the sample that were published between July and November 1998, the time to receive materials after publication drops to an average of 6.6 weeks. Another major difference found between the adult materials and children's materials is the fact that 78% of the adult books sampled were reviewed prior to publication whereas only 27% of the children's titles were reviewed prior to publication. This factor alone would account for children's materials taking longer to receive after publication since selection is largely predicated on the published reviews.

The Vendor's Selector's Perspective. In order to provide an additional perspective, we took the opportunity to talk to the individual who currently selects children's books for Fort Worth Public Library. As noted above, there are factors that the selector cannot control, predominantly the budgetary cycle that creates a major gap in ordering. The selector commented that the easy part of her job is determining which titles are worthy of purchase. The hard and time-consuming part involves determining which agencies are to get which titles. She indicated that Fort Worth Public Library is unusual in that the vendor selector does it all. Most libraries that use selection services prefer to be provided with a recommended list of titles with reviews to select from. Generally, the children's librarians are satisfied with the materials selected for the library system. It is the timeliness of the receipt of materials that is the major bone of contention.

The current selector's credentials indicate an expertise that would be difficult to match within the library system, even in a materials coordinator position. She is an editor for the *Elementary School Library Collection* and is able to attend workshops and conferences that would be outside the typical children's librarian's realm. Her position also gives her access to review and galley copies. Although the contract specifies selecting from *School Library Journal, Booklist, Publisher's Weekly* and *Kirkus*, her scope is much broader than just these journals and she will select materials outside of these sources. Having worked with Fort Worth Public Library children's librarians for a number of years, she has established a rapport with them and seems genuinely interested in maintaining a quality children's collection for Fort Worth. Unfortunately, she has a small staff so when illness and family problems occur her work is just as likely suffer as it would if selection were being done in-house.

Bringing Children's Book Selection Back In-House. What would it take to bring selection of children's books back in-house? Assuming that the library continues to outsource cataloging and processing services, the very minimum additional staff needed would be a Children's Materials Coordinator to do the selecting and an additional clerk/typist to input and receive the orders. This would cost the library a minimum of $59,000 in salaries alone, not including fringe benefits. It is difficult to determine how much the library spends for vendor selection services as it is factored into the book discounts. Currently, the vendor gives the library a 35% discount for children's trade books. To get these same books from another source, the library would typically receive a 40% discount. Thus, it can be assumed that the vendor is charging the library 5% for selection services. In fiscal year 98/99, the vendor had a $200,000 contract for children's books. Five percent of this amount would be $10,000. This would not begin to cover the cost of additional staff. Even if the library could find the money, a major stumbling block would be the City's policy that permits staff to be added only if a new service is offered. Children's book selection would not be considered a new service.

So, what are Fort Worth's options? The system is not perfect, but it is working. Tightening up the contract specifications and the monitoring of the contract could possibly improve the timeliness of children's books. For the adult materials, sending orders electronically to the vendor should speed up the process by eliminating mailing time and inputting data by vendor staff. The major stumbling block for children's materials appears to be the gap in the ordering and budget cycles.

Another problem seems to be a lack of a single spokesperson for the Children's Librarians. The Materials Coordinator's duties are primarily concerned with adult materials and only deals with children's materials peripherally. Similarly, the Head of the Central Library's Youth Center is generally not responsible for children's services throughout the system. Other than infrequent on-site visits (once or twice a year) with the vendor's selector, the Children's Librarians do not have much contact with her and are discouraged from contacting her directly. Concerns are reported to the vendor selector through the Materials Coordinator.

If Fort Worth Public Library wanted to bring children's book selection back in-house it would take some creative juggling of existing staff and their duties. One question to ask would be "Is the outsourcing of selection services that different from in-house centralized materials selection?" Both use profiles to determine which agencies get what materials. The main concerns seem to be timeliness and ease of communication. Results from the study of the time to receive adult and children's books show that ordering in-house was not all that much more timely than having a selector do it (a total average of 7.35 weeks for the adult titles and 9.84 weeks for children's titles). Given that these materials arrive cataloged and processed, we do not know how much of that time accounts for cataloging and processing time. It appears that quality selection, whether done in-house or by a vendor, is a time-consuming process.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

V. OUTSOURCING OF MANAGEMENT

Contracting out to manage an entire library or library system is the most extreme case of outsourcing. It is this type of contracting that has been most commonly labeled "privatization," although technically management is no more "core" to librarianship than selection or cataloging, and perhaps it could be argued that it is even less. Nevertheless, recent decisions by some communities to contract with corporations to manage the provision of library services have resulted in considerable consternation within the profession.

In fact, management of library services by outside entities is a practice with quite a long history. Many firms in the corporate sector have secured essential information services by contracting with individuals, municipal libraries, or other corporations. Many communities have secured public library services for their citizens by contracting with other governmental entities—the county or the neighboring community, for example—or with local not-for-profit organizations, like women's clubs or fraternal service organizations. Not since the demise of the social library after the development of publicly funded libraries in nineteenth century, however, have communities contracted with for-profit corporations to provide library services.

This study focuses on two very different forms of contracting for the management of library services. The first, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is a large and diverse federal government agency. While NASA's approach to securing library and information services is an extremely interesting and provocative example, circumstances of NASA's operation are unique, and very little of the NASA outsourcing experience appears relevant to the general library situation.

More central to the concerns of the library profession is the case of Riverside County, California. The decision of Riverside County in 1997 to contract with Library Systems and Services, Inc. caused many expressions of dismay within the library profession. This contract, together with the Hawaii Baker and Taylor contract, was the proximate cause for the establishment of the ALA Task Force on Outsourcing and Privatization.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration Case

In order to understand how outsourcing has impacted the governance, staff development and cooperative endeavors of American libraries, it is necessary to review the rare libraries that have always been outsourced, or outsourced for decades, for comparison. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Scientific and Technical Information Administration libraries were selected for study because they are representative of those libraries that been contracted out for all, or almost all, of their history. NASA's policy of contracting for library services began before the Office of Management and Budget concluded in 1983 that federal library services qualified for privatization (Office of Management and Budget 1983). After that, other federal libraries, including those in the system of the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Energy, Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Census, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have been contracted out to the private sector.

NASA History. NASA was created by the National Aeronautics and Space Act (PL 85-568) in 1958 and started with employees and facilities from the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Today, NASA consists of NASA headquarters, nine centers, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (operated under contract to NASA by the California Institute of Technology), and several installations and offices in the United States and abroad.

In 1958, the newly formed space agency's mandate from the Eisenhower administration was to lead the civil space effort. The agency's charter gave it broad latitude to contribute to the nation's general welfare and security and to preserve its role as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology (Kraemer 1995). The agency was able to efficiently contract for labor and services, because in 1959, the General Services Administration authorized use of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations of 1947. This exempted NASA from the government policy of awarding contracts to the lowest bidder (Kraemer 1995). This policy of contracting has continued and is supported by the Office of Management and Budget's *OMB Circular A-76 Transmittal Memorandum 20* which states that the government should not compete with its citizens (2000). It requires that all government agencies contract "non-governmental" activities to the private sector.

The Cold War and the flight of the Sputnik satellite fueled the agency's growth. President Kennedy challenged the nation in 1961 to send a man to the moon and return him safely, and the President and the Congress provided NASA with the funds to do so. As a consequence of the rapid growth and preference for contract services, the agency's civil service personnel grew by a factor of three, while contract employees increased by a factor of ten. Throughout NASA's history, between 80 and 90 percent of its budget has been spent on goods and services provided through contracts.

Because of its reliance upon contracting, the agency has developed efficient methods of soliciting and managing contracts. In 1993, NASA developed Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS), a web based electronic procurement information system for midrange contracts, to provide procurement information for industry and small business and to reduce contract administration costs. The agency estimates that 80 to 90 percent of NASA's contract awards are in the midrange category. NASA employees at 10 field centers conduct the entire process of contract review and selections across the Internet (Cybernauts of Contracting 1997). NASA has relied upon clearly written contracts and a corps of professional employees deeply involved in technical details to guide the work of NASA contractors. As the emphasis of who performed the scientific research for NASA changed, the original NASA scientists became contract administers.

In 1990, NASA asked for a study to be conducted on the consequences of contracting out the bulk of its research and development work. The National Academy of Public Administration's study made two significant suggestions. The first was that the government should not contract out decisions on what work is to be done, what objectives are to be set, what the results are expected to be, and the evaluation of the work. The second was that contracting out led to erosion of strength of an important NASA asset—a corps of experienced scientists and engineers (Kraemer 1995).

A subsequent change in contracting methodology has only increased the problem. Three years ago, NASA changed from contracts that specified a level of effort to be provided, a system requiring extensive monitoring, to performance-based contracting which monitors the contractor's activity. Performance-based contracting can save the government money because it does not require as many professional management staff for monitoring. A concern has been

expressed that skilled NASA engineers will leave to take private sector jobs, and the agency will lose its ability to monitor contracts (Dickey 1999).

This loss of experienced personnel could also happen in other parts of NASA, as employees leave for other jobs or choose to retire. The agency has reduced its civil service staff by over 5,000 employees since 1993, and total employment will continue to decrease by 1,500 to 2,000 employees by 2002 (U.S. Congress 1998).

NASA Libraries. For NASA, and its libraries, contracting offered attractive advantages to supervisors and executives. NASA was able to acquire a high-quality labor force because contractors were not limited to government pay scales, could recruit employees more quickly than could be recruited in accordance with civil service rules, and could remove unsatisfactory performance employees from their positions. Contract workers would have helped NASA administrators maximize the number of authorized workers in engineer, scientist, and technician classifications against employment ceilings. NASA's total employment has declined from 34,167 in 1967 (U.S. Congress. House Appropriations Committee Hearings, 1973) to 19,259 in 1997, but the percentage of employees classified in engineering or technician positions has declined at a far lower rate (Office of Personnel Management, 1998).

Herbert S. White, NASA Scientific and Technical Information Administration Executive Director from 1964 until 1968, has written about additional reasons for organizations in general to outsource library services. The first is that it is cost effective to contract to an organization that has expertise in specialized tasks and second, it is an effective way to reduce backlogs and eliminate repetitive and routine operations (White 2000).

Overall supervision of NASA libraries is by the Scientific and Technical Information Division that acquires, processes, archives, announces and disseminates information for the scientific community. However, despite their common mission, NASA centers and facilities do not have a common organizational culture. This is because NASA combined three laboratories and two field stations from the 43 year old NACA, and rapidly added additional centers, each with its own history and traditions. Instead of creating a uniform culture, the centers have been described as behaving like rival universities with their own set of contractors, long range plans, and interests (McCurdy 1993). Since NASA libraries are governed by the center they serve, they also vary widely in methods of governance, population served, consortia participation, staffing, and collections. The differences are evident in the following comparisons:

- Staffing Models Some libraries, such as Goddard Space Flight Center, have both civil service and contract employees, while others, such as Johnson Space Center Scientific and Technical Information Center, are entirely contracted out, with a NASA librarian serving as a technical monitor (Pedrick 2000).
- Identity Not all libraries identify themselves as NASA. At least one library identified as NASA on the Headquarters web page maintained that it was part of another institution. The library and technical information center of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, a contract installation operated for NASA but owned by the California Institute of Technology, considers itself as an Institute/JPL library, and not a NASA library.
- Population Served They serve different populations. NASA Headquarters Library, founded in 1958, serves NASA and contract employees and permits public use of the reading room. In addition to serving contract and NASA employees, two others offer limited access to the public, and another library allows "qualified researchers" to visit.

- Archiving Records Johnson Space Center Scientific and Technical Center's records are archived at Fondren Library of Rice University in Houston, Texas. Sherikon Space Systems, Inc. archives records for the Jet Propulsion Laboratory library and technical information center offsite.
- Participation in consortia and networks NASA libraries participate in a variety of networks, but participation is also individual. Ten are members of Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC), six are members of PLC, four are members of the NASA Library Network, and one is a member of the AMIGOS group.

The agency's struggle against cultural change and centralization has resulted in an aggregate of independent libraries with many contractors. There are several personnel management contractors for NASA libraries.

The library staffing model with both civil service and contract employees has the potential of creating two separate and unequal pay and benefit schedules for employees performing similar work. Federal employees have established salary tiers, union representation, grievance procedures and perquisites such as time off for blood donations, while contract librarians do not have job security or perquisites. The Office of Management and Personnel listed 10 NASA librarians in 1997. And, while individual salaries are unknown, the 1997 biennial report on federal white collar employment shows that the government-wide average salary for librarians in Occupational Code and Title GS-1410 Librarian was $53,895. This is significantly higher than the average 1997-98 federal contract librarian's wage of $45,134 that was listed in the 1998 *SLA Annual Salary Survey* (Arnold 1998).

Survey of Library Staff. A modified version of the survey instrument used by the research team that visited the Riverside, California County Library System was used to collect information about the NASA libraries. Basic data from the directory entry for each library that was found in the *American Library Directory, 1998-1999* was used for information about publications holdings, librarian and library assistant staffing, and to identify the supervisor or head librarian at each library.

Each supervisor or head librarian was contacted by telephone and asked to participate in the survey. The survey form was sent by electronic mail to facilitate completion and return of responses. All but two of the responding libraries indicated that the questionnaire would have to be submitted to a higher level administrator for permission to complete and return the questionnaire. Only two responses were received to the questionnaire. The low response rate does not permit the survey data to be used or reported with confidence that the answers are representative of all NASA libraries and their staffs.

Conclusions.

The evidence we gathered seem to support the following conclusions:

- Contract employment is likely to increase as government officials conduct more commercial activity reviews to fulfill mandates of the Office of Management and Budget's *OMB Circular A-76 Transmittal Memorandum 20*, which states that federal agencies should review activities that are performed by federal employees that are not inherently governmental and to contract with the private sector for the performance of such an activity.

- NASA has always contracted out services, supplies and projects. Thus they are not experiencing the problems that public libraries encounter as they begin to negotiate and administer contracts for the first time.
- Each NASA library has responded to its unique environment, and as a consequence, has differing methods of governance, staffing models, archiving, and participation in consortia and networks.
- The research team found that data and published research on NASA's libraries are extremely limited and suggest that further research should be conducted on the NASA library system. In addition, due to the small number of NASA libraries and librarians, comparisons should be made with other federal libraries for statistical significance.

The Riverside County Library System Case

In June 1997 Riverside County, California, entered into a contract to with Library Systems and Services LLC (LSSI) to provide County library services. This event was widely reported in the library literature and generally decried as the first major instance of "privatization" of public library services. Because the Riverside County situation is the first, largest, most visible and apparently most controversial incidence of outsourcing an entire library system, we deemed it important to examine the Riverside County Library System (RCLS) carefully, including not only a comprehensive literature review, but also a site visit.

Historical Background. When Riverside County established public library service in 1911, it opted to take advantage of a provision of the 1911 California County Library law to contract with the city of Riverside for library services. The contract between the two public entities called for the city library director to become the county librarian and the city's board of library trustees to become the county library's policy making board. County officials had little more to do than to hand over county funds designated for libraries to the City of Riverside to run the newly developed Riverside county libraries. Library services for Riverside County were provided under extensions of this agreement with the city of Riverside from 1911 until 1997.

In 1965, Riverside County Libraries was reorganized as a taxing district, and a dedicated property tax was established to fund the County Library. The city of Riverside chose not to join the county system, except as its contracted administrator. The city chose, instead, to retain the municipal library as a separate system since it could tax its citizens at a higher rate. Several other cities within Riverside County also chose to follow the city of Riverside's lead and create their own municipal libraries. The county library system became known as the Riverside City and County Public Library in 1971.

California's Proposition 13 was passed in 1978. This proposition set limits on the amount of property tax increases. Riverside City and County Public Library administration reacted to the cutbacks from Proposition 13 by closing seven small branches in the less populated areas of the county. Subsequently the county supervisors forced the library system to reopen the branches and distribute funds more evenly between both the highly populated and less populated areas of the county. This was among the first of many contentious incidents that would later lead to the dissolving of the contractual relationship between the City of Riverside and Riverside County.

Over the next ten years the population of Riverside County grew 76 percent. The county and the Riverside City and County Public Library were hard pressed to keep up with the

demands for public and library services placed upon them by the growth. The population, however, brought with it more funding. The library needed to expand and update its facilities. In 1987, Moreno Valley Library became the first new regional facility built to accommodate the growth taking place within the county. Under the leadership of Linda M. Wood, who was the director during this period, the Riverside City and County Public Library was awarded LCSA grants and private funding for expansion. She also began construction on a new administration center, a move that became a severe drain on resources in the short term.

Two more incidents occurred during the early 1990's that would spell the end of the Riverside City and County Public Library and force Riverside County officials to look elsewhere for administration and management services for the library. In 1993, March Air Force Base closed. This closing caused the loss of military and civilian jobs that were a mainstay of the tax base in Riverside County. Property values plummeted as a result of the base closing bringing to an end the prosperity of the previous decade. As if this economic calamity were not enough, the California legislature passed the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund in the same year. This act caused millions of dollars to be drawn from California counties, cities, and special districts to fund the state's failing educational systems.

The crisis in funding resulted in reduced library hours and services, layoffs, and several years when expenditures for materials in the 26 libraries were nearly zero. For three years running nearly all library staff received annual layoff notices, and though the cutbacks each time were less severe than announced, a number of library employees did in fact lose their jobs. Several branches became almost totally dependent on volunteers to be able to open their doors. Some of the surrounding cities, sensing the difficulties, chose to withdraw from the county's library district, further depleting the library's funds. Public criticism of the new, costly library administrative center added to the woes of the beleaguered library system.

Control of the meager available funds became a critical political issue, one with significant emotional overtones. Lack of funding focussed attention on perceived inadequacies and misplaced priorities in the city's management of the county libraries. The issue was soon perceived by county elected officials, their constituents, and county staff as a lack of local control over funding and policy for county libraries. Disputes between the city and county culminated in the City announcing that it would no longer manage the libraries. The Riverside City and County Public Library was dissolved in December 1996.

County officials were faced with the need to find a new way to provide library services for the county. Having little knowledge of the organization of the library system and no expertise in running libraries, county officials determined to seek a new contractor to manage the county library system. A Request for Proposals was developed with help from key staff of the Riverside County Free Library System and the aid of Dallas Y. Shaffer, a consultant provided by the California State Library. In March 1997 Riverside County issued a "Request for Proposals for Administration and Operation of the Riverside County Free Library System." The RFP stipulated the funding that was available, and the scope of services desired. Three entities responded to the RFP with proposals: the Riverside County Office of Education, the San Bernadino County Library, and Library Systems and Services (LSSI). After a thorough review of the three proposals, county officials selected LSSI as the best available alternative.

Library service, under the management of LSSI, began on July 1, 1997. In April 1998, LSSI issued an Assessment Report of the Riverside County Library System. The report focused on the improvements of the first year of library service provided by LSSI, and recommendations for the future. The management contract was renewed in 1998 and again in 1999. The details of

the contract have varied slightly each year, but its essentials remain the same. The performance requirements focus on hours of service, staffing levels, and the materials budget. In the spring of 1999 the County Librarian commissioned an analysis of LSSI's Riverside County operations by an independent consultant, Ruth Metz, who reported that LSSI was meeting its contractual obligations in managing the libraries.

On-site review of RCLS. In March, 2000, a three person site visit team spent three days in Riverside County, interviewing County officials, LSSI staff, and library users. We gathered data by means of structured questionnaire instruments. We also visited the Moreno Valley Public Library, a municipal library in Riverside County that is not a member of the RCLS, in order to ascertain what factors induced Moreno Valley to opt out of the system, and to determine how the RCLS is viewed by other libraries in the county.

During our visit we received full and complete cooperation and support from both county and LSSI representatives. We were allowed to visit any location we chose, and to interview any individual we wanted. LSSI and County officials encouraged LSSI staff to speak with us openly and to respond to our questions with candor.

The site review team met with Deputy County Executive Officer Tom DeSantis and County Librarian Gary Christmas. DeSantis is the County Official who oversaw the RFP and contract negotiations throughout the period under review, and is perhaps the single person most responsible for the County's decision to outsource the management of the RCLS. Christmas is the sole library professional employed by the County of Riverside, and is responsible for overseeing the contract with LSSI and ensuring that the terms of the contract are met.

DeSantis offered a narrative description of the history of the RCLS contract. He emphasized the difficult and deteriorating relationship between the County and the City of Riverside in the mid-1990s. He stressed the difficulties in funding government operations, and especially a library district, under California's evolving tax code. He pointed out that, as the population of the county increased while funding for library services deteriorated, it became clear to the elected officials of the County that they had no control over funding and policy decisions for the county library system. A city board made policy for the county. Moreover, under the terms of the contract, the city of Riverside charged a ten percent overhead assessment. In 1996 the county conducted an internal audit of library operations, and recommended that the county Board of Supervisors wrest control over the county library system away from the city. The city did not respond well to a proposed change in the nature of the relationship, and ultimately chose to walk away from it. The decision to seek another vendor was thus not ultimately a funding issue, but rather a matter of structure, policy and governance.

In assessing the three proposals received in response to the RFP, DeSantis noted that San Bernadino County utilized less qualified staff in its operations, and Riverside wanted to keep the professional staff already in place if at all possible. He also admitted that there were some political reservations about turning over library operations to a neighboring county. The proposal from the Riverside County Board of Education offered less service for the funds available. The proposal from LSSI, on the other hand, seemed to offer some creative approaches to managing services, and considerably more accountability than had been the case with the city of Riverside. LSSI was the unanimous choice of the county staff, and the contract was approved by an overwhelming majority of the Board of Supervisors.

The period from January through June 1997, witnessed substantial uncertainty among the county library staff. According to DeSantis, the city of Riverside "demonized" the county,

resulting in substantial discomfort among the staff. County officials were prohibited by the city from directly contacting library staff, who were actually city employees.

After selecting the LSSI proposal, the county negotiated a contract with the vendor. The contract firmly established that Riverside County would retain full governance of the library system, and LSSI staff would carry out policies established by the county officials. The contract ensured that the County would have final authority in the employment of key personnel, and established Zone Advisory Boards, citizens panels that would assist in developing policy in three management zones. The county appointed as its sole library employee a county librarian who would serve as its in-house expert and monitor the contract. The contract specifies performance benchmarks in terms of hours of service, staffing, and collection development.

According to DeSantis, the county was able to achieve much of what it sought in terms of staff salaries and benefits. There ensued a difficult period of transition, in which LSSI sought with some success to assure county library staff that their jobs were secure. Although some employees decided to remain with the city of Riverside, or to seek employment elsewhere, virtually all former city employees who wished to transfer to LSSI and continue to work in county libraries were given jobs at the same rate of pay. Several staff who had earlier been laid off were rehired.

Branch hours of service were immediately increased, and staffing was increased from 67.09 FTE to 117.26 FTE (Metz 1998). Funding for these improvements in services and staffing was made possible by the elimination of substantial administrative overhead built in to the management of the libraries by the City of Riverside. In addition, LSSI trimmed the managerial staff, which under the city there had risen to twenty, down to only five. The controversial library administrative center was abandoned to other county uses.

According to DeSantis, the county has been extremely satisfied with the services provided by LSSI. They have renewed the contract twice with only minor changes.* When asked what his advice would be to other public officials who might consider outsourcing management of a library system, DeSantis unhesitatingly offered these four suggestions.

1. It is imperative to keep policy control with the elected public officials and representatives of the public;
2. It is equally important to have your own in-house expert, a qualified professional, to manage the contract and oversee vendor performance;
3. The contract must specify outcomes that are quantitatively measurable;
4. Choose your service provider carefully; be certain they have the experience and qualifications to deliver on their commitments.

Further discussion with County Librarian Gary Christmas reaffirmed much of what DeSantis had described. Christmas offered more details, and more of a professional's perspective, but with essentially the same bottom line. Christmas emphasized again that LSSI does not set library policy; the county Board of Supervisors does that, with the advice of the Zone Advisory Boards. As an example, Christmas cited the RCLS policy on filtering Internet access. The Board decided to install filtering software on some of the public access workstations in some library branches, and LSSI implemented the policy.

---

* Since the site visit we have learned that the County has decided to again renew the contract with LSSI, this time extending the arrangement for two additional years.

As County Librarian, he is involved in hiring decisions for the zone and branch managers. The Board scrutinizes the budget, sets policies, and sees every contract. Christmas personally reviews book orders and has final say on all collection development decisions. Christmas emphasized that increased services under LSSI come from their lean operation and organizational efficiency.

The site review team also met with Gordon Conable, LSSI's Director of West Coast Operations, and the de facto project manager for the Riverside contract. Conable stressed that, in his view, the RCLS contract did not constitute "privatization" for two reasons:

1. The assets all belong to the county. While LSSI employees may purchase books or paperclips with county funds, the resulting materials are property of the county. "It's not our library—it's the county's" Conable says.
2. The library board makes policy decisions. LSSI is merely the contractor that carries out board policy.

Conable stressed that, under the contract with LSSI, the county has not saved any money. "We haven't contracted with anyone yet by selling ourselves as costing less," he pointed out. Instead, the county has decided how much it wanted to spend on library services, and asked LSSI what they could do with it. The LSSI proposal offered more services for the money. Conable suggested that improved hours of service and staffing have resulted from LSSI being able to run the system with less overhead.

Conable commented that the arrangement in Riverside would not work everywhere. He claimed that the strength of LSSI was its ability to "localize" and "customize." "We offer viable alternative with a level of accountability that is strong—we have a contract that could be terminated," he observed. Conable suggested that LSSI's potential future growth would be in communities that were looking for more local control and accountability.

While in Riverside County the site review team also visited nine of the 24 branches of the RCLS. At each location the team interviewed staff (including the branch manager when possible) and library users. We employed structured interview instruments customized for staff, branch managers, and library users (see Appendix A).

We also took the opportunity to briefly survey the facilities and collections at each site visited. Although all the facilities we visited were adequately maintained and furnished, they varied significantly in size and adequacy for the populations served. The facilities ranged from renovated storefronts to magnificent new buildings, and included one joint-use facility. Although we made no effort to provide a quantitative analysis of collections, it was readily apparent that these too varied considerably from one community to the next. The primary cause for this variation in facility and collection adequacy appears to be the amount of local funding that is contributed to enhance the basic funding provided by the county. In some wealthy communities, that amount is apparently substantial; in other less affluent communities, there is little additional funding.

Finally, while in Riverside County we also visited the Moreno Valley Public Library and interviewed its director, Cynthia Pirtle, and key staff. Moreno Valley is one of the largest and fastest growing municipalities in Riverside County, and one of the libraries that withdrew from the RCLS. We wanted to ascertain why Moreno Valley left the system, what the perception of the RCLS was in a nearby public library, and what issues (if any) might remain that were relevant to the study.

Survey Responses. We interviewed staff to assess their perception of changes in library services and management following LSSI's assumption of the management role. We used a structured interview instrument (see Appendix A), we tabulated the data and, using standard statistical software, produced frequency tables for each response (see Appendix B). The total number of staff interviewed was small (N=23), and we therefore hesitate to make generalizations. But some strong indications do emerge from this small sample.

On the whole, RCLS staff is satisfied with conditions working for LSSI. More than eighty-two percent thought that their current salary was satisfactory and comparable to others in the area. Seventy-eight per cent said they had received a salary increase since they started working for LSSI. Seventy-three percent thought that they had adequate opportunities for continuing education. Ninety-five percent found their branch manager approachable and open to their ideas. Eighty-two percent felt that the collection in their library had improved since LSSI took over, and seventy-eight percent felt that the hours of service at their library were good for the community they served.

Some areas of concern also emerge. Forty-three percent expressed no opinion about their benefits, while more than a quarter each thought that their benefits were better or worse, respectively, than they had been before. Clearly there are some concerns that the benefits they had as public employees were better than those they now had as corporate employees. Only fifty-six percent thought that their work schedule enabled them to get their work done in a professional manner; apparently a substantial minority have concerns about there being more work to do than they can manage. And forty-three percent of those surveyed clearly felt that funds for collections were inadequate to address community needs, while another thirteen percent had no opinion.

Newer staff hired by LSSI generally appear to be paid less than staff who had been employees of the City of Riverside. There are unanswered questions about staff turnover, though it appears to be significant among newer employees. This raises questions about the potential impact on compensation in other libraries in the region if arrangements like this were to become commonplace. It is not clear, however, that either of these issues is related to LSSI's management of the library system. In most organizations newer staff receive less remuneration than the former City of Riverside employees, who are now the senior staff in RCLS. It is not clear that turnover among the newer employees is any greater than in other libraries of comparable size.

In its operation of RCLS, LSSI has demonstrated a willingness to hire staff without professional qualifications to perform function that had previously been performed by professional librarians. It must be noted, however, that this is not merely a local trend in Riverside. There is ongoing discussion in the library profession at large about appropriate staffing levels for various library functions, and there appears to be a trend to focus professional librarians on truly professional tasks while increasing the number of paraprofessionals to carry out work that can be rendered routine. Non-traditional staffing patterns, instigated in part by increasing competition for a shrinking pool of librarians, appears to be a national trend.

We also interviewed library users at nine branch locations. We used a structured interview instrument (see Appendix A), we tabulated the data and, using standard statistical software, produced frequency tables for each response (see Appendix B). The total number of patrons interviewed was small (N=74), and generalizations from such a small sample should be made with caution. Nevertheless, some strong patterns do emerge.

On the whole, the citizens of Riverside County who use the libraries there are generally satisfied with their library services. Sixty-three percent think that library services have definitely improved in the past three years (corresponding with the period they have been under LSSI's management). Ninety percent think the staff is very helpful. Eighty-one percent think that staff is readily available to help, while seventy-three percent feels they don't have to wait to check out materials. More than sixty-eight percent get what they need when they come to the library, and seventy-three percent are satisfied with the results of known-item searches. Almost two-thirds of the library users are satisfied with the hours the library is open.

On the other hand, only forty-three percent of the users find the library's OPAC easy to use, while an equal number have no opinion. This suggests that the OPAC is a problem, and that many users simply avoid it and go to the librarian for help in finding things. In fairness it should be pointed out that the OPAC is a legacy system, inherited by LSSI, and that the corporation has significantly upgraded the system at its own expense.

Almost a third of those surveyed had no opinion about the availability of computers in the library, while almost another third felt that they had to wait too long to get access to a computer. There was similar lack of consensus about the quality of the reference collection available.

The instrument we used did not include a question about the public awareness about the outsourcing of library management in Riverside County. It became clear, however, in the course of our investigations, that few people were aware of it or concerned about it. Indeed, many library users seemed even unaware that their community library was part of the county systems, perceiving instead that it was an operation of their own community. County officials indicated that they were pleased that the change had gone essentially unnoticed, and saw no reason to make any effort to inform the public about the change.

In short, both staff and patrons seem to agree that, in general, library services are improving, but that more money for collections is needed. Surprisingly, both groups seem to think that the hours of service are adequate.

Findings. The overall condition of the libraries in Riverside County continues to be poor, but most of this is due to the effects of California's maze of restrictive tax measures rather than any effect of privatization of library management. Funding levels for Riverside County libraries remain at desperately low levels, barely more than a third of the national average on a per capita basis.

Materials budgets have increased each year, rising from $180,000 in the first year of the contract to a projected $700,000 in 2000-01. Nevertheless, they are still inadequate to maintain the branch library collections, which are in the main too small for the populations they are intended to serve, and are generally old and worn. The few branches whose collection appears in better condition have clearly benefited from infusions of additional local funds.

None of this can improve significantly until a larger source of revenue can be found. Riverside County has pinned its hopes for overall improvements in funding for library services on a package of impact fees that will provide significant revenues as long as the current growth boom continues.

Two cities in Riverside County have withdrawn from the county library system since LSSI assumed management control of the system. Both withdrawals were underway before LSSI was selected to manage the library system, and there is no evidence that the withdrawals were in any way a result of privatization. An interview with the three top staff at Moreno Valley

indicated that the motivation for the withdrawal was the city's desire for local control, combined with the opportunity to capture a local tax revenue stream sufficient to provide better library services than the county is able to fund.

It is significant to note in this context that six other cities were contemplating withdrawing from the county system prior to the arrival of LSSI, and none of them appears at this time interested in pursuing the course further. This can be attributed in part to several factors, including service improvements instituted under LSSI, a perception of greater equity in resource allocation and increased local control, and a realization of the high costs of providing better library service with exclusively local funding,

The County of Riverside has made great efforts to give local communities a sense of greater local control. They instituted three zone advisory boards of citizens to provide input on the allocation of fiscal resources within regional zones. They have focussed on trying to return tax funds to the zone in which they were generated, and in doing so have calmed many concerns about inequitable funding. However, the issue of "return to source" with regard to tax revenues remains. It is a difficult one to manage in an area with great disparities in both wealth and local property tax base. There is reason for concern that this issue may be a potent force tending to pull the county library system apart over time.

Based on a number of interviews, the staff of the Riverside County Library System apparently has no reason to feel that their professional values or standards are in any way compromised by being employees of a private corporation that manages their public libraries. Most staff members interviewed seem to feel strong sense of loyalty to LSSI because the company has restored a measure of stability to their jobs.

Staff has perceived relatively few changes of policy or procedure at the branch level since LSSI assumed control. This may point to a possible problem in leadership or direction due to the division of responsibilities between the county and the contractor. The County Librarian is fully occupied in administering a large number of contracts and interlocal agreements, and takes care not to become involved in the details of running the libraries. Much of his administrative effort is currently being focussed on an ambitious program of building and improving facilities. The contractor, LSSI, is charged with providing day-to-day management of library operations, but is not responsible for strategic planning for the library system. It appears that responsibility for long range planning may have fallen into the cracks between the contractually stipulated responsibilities of the respective parties. It is open to question if a single county employee, the County Librarian, can be expected to manage so many contracts, continue an aggressive building program, and effectively provide vision and direction for the system. The County needs to either hire additional staff for that purpose, or else contract for that task as well as for day-to-day operations.

The staff reports that there appear to be several advantages in private sector management of the library system. Among these advantages are reduced red tape in getting things done, ranging from the ordering of supplies to the furnishing and equipping of a branch library. In interviews some staff noted, with an obvious show of relief, that it was easier for a private contractor to discipline or discharge employees who weren't performing well.

Conclusions. Overall, the evidence we gathered leads to the following conclusions:

1. The county acted judiciously in contracting the management of Riverside County Library System to LSSI. County officials took care to retain policy control, and have developed

detailed and enforceable contracts. A capable and experienced library professional, who is an employee of the county, manages these contracts.

2. The decision to contract with LSSI has apparently enhanced local control over library operations and increased the accountability of library management to public officials.

3. The outsourcing of library management to LSSI can not be considered "privatization" under any reasonable definition of the term because the County retains full and complete control over the assets of the library and over library policy matters.

4. The citizens of Riverside County feel that they are receiving better library service now, with the LSSI management of RCLS, than they were receiving when the system was managed by the city of Riverside.

5. Funding for collections and hours of service have both increased since the decision to outsource management of RCLS to LSSI. These issues both remain a significant concern for County officials, and further improvements are expected.

6. Staff feel that, overall, LSSI is a better employer than the City of Riverside, and are generally satisfied with their compensation and working conditions. They do appear to have concerns about the benefits they receive, and about work schedules.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has been limited to a comprehensive review of the literature on outsourcing in general, an in depth analysis of the literature on outsourcing of cataloging, followed by a detailed examination of a four selected specific outsourcing cases. This is a rather limited set of cases on which to generalize, but nevertheless the evidence does point to some tentative conclusions about the impact of outsourcing on the three specific areas identified in the RFP.

Library governance and First Amendment issues. We found no evidence that outsourcing *per se* represents a threat to library governance, or to the role of the library in protecting the First Amendment rights of the public. Library staff in organizations where the management was contracted to outside vendors (NASA, Riverside County) expressed little concern that their values were in conflict with those of their employers. Likewise, surveys of library users revealed no concern about the practice. Elected officials and county officers in Riverside have found that by contracting out the management of the public library system to a commercial vendor rather than a municipality, they have significantly increased their control over policy matters and resource allocation decisions and enhanced the accountability of the library to the people it serves.

Maintenance of a quality workforce. With regard to outsourcing of cataloging and selection, this issue is elusive and difficult to determine. There appears to be legitimate cause for concern that, with increasing reliance on vendors for cataloging and selection, the expertise of local library professional staff in these areas way dwindle and atrophy. One the other hand, this is a logical by-product of the managerial choice to direct local staff resources toward other activities and functions, enhancing staff expertise in these other areas. These represent the difficult choices managers must make in the face of limited resources and increasing demands for services.

In the Riverside case, we uncovered some vague indications of increasing workloads and decreasing compensation—especially in terms of benefits—that might lead to diminished work forces over the long term. There was also a clear indication of a change in the staffing pattern in some libraries, with non-professionals handling tasks that had formerly been carried out by professionals. Some observers might interpret this as the cynical manipulation of labor by a for-profit employer. An equally valid view, in our opinion, is that this represents a specific instance of a much larger trend in library management, involving innovative approaches to staffing patterns in order to find more effective allocations of scarce resources. The evidence is equivocal and the conclusions by no means certain. More study is needed, and perhaps more time to develop a discernible pattern of activities.

The community of libraries and their cooperative endeavors. We also found no evidence that outsourcing *per se* had any significant impact on interlibrary cooperation. Conceptually, there is the possibility that library collections developed by vendors rather than local selectors might tend to become homogenous over time. This, in turn, would limit the diversity of library collections as a whole, and vitiate the rationale for effective library resource sharing. It is not clear from the evidence at hand, however, that the scale of outsourced selection justifies concern about this theoretical evolution. Nor is it certain that, given emerging patterns in publishing and

information distribution systems, such homogenization is not more or less inevitable in the long run.

Far from being a threat to library cooperation, outsourcing of cataloging is in fact facilitated by widespread access to shared cooperative cataloging efforts.

Outsourced library management, on the other hand, more logically might pose a threat to interlibrary cooperation. We found, however, no evidence that it fact has as yet made any impact. In Riverside, the surrounding communities appear to view LSSI as a good neighbor, and one with whom they are more than willing to work for common improvements.

General considerations. While we found no evidence that outsourcing *per se* represents a threat, there are to be sure a number of issues which might deserve sober deliberation by the library profession. There are clearly instances in which outsourcing has led to undesirable—perhaps even disastrous—results. In seems apparent, however, that these debacles are less a consequence of outsourcing than of poor management; in other words, outsourcing badly done. It is clear from these examples, as well as from consistent admonitions in the literature that, a decision to outsource is one that should be made very carefully, with deliberate consideration of all of the factors and ramifications. It would be perhaps useful to reiterate the suggestions of Riverside County official Tom DeSantis about things to be sure to do before outsourcing.

1. Keep policy control with the elected public officials and representatives of the public;
2. Have your own in-house expert, a qualified professional, to manage the contract and oversee vendor performance;
3. The contract must specify outcomes that are quantitatively measurable;
4. Choose your service provider carefully; be certain they have the experience and qualifications to deliver on their commitments.

The first two of these are clear and unambiguous. We might elaborate further on the second two. From the third suggestion it can be noted that a key element in successful outsourcing projects is the quality of the contract: a poor contract will likely result in poor performance. It is imperative, therefore that librarians and library managers become experts at developing, monitoring and administering contracts. It seems equally obvious that model contracts and guidelines for developing proposals be created by appropriate professional organizations to aid librarians in negotiating their way through the contracting wilderness.

The final suggestion above leads to another observation: one of the greatest impediments to successful outsourcing is the limited pool of qualified and experienced vendors, especially in the area of library management. The most important handicap that Riverside County has in negotiating with LSSI is that there are few alternative vendors from which to chose. If there were a half dozen qualified and experienced vendors from which to chose, contract negotiations with any single vendor would take on a completely different complexion.

Michael Gorman is one of the most outspoken critics of outsourcing in the library literature. He has written that library managers who decide to contract with outside vendors for cataloging, selection or acquisition services "are saying, in effect, that professional library skills and experience can be replaced by distant vendors who probably lack the former and certainly lack the latter" (Gorman 1998, 74). We would certainly agree that library managers should not contract for *any* services with vendors who lack relevant professional skills or adequate experience. We would assert, however, that many vendors can offer skills and experience equal

to the professional staffs of many libraries. The evidence we considered indicates that, in many cases, the skills and experience of vendor staffs may far exceed those of the local library staff—*for specific activities and functions*. The key to success in outsourcing is knowing when to outsource, and negotiating a workable contract with a capable vendor. This in turn results from careful analysis and planning, establishment of measurable objectives, and vigilant monitoring of contract performance.

Conclusions. In general, there is no evidence that outsourcing *per se* has had a negative impact on library services and management. On the contrary, in the main outsourcing has been an effective managerial tool, and when used carefully and judiciously it has resulted in enhanced library services and improved library management. Instances where problems have arisen subsequent to decisions to outsource aspects of library operations and functions appear to be attributable to inadequate planning, poor contracting processes, or ineffective management of contracts.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered to the American Library Association to improve the use of outsourcing as an effective management tool in American libraries.

1. The American Library Association should encourage the inclusion of data documenting the extent of outsourcing in libraries in the regular annual data collection activities of such agencies as the National Center for Education Statistics.
2. The American Library Association should foster regular treatment of outsourcing trends, vendors and services, and other issues related to outsourcing, in the journals published by the divisions and units of ALA.
3. The American Library Association should foster, through its Divisions and other units, the development of guidelines and model contracts to aid librarians in making decisions about outsourcing.
4. The American Library Association, working collaboratively with other appropriate agencies such as the Council on Library and Information Resources and the Institute of Museum and Library Services, should encourage and foster further research into the impact of outsourcing on library services and management.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

VII. WORKS CITED

American Library Association. 1999a. Outsourcing and privatization in American libraries: Report of the ALA Outsourcing Task Force. 1998-99 Council Document #24.

American Library Association. 1999b. Motions related to CD24. Outsourcing & privatization in American libraries. 1998-99 Council Document #24.1.

Arnold, Ruth M., ed. 1998. *SLA Annual Salary Survey*. Washington D.C.: Special Libraries Association.

Ashley, Lowell. 1994. Outsourcing, cataloging costs, value of cataloging. AUTOCAT discussion list. 25 January. http://listserv.acsu.buffalo.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9401d&L=autocat&F=&S=&P=5217 Accessed 4 June 2000.

Baker, Barry B. 1998. Resource sharing: outsourcing and technical services. *Technical Services Quarterly* 16, no. 2: 35-45.

Baker, Ronald J. 1998. Outsourcing in Riverside County: Anomaly, no prophecy. *Library Journal* 123, no. 5 (15 March): 34-7.

Barayuga, Debra. 1997a. End books contract? BOE cautious. *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, 4 June, A3.

Benaud, Claire-Lise and Sever Michael Bordeianu. 1998. *Outsourcing library operations in academic libraries: An overview of issues and outcomes*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Berry, John. 1998. The measure of outsourcing: No vendor serves people better than the librarians who work there already. *Library Journal* 123 (February): 6.

Block, Rick J. 1994. Cataloging outsourcing: issues and options. *Serials Review* 20, no. 3: 73-7.

Bordeianu, Sever and Claire-Lise Benaud. 1997. Outsourcing in American libraries–An overview. *Against the Grain* 9, no. 5 (November): 1,16,18,20.

Buser, Robin. 2000. Email message from OCLC, Dublin, OH, to Tim Judkins. 1 March.

Bush, Carmel C., Margo L. Sasse, and Patricia A. Smith. 1994. Toward a new world order: A survey of outsourcing capabilities of vendors for acquistions, cataloging, and collection development services. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 18: 397-416.

Chervinko, J. S. 1995. Cooperative and contract cataloging of foreign-language materials in academic and research libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 21, no. 1: 29-65.

Crismond, Linda F. 1994. Outsourcing from the A/V vendor's viewpoint: The dynamics of a new relationship. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 18: 375-81.

Cybernauts of contracting. 1997. *Government Executive* 29, no. 10: 10.

Dickey, Beth. 1999. Everything must go! *Government Executive* 31, no. 8: 20-5.

Diggin, Denise, Jan Oberla, Carol Emery, Susan M. Tarr, and Sandy Scwalb. Handbook of federal librarianship, chapter 5. [http://lcweb.loc.gov/flicc/hbfl/chap5.html]. Accessed 8 May 2000.

Dubberly, Ronald A.1998. Why outsourcing is our friend. *American Libraries*. 29 (January): 72-4.

Dixon, Catherine A. and Frances G. Bordonaro. 1997. From selection to shelf: Outsourcing book selection, copy cataloging, and physical processing at Fort Worth Public Library. In *Outsourcing library technical services operations: Practice in academic, public, and special libraries*, ed. Karen A. Wilson and Marylou Colver, 137-53. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Duke, John Kenneth. 1997. Acceptable copy: Quality in record selection and outsourcing. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 21, no. 4: 483-5.

Dunkle, Clare B.1996. Outsourcing the catalog department: A meditation inspired by the business and library literature. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 1: 33-44.

Duranceau, Ellen Finnie. 1994. Vendors and librarians speak on outsourcing, cataloging, and acquisitions. *Serials Review* 20, no. 3: 69-83.

Easton, Christa. 1997. Partnering with vendors for increased productivity in technical services. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 21: 64-6.

Eberhardt, George M.1997. The outsourcing dilemma. *American Libraries* 28 (May): 54-6.

Eisenberg, Michael B. and Judi Repman. 1997. The sky is falling, the sky is falling...or is it? *Book Report* 16 (May): 22-4.

El-Sherbini, Magda. 1995. Contract cataloging: A pilot project for outsourcing Slavic books. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, no. 3: 57-73.

Exploring Outsourcing. 1997. *Information Outlook* 1: 31

Farkas, Doina. 1997. Outsourcing of AV cataloging at UNT libraries. *OLAC Newsletter* 17, no. 1: 24-6.

Fast, Barry. 1995. Outsourcing and PromptCat. *Against the Grain* 7 (April): 50.

German, Lisa B. 1997. In or out–in-house innovation and outsourcing technical services

alternatives for the 90s: A report of an ALCTS program. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 21: 77-9.

Giambi, M. Diana. 1998. The books are shelf ready, are you? *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 22, no. 2: 194-5.

Gordon, Mary Jane and Les Moor. 1997. Creating a library technical services outsourcing operation. *Serials Librarian* 32, no. 1-2: 53-76.

Gorman, Michael. 1995. The corruption of cataloging. *Library Journal* 120, no. 15 (15 September): 32-4.

_____. 1998. *Our singular strengths: Meditations for librarians*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Harmon, Joseph C.1996. The death of quality cataloging: Does it make a difference for library users? *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 4: 306-7.

Held, Ray E.1973. *The rise of the public library in California*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Hill, Janet Swan. 1998. Boo! Outsourcing from the cataloging perspective. *The Bottom Line* 11, no. 3: 116-21.

Hirshon, Arnold and Barbara A. Winters. 1996. *Outsourcing library technical services: A how-to-do-it manual for librarians*. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Holt, Glen E. 1995. Catalog outsourcing: No clear-cut choice. *Library Journal* 120 (15 September): 34.

HSPLS customer information update. 1996. *Ho'ala News*. October.

Intner, Sheila S. 1993. Reengineering, outsourcing, downsizing, and perfect timing. *Technicalities* 13, no. 11 (November): 1.

_____. 1994. Outsourcing–what does it mean for technical services. *Technicalities* 14, no. 3 (March): 3-5.

_____. 1996. What is your catalog worth? *Technicalities* 16, no. 4 (April): 2-3.

_____. 1997a. Stream of consciousness: Outsourcing selection in Hawaii–the next installment. *Technicalities* 17, no. 4 (April): 2-3.

_____. 1997b. We keep saying libraries need catalogers, but outsourcing says it isn't so. *Technicalities* 17, no. 5 (May): 2-3.

Johnson, Marta, Director of Collections and Technical Services Division, OCLC, Dublin, OH. 2000. Interviewed via telephone by Tim Judkins, March 1.

Johnston, Janis L. 1996. Outsourcing: New name for an old practice. *Law Library Journal* 88: 128-34.

Kraemer, Sylvia K. 1995. Organizing for Exploration. In *Exploring the Unknown*, ed John M. Longsdon. Washington D.C.: NASA History Office.

Lancaster, Hal. 1995, Saving your career when your position has been outsourced. *Wall Street Journal*, 12 December, B1.

Leiding, Reba. 1996. Reader's soapbox revisited: A response to Dwyer's commentary on PromptCat. *Technicalities* 16, no. 15 (July).

Libby, Katherine A. and Dana M. Caudle. 1997. A survey on the outsourcing of cataloging in academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries* 58, no. 6: 550-60.

Marcum, James W. 1998. Outsourcing in libraries: Tactic, strategy, or "meta-strategy"? *Library Administration & Management* 12, no. 1: 15-25.

McCurdy, Howard E. 1993. *Inside NASA: High technology and organizational change in the U.S. space program*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Metz, Ruth M.. 1998. Analysis of LSSI's Riverside County Library System operation for FY 1997-98 and FY 1998-99. Riverside, CA: County Executive Office, Riverside County. Photocopied.

Miles, Kevin. 1996. Outsourcing in private law libraries since the Baker & Mckenzie action. *The Bottom Line* 9, no. 2: 10-3.

The OCLC TechPro service: Your partner in technical procession since 1985. 2000. Dublin, OH: Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

Oder, Norman. 1997. Outsourcing model–or mistake? The collection development controversy in Hawaii. *Library Journal* 122 (15 March): 28-31.

Oder, Norman and Susan Smith DiMattia. 1996. Hawaii / B&T outsourcing deal causing controversy. *Library Journal* 121 (15 November): 12.

Office of Management and Budget. 1983. Performance of commercial activities. OMB Circular A-76 Transmittal Memorandum 20. http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/a076/a076tm20.html. Accessed 3 May 2000.

Office of Personnel Management. 1998. *Occupations of federal white-collar and blue-collar workers as of September 30, 1997. OMSOE-OWI-56-25*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Ogburn, Joyce L. 1994. An introduction to outsourcing. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 18: 363-416.

Olson, Renee. 1996. Hawaii's newest volcano: Dissent erupts over outsourcing. *School Library Journal* 42: 10-1.

Pedrick, Andrew, manager for NASA Headquarters Library, Washington D.C. 2000. Interviewed via telephone by Lea Worcester, March 17.

Rider, Mary M. 1996. Developing new roles for paraprofessionals in cataloging. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 1: 26-32.

Rider, Mary M. and Marsha Hamilton. 1996. PromptCat issues for acquisitions: Quality review, cost analysis and workflow implications. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 20, no. 1: 9-21.

Ruschoff, Carlen. 1995. Cataloging's prospects: Responding to austerity with innovation. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 21, no. 1: 51-7.

Schneider, Karen G. 1998. The McLibrary syndrome. *American Libraries* 29 (January): 66-8.

Shirk, Gary M. 1994. Outsourced library technical services: The bookseller's perspective. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 18, no. 4: 383-95.

Somers, Michael A. 1997. Causes and effects: Shelf-ready processing, PromptCat, and Louisiana State University. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 21: 228.

Stomberg, Lisa. 1996. The underutilization of government document collections: Can outsourcing provide access solutions? *Colorado Libraries* 22: 42-3.

Technical processing projects undertaken by OCLC TechPro service. 1999. Dublin, OH: Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

Tsui, Susan Lee and Carol F. Hinders. 1999. Cost-effectiveness and benefits of outsourcing authority control. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 26, no. 4: 43-61.

U.S. Congress, House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. 1998. *Department of Veteran's Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations for 1999: Part 1. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Urban Libraries Council. 1999. *Outsourcing metropolitan public libraries: A frequent fast facts survey*. Evanston, IL: Urban Libraries Council.

Varner, Carroll H.1995. Outsourcing library production: The leader's role. *Continuity & transformation: The promises of confluence. Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries.* Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association, 445-8.

Waite, Ellen J.1995. Reinvent catalogers! *Library Journal* 120, no. 18 (1 November): 36-7.

Walker, Thomas M. 1996. Outsourcing: A customer's perspective on the process and the potential. *The Bottom Line* 9, no. 2: 14-7.

White, Herbert S. 2000. Why outsourcing happens, and what to do about it. *American Libraries* 31, no. 1 (January): 66-71.

Wilson, Karen A. 1995. Outsourcing copy cataloging and physical processing: A review of Blackwell's outsourcing services for the J. Hugh Jackson Library at Stanford University. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 39, no. 4: 359-83.

Wilson, Karen A., and Marylou Colver, ed. 1997. *Outsourcing library technical services operations: Practices in academic, public, and special libraries*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Woodsworth, Anne. 1998. Outsourcing: A tempest in a teapot. *Library Journal* 123, no. 5 (15 March): 46.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Outsourcing in Libraries

Abel, Richard. 1998. The return of the native. *American Libraries* 29, no. 1 (January): 76-8.

Adamski, Mary. 1997a. State librarians promised a role in book selection. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 14 February, A3.

_____. 199b7. Book contract draws heavy disapproval. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 25 February, A1, A6.

_____. 1997c. Tam says BOE should fire Kane. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 2 May, A3.

_____. 1997d. Confidence ballot on Kane circulated. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 13 May, A1, A10.

Agada, John. 1997. Information counseling and the outsourcing challenge to corporate librarianship. *College & Research Libraries* 58 (July): 338-47.

Alley, Brian. 1993. Reengineering, outsourcing, downsizing, and perfect timing. *Technicalities* 13 (November): 1.

American Library Association. 1999a. Outsourcing and privatization in American libraries: Report of the ALA Outsourcing Task Force. 1998-99 Council Document #24.

American Library Association. 1999b. Motions related to CD24. Outsourcing & privatization in American libraries. 1998-99 Council Document #24.1.

Angry Hawaiian librarians denounce B&T outsourcing. 1997. *American Libraries* 28, no. 1 (January): 12-3.

Arnold, Ruth M., ed. 1998. *SLA Annual Salary Survey*. Washington D.C.: Special Libraries Association.

Ashley, Lowell. 1994. Outsourcing, cataloging costs, value of cataloging. AUTOCAT discussion list. 25 January. http://listserv.acsu.buffalo.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9401d&L=autocat&F=&S=&P=5217 Accessed 4 June 2000.

Baker, Barry B. 1998. Resource sharing: outsourcing and technical services. *Technical Services Quarterly* 16, no. 2: 35-45.

Baker, Ronald J. 1998. Outsourcing in Riverside County: Anomaly, not prophecy. *Library Journal* 123, no. 5: 34-7.

Barayuga, Debra. 1997a. End books contract? BOE cautious. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 4 June, A3.

_____. 1997b. Libraries poised for change. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 4 July, A1, A12.

_____. 1997c. Kane gets 6 months. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 25 July, A1, A12.

_____. 1997d. Librarians can start buying next week. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 20 August, A3.

_____. 1998a. State Librarian Bart Kane fired. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 20 February, A1, A8.

_____. 1998b. Kane suing BOE over his firing. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 18 May, A1.

_____. 1998c. Bart Kane says library board broke promises. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 19 May, A3.

Barayuga, Debra and Gregg K. Kakesako. 1997, Baker & Taylor book deal doomed. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 20 June, A1, A14.

Bates, Mary Ellen. 1997. Avoiding the ax: How to keep from being downsized or outsourced. *Information Outlook* 1, no. 10 (October): 18-21.

_____. 1997. Outsourcing, co-sourcing, and core competencies: What's an information professional to do? *Information Outlook* 1, no. 12 (December): 35-7.

Benaud, Claire-Lise and Sever Michael Bordeianu. 1998. *Outsourcing library operations in academic libraries : An overview of issues and outcomes*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Benaud, Claire-Lise and Sever Michael Bordeianu. 1996. Outsourcing: SCOUG's annual conference. *Against the Grain* 8: 66-8.

Berry, John N. 1998. The measure of outsourcing: No vendor serves people better than the librarians who work there already. *Library Journal* 123: 6.

Bielsky, Katherine. 1997. An experiment in outsourcing at the College of Charleston libraries. *Against the Grain* 9, no. 5: 24,26.

Blecic, Deborah D., Sue M. Hollander, and Don Lanier. 1999. Collection development and outsourcing in academic health sciences libraries: a survey of current practices. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 87, no. 2 (April): 178-86.

Block, Rick J. 1994. Cataloging outsourcing: Issues and options. *Serials Review* 20, no. 3: 73-7.

Booklines Hawaii wins major library contract. 1996. *Hale Pai Pacific American News Journal* 2 (July), no. 7.

Bordeianu, Sever and Claire-Lise Benaud. 1997. Outsourcing in American libraries--An overview. *Against the Grain* 9, no. 5: 1,16,18,20.

Branche-Brown, Lynne C. 1997. Practical issues associated with outsourcing. *Against the Grain* 9, no. 6: 75-7.

Bush, Carmel C., Margo L. Sasse, and Patricia A. Smith. 1994. Toward a new world order: A survey of outsourcing capabilities of vendors for acquistions, cataloging, and collection development services. *Library Acquisitions* 18: 397-416.

CannCasciato, Daniel. 1994. Tepid water for everyone? The future of OLUC, catalogers, and outsourcing. *OCLC Systems & Services* 10: 5-8.

Carr, Mary M. 1998. To the lowest bidder: libraries for sale . *Alki* 14, no. 3 (December): 24-6.

Chervinko, J. S. 1995. Cooperative and contract cataloging of foreign-language materials in academic and research libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 21, no. 1: 29-65.

Cline, Lynn S. 1997. Outsourcing book selection and cataloging in Hawaii: A crictical examination. *Library Acquisitions* 21, no. 4: 504-5.

Crismond, Linda F. 1994. Outsourcing from the A/V vendor's viewpoint: The dynamics of a new relationship. *Library Acquisitions* 18: 375-81.

Cybernauts of contracting. 1997. *Government Executive* 29, no. 10: 10.

Davidson, Ann C. 1996. "Obedience to the unenforceable": The ethics of outsourcing. *Searcher* 4: 28-30.

Dickey, Beth. 1999. Everything must go! *Government Executive* 31, no. 8: 20-5.

Diedrichs, Carol Pitts. 1998. Using automation in technical services to foster innovation. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 24, no. 2: 113-20.

Diggin, Denise, Jan Oberla, Carol Emery, Susan M. Tarr, and Sandy Schwalb. Handbook of federal librarianship, chapter 5. [http://lcweb.loc.gov/flicc/hbfl/chap5.html]. Accessed 8 May 2000.

Dinerman, Gloria. 1997. The angst of outsourcing. *Information Outlook* 1, no. 4: 21-4.

Dixon, Catherine A. and Frances G. Bordonaro. 1997. From selection to shelf: Outsourcing book selection, copy cataloging, and physical processing at Fort Worth Public Library. *Outsourcing library technical services operations: Practice in academic, public, and special libraries*, 137-53. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Dobb, Linda S. 1998. Bringing it back: Insourcing what you do well. *The Bottom Line* 11, no. 3: 105-10.

Donnelly, Christine. 1997a. Library book deal a Disaster. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 9 January, A1, A9.

_____. 1997b. State will audit library book deal. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 17 January, A3.

Dubberly, Ronald A. 1998a. Why outsourcing is our friend. *American Libraries* 29 (January): 72-4.

Dubberly, Ronald. 1998b. Assessment report of the Riverside County Library System. Germantown, MD: Library Systems & Services, Inc.

Duke, John Kenneth. 1997. Acceptable copy: Quality in record selection and outsourcing. *Library Acquisitions* 21, no. 4: 483-5.

Dunkle, Clare B. 1996. Outsourcing the catalog department: A meditation inspired by the business and library literature. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 1: 33-44.

Duranceau, Ellen Finnie. 1994. Vendors and librarians speak on outsourcing, cataloging, and acquisitions. *Serials Review* 20, no. 3: 69-83.

Dwyer, Jim. 1997. Outsource the routines, retain the expertise. *Alki* 13, no. 2: 30.

Easton, Christa. 1997. Partnering with vendors for increased productivity in technical services. *Library Acquisitions* 21: 64-6.

Eberhardt, George M. 1997a. The outsourcing dilemna. *American Libraries* 28 (May): 54-6.

_____. 1997b. Hawaii terminates outsourcing contract. *American Libraries* 28 (August): 15.

_____. 1998. Hawaii's state librarian takes a stand on selection. *American Libraries* 29, no. 9 (October): 20.

Edison, Betty. 1997. Our profession is changing–whther we like it or not. *Online* 21, no. 1: 72-81.

Eisenberg, Michael B. and Judi Repman. 1997. The sky is falling, the sky is falling...or is it? *Book Report* 16 (May): 22-4.

El-Sherbini, Magda. 1995. Contract cataloging: A pilot project for outsourcing Slavic books. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, no. 3: 57-73.

Farkas, Doina. 1997. Outsourcing of AV cataloging at UNT libraries. *OLAC Newsletter* 17, no. 1: 24-6.

Farmanfarmaian, Roxane. 1996. B&T, local wholesaler choose books for Hawaii libraries. *Publishers Weekly* 243, no. 42 (14 October): 15.

Fast, Barry. 1995. Outsourcing and PromptCat. *Against the Grain* 7: 50.

_____. 1997. The lessons of Hawaii. *Against the Grain* 9: 69.

Fennessy, Eamon T., Linda F. Albright, and Katherine J. Miraglia. 1997. Are you outsourcing...and, if so, what? *Against the Grain* 9: 76.

Fogerty, James E. 1997. Archival brinkmanship: downsizing, outsourcing, and the records of corporate America . *The American Archivist* 60, no. 1: 44-55.

German, Lisa B. 1997. In or out—In-house innovation and outsourcing technical services alternatives for the 90s. *Library Acquisitions* 21: 77-9.

Gershenfeld, Nancy. 1994. Outsourcing serials activity at the Microsoft Corporation. *Serials Review* 20, no. 3: 81-3.

Giambi, M. Diana. 1998. The books are shelf ready, are you? *Library Acquisitions* 22, no. 2: 194-5.

Gordon, Mark L. and Timothy P. Walsh. 1997. Outsourcing technology in government owned, controlled, or regulated institutions. *Journal of Government Information* 24: 267-93.

Gordon, Mary Jane and Les Moor. 1997. Creating a library technical services outsourcing operation. *The Serials Librarian* 32, no. 1-2: 53-76.

Gorman, Michael. 1995. The corruption of cataloging. *Library Journal* 120, no. 15: 32-4.

Hallman, Phillip. 1995. Outsourcing media. *Against the Grain* 7: 92-4.

Harmon, Joseph C. 1996. The death of quality cataloging: Does it make a difference for library users? *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 4: 306-7.

Harrison, Jerri. 1996. Outsourcing by you, for you, or in spite of you? *Serials Review* 22: 131-5.

Hawaii PL outsources collection selection to B&T. 1996. *American Libraries* 27, no. 6 (June): 25.

Held, Ray E. 1973. *The rise of the public library in California*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Helfer, Doris Small. 1997. Insourced or outsourced: A tale of two libraries. *Searcher* 5, no. 8: 68-70.

_____. 1998. Outsourcing, teaming, and special libraries: threats and opportunities. *Information Outlook* 2, no. 12: 26-9.

HGEA files class-action lawsuit on behalf of state library employees. 1997. *HGEA/AFSCME News and Announcements* 10 June, 1.

Hill, Janet Swan. 1998. Boo! Outsourcing from the cataloging perspective. *The Bottom Line* 11, no. 3: 116-21.

Hirshon, Arnold and Barbara A. Winters. 1996. *Outsourcing library technical services: A how-to-do-it manual for librarians*. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Holt, Glen E. 1995. Catalog outsourcing: No clear-cut choice. *Library Journal* 120: 34.

HSPLS customer information update. 1996. *Ho'ala News*. October.

Intner, Sheila S. 1993. Reengineering, outsourcing, downsizing, and perfect timing. *Technicalities* 13, no. 11 (November): 1+.

_____. 1994. Outsourcing—what does it mean for technical services? *Technicalities* 14, no. 3 (March): 3-5.

_____. 1996. What is your catalog worth? *Technicalities* 16, no. 4 (April): 2-3.

_____. 1997a. Stream of consciousness: Outsourcing selection in Hawaii—the next installment. *Technicalities* 17, no. 4 (April): 2-3.

_____. 1997b. We keep saying libraries need catalogers, but outsourcing says it isn't so. *Technicalities* 17, no. 5 (May): 2-3.

Johnston, Janis L. 1996. Outsourcing: New name for an old practice. *Law Library Journal* 88: 128-34.

Kraemer, Sylvia K. 1995. Organizing for Exploration. In *Exploring the Unknown*, ed John M. Longsdon. Washington D.C.: NASA History Office.

Kua, Crystal. 1999, State settles suit against book buyer. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (Honolulu, HI), 23 July, A1.

Lancaster, Hal. 1995, Saving your career when your position has been outsourced. *Wall Street Journal*, 12 December, B1.

Las Vegas outsources authority. 1998. *American Libraries* 29, no. 4 (April): 33-4.

Lawes, Ann. 1994. Contracing out. *New Library World* 95, no. 1114: 8-12.

Leiding, Reba. 1996. Reader's soapbox revisited: A response to Dwyer's commentary on PromptCat. *Technicalities* 16, no. 15.

Libby, Katherine A. and Dana M. Caudle. 1997. A survey on the outsourcing of cataloging in academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries* 58, no. 6 (November): 550-60.

Majka, David R. 1999. Of portals, publishers and privatization. *American Libraries* 30, no. 10 (October): 46-9.

Manley, Will. 1997. The fiasco factor. *American Libraries* 28, no. 11 (December): 96.

Marcum, James W. 1998. Outsourcing in libraries: Tactic, strategy, or "meta-strategy"? *Library Administration & Management* 12, no. 1: 15-25.

Martin, Murray S. 1995. Outsourcing. *The Bottom Line* 8, no. 3: 28-30.

McCurdy, Howard E. 1993. *Inside NASA: High technology and organizational change in the U.S. space program*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

McLaren, Mary. 1998. Outsourcing: into the next dimension. *Library Acquisitions* 22, no. 2: 214-16.

Metz, Ruth M.. 1998. Analysis of LSSI's Riverside County Library System operation for FY 1997-98 and FY 1998-99. Riverside, CA: County Executive Office, Riverside County. Photocopied.

Mitchell, Sylvia. 1997. Librarians voice their concerns. *The Public Employee* September, 6-7.

Miyashiro, Fusako. 1995. Library news. *The Waimanalo News Home Page*. August.

Miles, Kevin. 1996. Outsourcing in private law libraries since the Baker & Mckenzie action. *The Bottom Line* 9, no. 2: 10-3.

Morton-Schwalb, Sandy I. 1997. The ins and outs of outsourcing: The changing, evolving scene for information professionals. *Database* 20: 41-2+.

Neville, Shelley. 1999. Biz of acq—libraries, outsourcing, and integrated library services: peaceful coexistence, or contradiction in terms? *Against the Grain* 11, no. 1: 68-70.

Nisonger, Thomas E. 1998. Outsourcing selection in academic libraries (meeting of the ALCTS Collection Development Librarians of Academic Libraries Discussion Group, ALA Midwinter 1998). *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 22, no. 3: 356-8.

Nurse! There are headaches in Hawaii! 1996. *School Library Journal* 42, no. 12 (December): 38.

The OCLC TechPro service: Your partner in technical procession since 1985. 2000. Dublin, OH: Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

Oder, Norman. 1997a. Outsourcing model—or mistake? The collection development controversy in Hawaii. *Library Journal* 122, no. 5 (15 March): 28-31.

_____. 1997b. Hawaii bends on outsourcing bill. *Library Journal* 122, no. 10 (June): 16.

_____. 1997c. Hawaii cancels B&T outsourcing. *Library Journal* 122, no. 12 (July): 12-3.

Oder, Norman and Susan Smith DiMattia. 1996. Hawaii / B&T outsourcing deal causing controversy. *Library Journal* 121 (15 November): 12.

Office of Management and Budget. 1983. Performance of commercial activities. OMB Circular A-76 Transmittal Memorandum 20. http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/a076/a076tm20.html. Accessed 3 May 2000.

Office of Personnel Management. 1998. *Occupations of federal white-collar and blue-collar workers as of September 30, 1997. OMSOE-OWI-56-25.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Ogburn, Joyce L. 1994. An introduction to outsourcing. *Library Acquisitions* 18: 363-416.

Okata, Russell K. 1997. We're on your side. *The Public Employee.* June, 4.

Olson, Renee. 1996. Hawaii hands collection development to Baker & Taylor. *School Library Journal* 42, no. 6 (June): 10-1.

_____. 1996. Hawaii's newest volcano: Dissent erupts over outsourcing. *School Library Journal* 42, no. 10, (November): 10-1.

Osif, Bonnie A. and Richard L. Harwood. 2000. Privatization and outsourcing. *Library Administration and Management.* 14, no. 2: 102-107.

Penebacker, John R. 1997. Letter from Hawaii State Public Library System, to Arnie Wight, Baker & Taylor Books, 12 February 1997.

Platten, Bessie. 1999. The case against outsourcing. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services* 23, no. 2: 210-12.

Quint, Barbara. 1996. The best defense is a good offense. *Searcher* 4, no. 7: 12-6.

_____. 1996. Disintermediation. *Searcher* 4: 4+.

_____. 1996. The last word: Ambivalence. *Searcher* 4: 54-5.

_____. 1996. Library-to-library outsourcing: Interview with Steve Coffman. *Searcher* 4: 24-31.

_____. 1996. Professional associations react to the challenge: Interviews with SLA's David Bender and AIIP's Jane Miller. *Searcher* 4: 8+.

Ray, Ron L. 1997. Outsourcing technical services: The selection process. *Library Acquisitions* 21, no. 4: 490-3.

Reid, Calvin. 1997. More B&T woes: Hawaii cancels pact, Chicago claims fraud. *Publishers Weekly* 244, no. 32: 21.

Renaud, Robert. 1997. Learning to compete: Competition, outsourcing, and academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 23: 85-90.

Rider, Mary M. 1996. Developing new roles for paraprofessionals in cataloging. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 22, no. 1: 26-32.

Rider, Mary M. and Marsha Hamilton. 1996. PromptCat issues for acquisitions: Quality review, cost analysis and workflow implications. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 20, no. 1: 9-21.

Ruschoff, Carlen. 1995. Cataloging's prospects: Responding to austerity with innovation. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 21, no. 1: 51-7.

Schneider, Karen G. 1998. The McLibrary syndrome. *American Libraries* 29, no 1, (January): 66-8.

_____. 1998. Outsourcing. *The Bottom Line* 11, no. 3: 96-121.

Schuman, Patricia Glass. 1998. The selling of the public library: It's not just "outsourcing," it's privatization. *Library Journal* 123, no. 13 (August): 50-52.

Schwalb, Sandy. 1997. The ins and outs of outsourcing. *Database* 20, no. 3 (June): 41-46.

Seitz, Rob. 1998. Outsourcing helps library meet demand. *American City & County* 113, no. 5: 72.

Sellberg, Roxanne. 1995. Managing the cataloging enterprise in an academic library: An introduction. *Wilson Library Bulletin* 69, no. 7 (March): 33-6.

Shirk, Gary M. 1995. Outsourced library technical services: The bookseller's perspective. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 18, no. 4: 383-95.

Smith, Vicki Toy. 1997. Outsourcing cataloging: An evaluation. *Journal of Educational Media & Library Sciences* 34, no. 4 (June): 380-95.

Somers, Michael A. 1997. Causes and effects: Shelf-ready processing, PromptCat, and Louisiana State University. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 21: 228.

Stomberg, Lisa. 1996. The underutilization of government document collections: Can outsourcing provide access solutions? *Colorado Libraries* 22: 42-3.

Swenson, Jennifer. 1998. *County services: A tale of eight counties*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.

Technical processing projects undertaken by OCLC TechPro service. 1999. Dublin, OH: Online Computer Library Center, Inc.

Tsui, Susan Lee and Carol F. Hinders. 1999. Cost-effectiveness and benefits of outsourcing authority control. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 26, no. 4: 43-61.

U.S. Congress, House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. 1998. *Department of Veteran's Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations for 1999: Part 1. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Urban Libraries Council. 1999. *Outsourcing metropolitan public libraries: A frequent fast facts survey.* Evanston, IL: Urban Libraries Council.

Varner, Carroll H. 1996. Outsourcing library production: The leader's role. *Continuity & transformation: The promises of confluence. Proceedings of the Seventh National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries* Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries, American Library Association, 445-8.

Waite, Ellen J. 1995. Reinvent catalogers! *Library Journal* 120, no. 18: 36-7.

Walker, Thomas M. 1996. Outsourcing: A customer's perspective on the process and the potential. *The Bottom Line* 9, no. 2: 14-7.

Waltner, Robb M. 1998. Outsourcing continuations services: issues and implications. *The Serials Librarian* 34, no. 3-4: 267-9.

Watson, James K., Richard Huff, and Jay Bromberek. 1998. Outsourcing document capture: Adding more service to service bureaus. *Inform* 12, no. 1 (January): 28-31.

Weaver, Barbara F. 1993. Outsourcing—a dirty word or a lifeline? *The Bottom Line* 7: 26-9.

White, Herbert S. 1998. Library outsourcing and contracting: Cost-effectiveness or shell game? *Library Journal* 123, no. 11: 56-7.

_____. 2000. Why outsourcing happens, and what to do about it. *American Libraries* 31, no. 1 (January): 66-71.

Wiegand, Wayne A. 1998. The politics of cultural authority. *American Libraries* 29, no. 1 (January): 80-2.

Wight, Arnie. 1997. Letter from Baker & Taylor Books, to Karen Knudsen,13 February 1997.

Willett, Charles. 1998. Consider the source: A case against outsourcing materials selection in academic libraries. *Collection Building* 17, no. 2: 91-5.

Wilson, Karen A. 1995. Outsourcing copy cataloging and physical processing: A review of Blackwell's outsourcing services for the J. Hugh Jackson Library at Stanford University. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 39, no. 4: 359-83.

Wilson, Karen A., and Marylou Colver, ed. 1997. *Outsourcing library technical services operations: Practices in academic, public, and special libraries.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Winters, Barbara A. 1994. Catalog outsourcing at Wright State University: Implications for acquisitions managers. *Library Acquisitions* 18: 367-73.

Wittorf, Robert. 1998. Outsourcing photocopying in a library: one experience. *The Bottom Line* 11, no. 3: 101-4.

Woodsworth, Anne. 1998. Outsourcing: A tempest in a teapot. *Library Journal* 123, no. 5: 46.

Wright, Susan. 1997. Exploring outsourcing. *Information Outlook* 1 (March): 31+.

Zula, Floyd M. 1997. Creative outsourcing assessment and evaluation. *Library Acquisitions* 21 (Spring): 89-91.

Outsourcing in Education and Government

An interview with David Bennett, President, Educational Alternatives, Inc. 1993. *School Business Affairs* 59, no. 11 (November): 22-5.

Farm it out: An interview with Steve Kramer. 1996. *School Planning & Management* 35, no. 4 (April): 18-22.

Adams, Matthew C. 1998. Off-balance sheet financing. *Facilities Manager* 41, no. 4: 56-7.

Baten, Eugene C. 1996. Lessons learned: EAI and the Hartford Board of Education. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 12-6.

Blackshear, Patsy Baker. 1993. The tides of change: Privatization in education. *School Business Affairs* 59, no. 6 (June): 26-8,30.

Brown, Frank. 1995. Privatization of public education: Theories and concepts. *Education & Urban Society* 27, no. 2 (February): 114-26.

_____. 1997. Privatization and urban education: More political and less educational. *Education & Urban Society* 29, no. 2 (February): 204-16.

Brown, Frank and Richard C. Hunter. 1996. The privatization of public education: What do we mean? *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 6-11.

Carnoy, Martin. 1995. Is school privatization the answer? Data from other countries help burst the voucher bubble. *American Educator* 19, no. 3: 29-30.

Cowen, Richard. 1991. Privatization of transportation: The ownership question. *School Business Affairs* 57, no. 1 (January): 36-9.

Dervarics, Charles. 1993. Weighing the contract option. *American School Board Journal* 180, no. 9 (September): 42-4.

Donovan, Sharon. 1996. The benefits of private contractors: Four case studies. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 25-31.

Doyle, Denis P. 1994. Private management and school reform. *American Enterprise* 5, no. 3: 12-5.

Eckerd, Cynthia L. 1996. The battle of Wilkinsburg: One district's efforts to privatize. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 22-4.

Feir, Priscilla L. 1996. Contracting for educational services. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 1 (January): 38-40, 42.

Finkel, Karen E. 1998. Writing the right contract: Getting what you want. *School Business Affairs* 64, no. 2 (February): 40-3.

Furtwengler, Carol B. 1998. Policies and privatization. *American School Board Journal* 185, no. 4 (April): 42-6.

Gliedman, John A. 1991. The choice between educational privatization and parental governance. *Journal of Law & Education* 20, no. 4: 395-419.

Green, Preston C. 1997. To a peaceful settlement: Using constructive methods to terminate contracts between private corporations and school districts. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 30, no. 2 (September): 39-48.

Harrington-Lueker, Donna. 1993. Public schools go private. *American School Board Journal* 180, no. 9 (September): 35-9.

Hounsell, Dan. 1996. Privatizing maintenance. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 2 (February): 16-7,19.

Hunter, Richard C. 1995a. Private procurement in the public sector and in education. *Education & Urban Society* 27, no. 2 (February): 136-53.

_____. 1995b. Privatization of instruction in public education. *Education & Urban Society* 27, no. 2 (February): 168-94.

Jacobs, Glenn. 1993. History, crisis, and social panic: Minority resistance to privatization of an urban school system. *Urban Review* 25, no. 3 (September): 175-98.

_____. 1994. Why is Boston University still in Chelsea? *New England Journal of Public Policy* 10, no. 1: 179-207.

Keane, William G. and Samuel Flam. 1998. Politics and privatization. *American School Board Journal* 185, no. 4 (April): 46-8.

Kinkel, Karen E. 1996. Driving down a new road: Outsourcing student transportation. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 38-42.

Koppich, Julia E. 1997. Considering nontraditional alternatives: Charters, private contracts, and vouchers. *Future of Children* 7, no. 3: 96-111.

Levine, Marvin J. 1990. *Privatization of government: The delivery of public goods and services by private means*. Alexandria, VA: International Personnel Management Association.

Lurie, Sylvia and Kenneth Smith. 1996. Two views on performance contracting. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 47-51.

Lyons, James E. 1995. Contracting out for public school support services. *Education & Urban Society* 27, no. 2 (February): 154-67.

Madsen, Jean. 1997. Leadership in decentralized schools. *Journal of School Leadership* 7, no. 2 (March): 110-37.

_____. 1998. Private and decentralized public schools: Do they speak the same language? *International Journal of Educational Reform* 7, no. 2 (January): 20-33.

McCarthy, Martha M. 1995. Private investment in public education: Boon or boondoggle? *Journal of School Leadership* 5, no. 1 (January): 4-21.

McLaughlin, John M. 1994. The private management of public schools. *Principal* 73, no. 4 (March): 16-7,19.

McLaughlin, John M. and Michael M. Norman. 1995. Education as an industry: Opportunities for public schools. *School Business Affairs* 61, no. 11 (November): 10-4.

Noguera, Pedro A. 1994. More democracy not less: Confronting the challenge of privatization in public education. *Journal of Negro Education* 63, no. 2: 237-50.

Page, Paul R. and Lloyd D. Davis. 1994. Leave the driving to us. *American School Board Journal* 181, no. 11 (November): 43-5.

Payne, James L. 1996. Profit is not a dirty word: The role of money in education. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 43-6.

Ravitch, Diane and Joseph Viteritti. 1996. A new vision for city schools. *Public Interest*, no. 122: 3-16.

Russo, Charles J. 1995. Legal issues in contracting out for public education services. *Education & Urban Society* 27, no. 2 (February): 127-35.

Russo, Charles J. and J. Harris. 1996. Buyer beware: State controls over privatization. *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 17-8,20-1.

Schnaiberg, Lynn. 1999. Entrepreneurs hoping to do good, make money. *Education Week* 19, no. 14: 1-2.

Slesnick, Donald D. II and Jennifer K. Poltrock. 1996. Public sector bargaining in the mid-90s (The 1980s were challenging, but this is ridiculous)--a union perspective. *Journal of Law & Education* 25, no. 4: 661-71.

Tetreault, Donald R. and Lawrence O. Picus. 1996. School privatization: Is there a future? *School Business Affairs* 62, no. 5 (May): 32-7.

Thompson, Garland L. 1994. Contention over privatization: Will it help or hurt the schools? *Black Issues in Higher Education* 11, no. 16: 20-1.

Uline, Cynthia L. 1998. The privatization of public schools: Breaking the mold in Hartford, Connecticut. *Journal of Research & Development in Education* 31, no. 3: 176-88.

Walsh, Norman J. 1995. Public School, Inc.: Baltimore's risky enterprise. *Education & Urban Society* 27, no. 2 (February): 195-205.

Wood, Lonnie. 1998. Getting down to business. *American School Board Journal* 185, no. 6 (June): 40-1.

Outsourcing in the Private Sector

Ambrosio, Johanna. 1990. Soul-searching: Four case studies. *Computerworld* 24, no. 49 (3 December): 69, 73.

Brown, Bob. 1992. Outsourcing's side effects can inflame instead of cure. *Network World* 9, no. 17 (27 April): 27, 31.

Caldwell, Bruce. 1995. Outsourcing megadeals. *Informationweek* 552 (6 November): 34-52.

Connelly, Karin. 1999. Ship out! *Inside Business* 1, no. 11: 88-91.

Deavers, Kenneth L. 1997. Outsourcing a corporate competitiveness strategy, not a search for low wages. *Journal of Labor Research* 18: 503-19.

Gillooly, Caryn. 1995. Outsourcing the corporate network. *Informationweek* 557 (11 December): 14-6.

Hannum, Amy Raufman. 1999. Outsource IT. *Inside Business* 1: 61-5.

Hayes, Heather. 1999. Agencies move to outsource network management. *Washington Technology* 14, no. 13: 32-6.

King, Julia. 1998. Outsourced, but not outclassed. *Computerworld* The Premier 100 Supplement (16 November): 36-7.

McCartney, Laton. 1998. Winning with IT consultants: Let the buyer beware in this $50 billion consulting market. *Industry Week* 247, no. 16 (7 September): 51-4.

Savas, E. S. 2000. *Privatization and public-private partnerships*. New York: Chatham House.

Schatz, Willie. 1993. Get ready for bailoutsourcing. *Computerworld* 27, no. 4 (25 January): 57-8.

Sheridan, John H. 1999. Managing the chain. *Industry Week* 284, no. 16 (6 September): 50-2.

Strassman, Paul A. 1998. Outsourcing IT. *Across the Board* 35, no. 5 (May): 23-5.

Tully, Shawn. 1993. The modular corporation. *Fortune* 127, no. 3 (8 February): 52-6.

Violino, Bob. 1995. Bringing harmony to business systems - Part 1. *Informationweek* 547 (2 October): 34-40.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association

IX. APPENDICES

A. Survey Instruments

Fort Worth Public Library System Selectors
NASA Staff
Riverside County Library System Staff
Riverside County Library System Customers
Riverside County Library System Management Questionnaire

B. Data Frequency Tables

Fort Worth Public Library System Selectors
Riverside County Library System Staff
Riverside County Library System Customers

C. Narrative Responses to Surveys

Fort Worth Public Library System Selectors
Riverside County Library System Staff
Riverside County Library System Customers

D. Fort Worth Public Library System Cost Estimate

E. Selected Cataloging Contractors

F. NASA Libraries and Contractors

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association

OUTSOURCING SELECTION SURVEY

Please answer the following questions about yourself?

1. Do you have a masters degree in library science?

2. How many years have you been employed in your present library system?

3. How many years of total professional library experience do you have?

4. What is your formal job title?

Please evaluate the following statements based on your opinions and perceptions by choosing from among the indicated responses.

1. The outsourcing of juvenile book selection gives staff more time to devote to story times and other programs for the public.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

2. Although children's books are vendor selected, I am afforded time in my work schedule to consult review journals and keep abreast of new publications.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

3. The outsourcing of selection limits my familiarity with the collection and my ability to do effective reader's advisory.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

4. The outsourcing of selection, by reducing my role in the collection development process, affects my future marketability in the library work force.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

5. As a professional, I feel the need for the authority to accept or reject materials sent by the vendor based on their suitability for my library's specific character and collection needs.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

6. Materials that have been selected through outsourcing are received at the library in a timely manner.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

7. The use of profiles to define local needs is sufficient to get the materials my unit needs.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

8. There is an effective procedure for identifying and ordering materials not selected by the vendor.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

9. In addition to using the unit profiles for selection, the vendor maintains sufficient contact with the children's librarians to see that their needs are being met.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

10. My neighborhood needs are being met through outsourced materials selection.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

11. My patrons are aware that children's books are being selected by an outside vendor.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

12. Selection done in-house by a juvenile materials coordinator using unit profiles would be more responsive to my unit's needs than an outsourced materials selector.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

13. The overall quality of the children's book collection has improved due to outsourcing.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

14. The vendor has a strong commitment to the quality of the children's book collection.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

15. The outsourcing of children's book selection has improved the morale of the children's librarians.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

16. The outsourcing of juvenile book selection makes a positive statement to the local community about the library's commitment to children's services.

1	2	3	4	5
agree strongly	agree	no opinion	disagree	disagree strongly

Staff Survey

NASA Library :_____

1. Year you joined NASA Library: _____

2. Are you a professional librarian with an MLS? Yes No

For the following questions, use this scale:
1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = No opinion; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Strongly disagree

Based on your experiences in the NASA library:

3.	My current salary is satisfactory and is comparable to surrounding library systems.	1 2 3 4 5
4	I have received a salary increase in the last three years based on the merit of my performance.	1 2 3 4 5
5	My current benefits (sick leave, vacation, health insurance, insurance, and retirement) compare favorably with those in surrounding library systems.	1 2 3 4 5
6	My current work schedule allows me to complete my work in a professional manner.	1 2 3 4 5
7	My job provides opportunities for continuing education and training.	1 2 3 4 5
8	My manager is approachable and listens to my ideas and suggestions.	1 2 3 4 5
9	The collection in my library has improved in the last three years.	1 2 3 4 5
10	The materials budget is sufficient to purchase materials that satisfy library users.	1 2 3 4 5
11	The computer equipment in my library is upgraded and is serviced regularly.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	I think that the library's hours are convenient for the service community.	1 2 3 4 5

13. What I like best about my library is:

14. What I like least about my library is:

15. Do you feel that there is any conflict between your professional values as a librarian and the corporate goals of your employer?

STAFF SURVEY

1. Year you joined the staff in Riverside County: _____

2. Are you a professional librarian with an MLS? Yes No

For the following questions, use this scale:

1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = No Opinion; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Strongly disagree

Based on your experience in the Riverside County Library System:

3. My current salary is satisfactory and is comparable to surrounding library systems.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I have received a salary increase in the last three years based on my length of service and on the merit of my performance.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My current benefits (sick leave, vacation, health insurance, life insurance, and retirement) compare favorably with those I had before 1997.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My current work schedule allows me to complete my work in a professional manner.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My job provides opportunities for continuing education and training.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My branch manager is approachable and listens to my ideas and suggestions.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The collection in my library has improved over the past three years.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The materials budget is sufficient to purchase materials that satisfy library users.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My library presents programs that enhance the lives of library users of all ages.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The computer equipment in my library is upgraded when needed and is serviced regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I think that the library's hours are convenient for our community.	1	2	3	4	5

14. What I like *best* about my library is:

15. What I like *least* about my library is:

16. Do you feel that there is any conflict between your professional values as a public librarian and the corporate goals of LSSI?

CUSTOMER SURVEY

1. What year were you born?_____

2. How many years have you lived in Riverside County?_____

3. How many years have you been using a library in Riverside County?_____

4. How often do you visit the library? ____ First visit; ____ times per week; ____ times per month; ____ times per year

5. What do you use the library for *primarily*:

____ children's materials; ____ children's programs; ____ recreational materials; ____ information needs

For the following questions, use this scale:

1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = No Opinion; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Strongly disagree

6. In the last 3 years, the library service has gotten noticeably better.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The library staff is very helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
8. There is always staff available to help locate materials and information.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I do not have to wait in line to check out materials.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I find the library's electronic catalog easy to use.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I don't have to wait to use a computer in the library.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am satisfied with the programs offered for children and adults. (times, topics, frequency)	1	2	3	4	5
13. I can always find the information I am seeking at the library.	1	2	3	4	5
14. When I come to the library for a specific item, I am not disappointed.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The reference collection is up-to-date and provides information on all topics.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I find the library's hours very convenient.	1	2	3	4	5

17. What I like *best* about the library is:

18. What I like *least* about the library is:

Management Questionnaire

1. Please discuss your public relations efforts, including any marketing plan you have.

2. Please rate your quality and quantity of service. What specific things do you have in place to strive for higher levels?

3. Explain the impact your volunteer and friends of the library programs have on the library system.

4. How has the chain of command and/or organizational flow changed since 1997? Is it better? Are there ways it can still be improved?

5. How do you think your staff feel about their workload? And their salaries?

6. How do you feel about your present workload? Do your salary and benefits adequately correspond to the work you do?

7. What procedures do you have in place to recruit new staff?

8. What types of training programs do you have in place? Do you believe that they are effective?

9. What number / percentage of your staff are professionals (MLS)? Do they participate in professional organizations?

10. Please explain your interviewing and hiring process. Who is involved in the decision making process?

11. In what ways are you and your library staff active in the community?

12. How would you say your neighboring libraries view your library system?

13. In what ways do you participate in reciprocal or consortia agreements?

© 2000 American Library Association

Fort Worth Public Library Staff Survey

Frequency Tables

Outsourcing of juvenile book selection gives staff more time to devote to story times and other programs for the public

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
agree	9	50.0	50.0	61.1
no opinion	1	5.6	5.6	66.7
disagree	5	27.8	27.8	94.4
strongly disagree	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

I am afforded time in my work schedule to consult review journals and keep abreast of new publications

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
agree	14	77.8	77.8	83.3
disagree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Outsourcing of selection limits my familiarity with the collection and my ability to do effective reader's advisory

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	3	16.7	16.7	16.7
agree	5	27.8	27.8	44.4
disagree	8	44.4	44.4	88.9
strongly disagree	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Outsourcing of selection, by reducing my role in the collection development process, affects my future marketability in the work force

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	4	22.2	22.2	22.2
no opinion	6	33.3	33.3	55.6
disagree	8	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

As a professional, I feel the need for the authority to accept or reject materials sent by the vendor based on their suitability for my library's specific character and collection needs

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	5	27.8	27.8	27.8
agree	8	44.4	44.4	72.2
disagree	5	27.8	27.8	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Materials that have been selected through outsourcing are received at the library in a timely manner

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
no opinion	2	11.1	11.1	22.2
disagree	9	50.0	50.0	72.2
strongly disagree	5	27.8	27.8	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Materials that have been selected through outsourcing are received at the library in a timely manner

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
no opinion	2	11.1	11.1	22.2
disagree	9	50.0	50.0	72.2
strongly disagree	5	27.8	27.8	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

There is an effective procedure for identifying and ordering materials not selected by the vendor

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
agree	8	44.4	44.4	50.0
no opinion	3	16.7	16.7	66.7
disagree	5	27.8	27.8	94.4
strongly disagree	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

In addition to using the unit profiles for selection, the vendor maintains sufficient contact with the children's librarians to see that their needs are being met

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
disagree	12	66.7	66.7	77.8
strongly disagree	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

My neighborhood needs are being met through outsourced materials selection

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
no opinion	2	11.1	11.1	44.4
disagree	9	50.0	50.0	94.4
strongly disagree	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

My patrons are aware that the children's books are being selected by an outside vendor

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	3	16.7	16.7	16.7
no opinion	3	16.7	16.7	33.3
disagree	9	50.0	50.0	83.3
strongly disagree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Selection done in-house by a juvenile materials coordinator using unit profiles would be more responsive to my unit's needs that an outsourced materials selector

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
agree	13	72.2	72.2	77.8
no opinion	1	5.6	5.6	83.3
disagree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

The overall quality of the children's book collection has improved due to outsourcing

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
no opinion	5	27.8	27.8	33.3
disagree	10	55.6	55.6	88.9
strongly disagree	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

The vendor has a strong commitment to the quality of the children's book collection

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
agree	11	61.1	61.1	66.7
no opinion	4	22.2	22.2	88.9
disagree	1	5.6	5.6	94.4
strongly disagree	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

The outsourcing of children's book selection has improved the morale of the children's librarians

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
no opinion	6	33.3	33.3	33.3
disagree	8	44.4	44.4	77.8
strongly disagree	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

The outsourcing of juvenile book selection makes a positive statement to the local community about the library's commitment to children's services

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
no opinion	7	38.9	38.9	44.4
disagree	5	27.8	27.8	72.2
strongly disagree	5	27.8	27.8	100.0
Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Riverside County Staff Survey Frequency Tables

My current salary is satisfactory and comparable to surrounding...

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	14	60.9	60.9
agree	5	21.7	82.6
no opinion	1	4.3	87.0
disagree	3	13.0	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

I have received a salary increase in the last three years.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	9	39.1	39.1
agree	9	39.1	78.3
no opinion	4	17.4	95.7
disagree	1	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

My current benefits compare favorably with those I had before

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	1	4.3	4.3
agree	6	26.1	30.4
no opinion	10	43.5	73.9
disagree	6	26.1	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

My current work schedule allows me to complete my work ...

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	5	21.7	21.7
agree	8	34.8	56.5
no opinion	1	4.3	60.9
disagree	8	34.8	95.7
strongly disagree	1	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

My job provides opportunities for continuing education ...

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	4	17.4	17.4
agree	13	56.5	73.9
no opinion	5	21.7	95.7
disagree	1	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

My branch manager is approachable and listens to my ideas...

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	16	69.6	69.6
agree	6	26.1	95.7
no opinion	1	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

The collection in my library has improved in the past three years.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	10	43.5	43.5
agree	9	39.1	82.6
no opinion	4	17.4	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

The materials budget is sufficient to purchase materials...

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	1	4.3	4.3
agree	9	39.1	43.5
no opinion	3	13.0	56.5
disagree	7	30.4	87.0
strongly disagree	3	13.0	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

My library presents programs that enhance the lives of library users.

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	8	34.8	34.8
agree	10	43.5	78.3
no opinion	2	8.7	87.0
disagree	3	13.0	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

The computer equipment in my library is upgraded when needed

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	3	13.0	13.0
agree	12	52.2	65.2
no opinion	3	13.0	78.3
disagree	5	21.7	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

I think the library's hours are convenient for our community

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
strongly agree	5	21.7	21.7
agree	13	56.5	78.3
no opinion	2	8.7	87.0
disagree	2	8.7	95.7
strongly disagree	1	4.3	100.0
Total	23	100.0	

Riverside County Customer Surveys

In the last 3 years, library service has noticeably improved

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	16	21.6	21.6	21.6
	agree	34	45.9	45.9	67.6
	no opinion	18	24.3	24.3	91.9
	disagree	4	5.4	5.4	97.3
	strongly disagree	2	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

The library staff is very helpful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	41	55.4	55.4	55.4
	agree	26	35.1	35.1	90.5
	no opinion	4	5.4	5.4	95.9
	disagree	3	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

There is always staff available to help locat materials and

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	34	45.9	45.9	45.9
	agree	26	35.1	35.1	81.1
	no opinion	7	9.5	9.5	90.5
	disagree	7	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

I do not have to wait in line to check out materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	12	16.2	16.2	16.2
	agree	42	56.8	56.8	73.0
	no opinion	9	12.2	12.2	85.1
	disagree	10	13.5	13.5	98.6
	strongly disagree	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

I find the library's electronic catalog easy to use

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	10	13.5	13.5	13.5
	agree	22	29.7	29.7	43.2
	no opinion	32	43.2	43.2	86.5
	disagree	10	13.5	13.5	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

I don't have to wait to use a computer in the library

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	11	14.9	14.9	14.9
	agree	15	20.3	20.3	35.1
	no opinion	23	31.1	31.1	66.2
	disagree	21	28.4	28.4	94.6
	strongly disagree	4	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

I am satisfied with the programs offered for children and ad

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	8	10.8	10.8	10.8
	agree	22	29.7	29.7	40.5
	no opinion	41	55.4	55.4	95.9
	disagree	3	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

I can always find the information I am seeking at the librar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	15	20.3	20.3	20.3
	agree	36	48.6	48.6	68.9
	no opinion	5	6.8	6.8	75.7
	disagree	17	23.0	23.0	98.6
	strongly disagree	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

When I come to the library for a specific item, I am not dis

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	15	20.3	20.3	20.3
	agree	39	52.7	52.7	73.0
	no opinion	6	8.1	8.1	81.1
	disagree	14	18.9	18.9	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

The reference collection is up-to-date and provides informat

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	12	16.2	16.2	16.2
	agree	27	36.5	36.5	52.7
	no opinion	22	29.7	29.7	82.4
	disagree	11	14.9	14.9	97.3
	strongly disagree	2	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

I find the library's hours very convenient

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	strongly agree	23	31.1	31.1	31.1
	agree	25	33.8	33.8	64.9
	no opinion	1	1.4	1.4	66.2
	disagree	20	27.0	27.0	93.2
	strongly disagree	5	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	74	100.0	100.0	

© 2000 American Library Association

Appendix C

Narrative Responses
Outsourcing Children's Collection Development
Ft. Worth Public Library

Total Narrative Responses - 8

Outsourcing Negative Statements

Requires more staff time - 2
Awareness of new titles is a problem – 2
Would prefer centralized selection or some other modified form of in-house selection - 1
Hurts my ability to do good reader's advisory - 1
Turn-over time from ordering to arrival is problem - 5
Profiles not sufficient to meet library's needs - 4
Vendors do not maintain adequate contact with the library – 4
Detrimental to my value as a professional - 2

Outsourcing Positive Statements

Saves staff time for other activities - 1
More efficient than in-house selection - 1
Doesn't hurt my ability to give good reader's advisory - 1
Profiles sufficient to meet library's needs - 2

Narrative Responses
Staff Survey
Riverside County

Total Responses: 22

What I like most about my library

Community Size/Diversity - 2
My job - 2
Comfortable atmosphere - 2
Building - 4
Convenient location - 1
Staff - 9
Supervisors/Management - 3
Bi-lingualism - 1
Ease of hiring and firing - 1
Friends - 2
Customers - 12
Programs - 1
Collection Improving - 2
Easier to get supplies - 1
Hours - 1

What I like least about my library

Building - 4
Lack of Adequate Equipment - 2
Shelf Space - 3
Collection development - 4
City/County Politics - 1
Social Security/Split Retirement - 4
Maintenance problems - 4
Hours - 1
Available Volunteers - 1
Short Staffed - 3
Staff Turnover - 2
Work Load - 1
Health benefits - 2
Grumpy Patrons - 2
Parking/Traffic - 2

Conflict between professional values and goals of LSSI?

No - 15
Yes - 2

* Of the 10 people who indicated no opinion on the survey question on benefits and retirement, 4 listed the question as not applicable because they were part-time, and thus received no benefits or only partial benefits. One person listed the question as N/A because she had only received full-time benefits last month.

Narrative Responses
Customer Survey
Riverside County

Total Responses - 74

What I like best about the library

Convenient Location – 16
Building – 7
Friends – 1
Relaxing/Quiet Atmosphere – 4
Hours – 7
Staff – 10
Well Organized – 1
Free – 3
Collection/Resources – 16
Accessibility – 6
Computers/Internet – 10
Magazines – 2
Audio books – 1
No wait for computers – 1

What I like least about the library

Collection – 11
Building – 1
Busy – 2
Décor – 2
Waiting for Computer Access – 4
Lack of Computer Instruction – 1
Staff – 3
Waiting to be Served – 1
Size – 3
Hours – 14
Needs Conference Room – 1
Noisy – 4
Lack of Videos – 2
Fees – 1
Broken Equipment – 1
System for Collecting Overdues – 1
Conflicts with other Patrons – 1

© 2000 American Library Association

Appendix D
FORT WORTH PUBLIC LIBRARY
Fall 1999

Cost to bring cataloging, processing and childrens book selection back in-house

Personnel		$333578
Cataloging		
2.5 FTE Senior Librarians @ $33204	$83010	
1 FTE Library Assistant	$23592	
Processing		
3 FTE Office Asst. II @ $18852	$56556	
Materials Selection		
1 FTE Materials Coordinator	$40356	
1 FTE Office Assistant II	$18852	
Administration		
1 FTE Library Manager	$44496	
Total Salaries	$266862	
Fringe Benefits @ 25% of salaries	$66716	
Processing supplies		$40000
OCLC contractual cost		$37000
Cost to bring privatized services in-house		**$410578***
Less cost of current contracts		**<197753>**
Net cost saving due to privatization		**$212825**

**Cost is figured by adding positions, supplies and contractual services cut in the1992-93 fiscal year.*

Advantages of Privatization

- In FY1989-90, 93,350 items were added to the Library's collection using 6 catalogers and 9 processing clerks. In FY1998-99, 94,004 items were added to the Library's collection using 2.5 catalogers, 7 processing clerks, and contractual cataloging & processing.
- Childrens Librarians spend more time on direct public service and less time selecting new materials, with no reduction in the quality of materials selected.
- Simplified cataloging with fewer local Dewey variations is easier for customers to use. No Dewey numbers of 10-13 digits assigned to new materials.
- The Library used the budget cuts and privatization to reorganize Support Services into a self directed work team. It was the first in the City Of Fort Worth, and one of the most successful. Quality and quantity of work is higher than previously, and staff motivation and morale are strong.

© 2000 American Library Association

Appendix E
Selected Cataloging Contractors

The companies listed in this appendix are representative of those that provide cataloging services to libraries. Many library web pages contain references to additional companies. For the purposes of this report, those web pages were not included in the search for companies providing cataloging services.

Advanced Information Consultants, Inc.
http:///www.advinfoc.com/AIC-corporate-info.htm

Advanced Information Consultants (AIC) serves a varied client base from individuals and small companies to Fortune 1oo corporations in the medical, pharmaceutical, legal, engineering, scientific and automotive communities. As part of its services, AIC offers cataloging services performed by specialist librarians in all classification systems and subject headings for a number of integrated library systems. Foreign language cataloging is available. Clients include corporations, hospitals and research centers, museums, schools and universities.

Blackwell's Book Services
http://www.blackwell.com/services/techserv/techserv.htm

Blackwell's Technical Services can facilitate the delivery of books fully processed and cataloged in accordance with individual library specifications. Blackwell's has developed a range of options that allows for delivery either directly from Blackwell's or through the library's choice of bibliographic utility or system vendor. MARC records can be delivered in a variety of types on a weekly basis for orders. Record customization is available including insertion of barcode numbers. Records can be enriched with tables of contents, title summaries, and author affiliation information. Physical processing for books is offered up to provision of shelf-ready materials.
The individual library can specify processing from a wide range of options.

BLS Bilingual Library Services
http://www.blsmarc.com/scripts/sh…com&cartid+%CARTID%&file=/main.htm

BLS specializes in selection, purchase, processing, collection development and cataloging of English and Spanish language materials for school and public libraries. BLS is a company the offers pre-selected list of Spanish language books written for libraries and classrooms. Non-print Spanish language materials are also available for the growing Spanish-speaking patron population. Additional services as specialized Spanish language bibliographies, translation services and programs are available.

Brodart Public Library Services
http://www.brodart.com/books/b_cpserv.htm

Since 1958, Brodart Compleat Book-Serv can supply an opening day collection, assist with reducing cataloging backlogs; or provide on-going cataloging services. For each library, cataloging and item level processing requirements meeting your library's bibliographic will be loaded into Brodart's cataloging utility and maintained as a resource for cataloging and authority processing. Brodart offers other services including collection development, electronic ordering for public and school libraries.

The Cadence Group, Inc.
http://www.cadence-group.com/startup.htm

The Cadence Group is an Atlanta-based information management corporation. Cadences' Staffing Division provides temporary, contract, temp-to-hire and permanent professionals and paraprofessionals. Cadence provides Library Management Services and Outsourcing, Database Design and Subject Indexing, Web Design, Content Management and training. Reference Services and Document Delivery are also provided in legal, medical, technical and business research. The Cadence Group provides comprehensive library services from complete library management to individualize services as cataloging, abstracting and indexing.

Costabile Associates, Inc.
http://lcweb.loc.gov/flicc/svcdir/tb.html

Costabile Associates, Inc. is one of the contract cataloging agents pointed to by the FEDLINK network. Costabile offers original cataloging, copy cataloging and shelf-ready physical processing based on customer library profiles. All formats are cataloged and special capabilities are offered under a request for quotation.

Ingram Library Services
http://www.ingramlibrary.com/prog_svcs/cataloging_processing.asp

Ingram offers customized cataloging based on customer profiles including unique local call number and cuttering, branch specific holdings attached to a MARC record form Ingram's BOOKMARC™ cataloging system. Ingram offers 90 different processing options for books and audiovisuals, which can be customized to a library's requirements.

Library Management Services, Inc.
http://www.librarymgmtsvc.com/

Library Management Services, Inc. has been serving the needs of law, tax and technical corporate library since 1978. Outsourcing with Library Management Services provides full access to Library Administrators, Automated Systems

Librarians, Technical Librarians, Reference Librarians and Library Clerks. Library Management Services offers outsourcing to run a library using subcontracted services.

Library Technologies, Inc.
http://www.librarytech.com/

Library Technologies, Inc. offers database services, including duplicate record resolution, item field builds, smart and dumb barcodes label production, help in local system migration and authority control services. LTI is recognized as an authority control agent, while no other cataloging services are available.

Library Systems and Services, L.L.C.
http://www.lssi.com/

LSSI is a company that offers complete library management to outsourcing individual tasks. All operations are tailored to the library's specific requirements. This corporation is known for managing entire library systems with the provision of all services and staffing on a contract basis.

MarcadiA
http://www.rlg.org/marcadia.html

MarcadiA is a joint service of the Research Libraries Group and MARC Link Corporation. Marcadia provides cataloging using a library's specific cataloging practices. Brief records, placed on a FTP server are picked up and returned fully cataloged. Marcadia merges selected cataloging data with the local information (control number, holdings, other local fields of your choice) Unmatched records can be returned or run again until matched. A variety of electronic reports allow analysis of the results.

The database used is the RLG union catalog (RLIN database) from the Research Libraries Group and the search engines of MARC Link. Cataloging in all formats and virtually all languages is available in addition to the basic automated cataloging service via FTP, Marcadia can provide additional services as provision of professional cataloging of unmatched records; send and receive on tape; do custom programming; automatically upgrade MARC records to current AACR2 cataloging; and provide services from authority control, to barcodes and spine labels; and provide training.

MARCIVE, Inc.
http://www.marcive.com/webl.htm

MARCIVE provides cataloging for current acquisitions, customized MARC records, catalog or shelf list cards, smart barcode labels and matching authorities records for cross references to libraries and vendors.

MARCIVE maintains a 5 million record database containing cataloging for trade publications, audiovisuals, serials, computer software, US and Canadian government documents, medical works and titles in other languages.

OCLC
http://www.OCLC.org/oclc/menu/home1.htm

OCLC offers a range of technical services to libraries, both OCLC – and non-member libraries. The OCLC TechPro Service is available to both OCLC member and nonmember libraries. TechPro is a tailored cataloging service offering off-site, short- and long-term cataloging and physical processing for materials in all formats and many languages. OCLC TechPro works with a library through a standard set of legal terms which is attached to a customized work statement that is specially prepared for each project. The OCLC PrompCat Service delivers bibliographic records for materials that libraries receive from vendors. PromptCat works from an electronic copy of your book vendor's order providing receipt of and OCLC-MARC prior to the delivery of the physical item. PromptCat can include an electronic file of labels, added local data, and automatic record editing. PrompCat is designed to work with copy cataloging to reduce staff time for searching and editing time in handling titles. OCLC Authority Control Services enables libraries to add and correct authority records in conjunction with the TechPro Service. OCLC offers other services in the cataloging area ranging from conversion of records to preparation of online databases.

OCLC-affiliated U. S. Regional Networks

The OCLC products are marketed by the U. S Regional Networks. Several of the networks offer cataloging services. A short description of the services offered by the Regional Networks follows:

BCR bibliographical center for research
http://www.bcr.org/1bss/cont-cat.htm

BCR offers current cataloging, original cataloging, copy cataloging and union listing services. Physical processing is also available. Cataloging and processing is done based on the library's needs with a contract developed for each project. Retrospective cataloging projects can be done along with other cataloging projects or in phases as funding is available. Trained library professionals perform original cataloging with expertise in various types of libraries. All cataloging is done using the OCLC database.

CAPCON Bibliographic Services
http://www.capcon.net/bibserv/bibserv.htm

CAPCON offers copy and original cataloging on the OCLC database under contracts. CAPCON's professionals offer services to suitable to both small and large libraries. Cataloging is offered for incoming acquisitions, backlog, copy cataloging only or retrospective conversion. In addition, CAPCON offers management of union lists on OCLC. CAPCON offers timely turn-around and flexible customization options.

Michigan Library Consortium
http://www.mlc.lib.mi.us/svs/cat/index.htm

The MLC markets OCLC cataloging outsourcing products plus a retrospective conversion service to help libraries convert their collections to machine-readable form for loading into a local online system.

MINITEX
http://kinglear.lib.umn.edu/mtx-org/

Professional catalogers staff the MINITEX OCLC Contract Cataloging unit. These library professionals provide OCLC Cataloging services on a contract basis. (Note – Not much information is given on this service.)

Sagebrush Library Services
http://www.catalogcard.com/

Sagebrush Library Services, since 1965 focuses almost exclusively on K-12 library publishers and distributors, providing cataloging and cataloging services. Staff professional librarians provide full MARC records that contain call numbers and subject headings.

Telesec Library Services
http://lcweb.loc.gov/flicc/svcdir/ts.html

Telesec Library Services is one of the contract cataloging agents pointed to by the FEDLINK network. Telesec Library Services offers contract cataloging, copy cataloging, and shelf-ready physical processing based on customer library profiles for all formats. Special capabilities as foreign languages or local thesauri are offered under a request for quotation

YBP Library Services
http://www.ybp.com/about.htm

This company is a merger of Baker & Taylor Academic Library Services with Yankee Book Peddler in July 1999. YBP offers a full service of products. YBP can

receive electronic orders, and offer full processing and cataloging services, including shelf-ready books. Company literature on the YBP web site indicates that more than 100 libraries use one of more of the YBP bibliographic, processing and cataloging services, and usage is expanding steadily. YBP cooperates with OCLC and can provide YBP services or OCLC services as a part of its library services depending on customer needs and preferences. YBP has a staff of more than 300 including more than 20 professional librarians. A few of the YPB roles for staff are bibliographers; book processors, catalogers, continuation-specialists, systems analysts and sales persons. In the development of this company, outsourcing brings positions for professional librarians.

© 2000 American Library Association

Appendix F
NASA Libraries

Ames Research Center & Research Information Resources
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000
Tel. 650-604-5387
Contact: Esther Johnson

Dryden Flight Research Center Library
P.O. Box 273
Edwards AFB, CA 93523-0273
Tel. 05-258-3702
Contact: Dennis Ragsdale and Erin Gerena

Goddard Space Flight Center Library
Bldg. 21
Greenbelt, MD 20771
Tel. 301-286-7218
Contact: Janet Ormes

Jet Propulsion Laboratory Technical Library & Information Center
4800 Oak Grove Dr.
Pasadena CA 91109
Tel. 818-354-3007
Contact: Linda Kosmin

John F. Kennedy Space Center Library
Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899
Tel. 407-867-3600
Contact: Audrey Silipo

John H. Glenn Research Center at Lewis Field
2100 Brookpark Rd.
Cleveland, OH 44135
Tel. 16-433-5762
Contact: Pam Caswell

Johnson Space Center Scientific & Technical Affirmation Center
2101 NASA Rd. One
Houston, TX 77058-3696
Tel. 281-483-2527
Contact: Jane Holtberg

Langley Research Center Technical Library
2 W. Durand St.
Hampton, VA 23681-0001
Tel. 757-864-2356
Contact: Mike Little

Marshall Space Flight Center, George.
C. Marshall Space Flight Center, AL 35812
Tel.256-544-4524
Contact: D.R. Wills

Matthew Fontaine Maury Oceanographic Library
Stennis Space Center, MS 39522
Tel. 228-688-4597
Contact: Ann Loomis

NASA Headquarters Library
300 E. St. SW
Washington D.C.
Tel. 202-358-0168
Contact: Andrew Pedrick

Wallops Flight Center Facility Library
252 W
Wallops Island, VA
Tel. 757-824-1065
Contact: Diane L. Hall

White Sands Test Facility Technical Library
P.O. Bo 20
Las Cruces, NM 8004-0020
Tel. 505-524-5293
Contact: Joe Beltran

Contractors for NASA Libraries

DynCorp World Headquarters
11710 Plaza America Drive
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-261-5000
or
DynCorp Information Systems
15000 Conference Center Drive
Chantilly, Virginia 20151
703-818-4000
www.dyncorp.com

IDI also known as InDyne
Suite 700
6862 Elm Street
McLean, VA 22101
www.idinc.com

NCI Information Systems, Inc.
8260 Greensboro Drive, Suite 400
McLean, VA 22102
www.nciinc.com

Sherikon, Inc
14500 Avion Parkway
Suite 200
Chantilly, VA 20151-1108
(800) 899-0123
www.sherikon.com

© 2000 American Library Association

X. NOTES ON THE RESEARCH TEAM

Steven L. Brown is the Director of the North Richland Hills (Texas) Public Library. Shortly after earning an MLS at the University of Texas at Austin in 1980 he began his professional career as a bookmobile librarian at the Austin Public Library. Since then he has served the public libraries of Texas in a series of professional and administrative positions. He is extremely active in both the Texas Library Association and the American Library Association, and has held appointed and elected offices in both organizations.

Jane Claes is a doctoral student and instructor at Texas Woman's University School of Library and Information Studies. She holds a BFA. from College Conservatory of Music at the University of Cincinnati and a MLS from Texas Woman's University. She has been an elementary school librarian in the Irving (Texas) Independent School District for six years. A reviewer for *School Library Journal*, Jane is also active in the American Library Association, serving on ALA Notable Videos for Children Committee 1998 - 2000. She is a current member of the Texas Bluebonnet Award Committee for the Texas Library Association.

Cynthia A. Gray is the System Services Administrator for the Dallas Public Library, Dallas, Texas. She earned a B. degree in Elementary Education from the University of Indianapolis, and a MLS degree from Texas Woman's University. She has a variety of experience in both public and school libraries. Primarily focusing on public services, she started her career in the library profession as a Page and has served as a county library director, children's librarian, and more recently in an administrative capacity. She has worked in large urban public library systems in Indiana, Georgia, and Texas. She is a past-president of the Texas Library Association. She has served as an adjunct professor in library science for Texas Woman's University.

Greg Hardin is Library Assistant for Reference Services in the Texas Woman's University Mary Evelyn Blagg-Huey Library. He earned a BS in Communication from the University of Idaho and has almost completed the requirements for an MLS at Texas Woman's University. He has worked in academic public services since 1997. Prior to that he worked for eight years in the retail book trade. He is active on several library and university committees, and a member of both the Texas Library Association and the American Library Association.

Timothy C. Judkins is the Manager, Collection and Information Development for the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center Library. He has worked at the Texas Tech University Health Science Center Library and the Oral Roberts University Medical Library. He is active in the Medical Library Association and its South Central Regional group, the Texas Library Association and is a member of the American Library Association. Tim is a volunteer member of the Texas Z39.50 Implementors Group and has served for the past two years.

Kelly Patricia Kingrey is the branch manager of the Sulphur Regional Branch of the Calcasieu Parish Library System (Louisiana). She is also a doctoral student in School of Library and Information Studies at Texas Woman's University. She earned an MLS from the University of Texas at Austin in 1995 and has five years of professional library experience in a variety of settings in public and special libraries.

Clara Latham, Collection Development and Systems Librarian, Midwestern State University, Wichita Falls, Texas. She earned a BA in Sociology from California State University, Fresno, and a MA in Librarianship from San Jose State University. She has also been a Doctoral student at Texas Woman's University since May 1997. She was Collection Development Librarian at MSU from 1989 to 1993; responsibility for Systems was added to her portfolio in 1993. She is active in the Texas Library Association and a member of the American Library Association.

Thomas K. Lindsey is Government Publications Librarian at the University of Texas at Arlington. He earned a BA in Sociology from Brown University and a MLS from the University of Pittsburgh, and completed 24 credit hours in a Master of Public Administration degree program at Texas Tech University. He has worked in academic and special libraries for 25 years, primarily in academic libraries. He has worked for three contract providers of library services, working in a government, academic, and corporate library. (Note: he did not participate in writing or reviewing any portions of the report about Library Systems and Services, Inc., or the Riverside County, California Library System.) He is a member of the American Library Association.

Robert S. Martin is Professor in the School of Library and Information Studies at Texas Woman's University. From 1995 to 1999 he served as Director and Librarian of the Texas State Library and Archives. Prior to that he held a succession of library administrative positions at the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Texas at Arlington, and Louisiana State University. He has a BA from Rice University, an MLS from the University of North Texas and a PhD from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He has published numerous articles in the library, archival and historical journals, and is the author of five books. He is active in the American Library Association and currently serves on the ALA Council.

JoAnn Rogers is the Director of the Euless Public Library, in Euless, Texas. She earned a BS in Sociology from Oklahoma State University and an MLS from Texas Woman's University. She has worked in public, academic and private school libraries in Texas for more than 25 years. Her experience ranged from cataloging to bookmobiles and children services. She received the ALA Shirley Olofson Award for Outstanding New librarian the year after she earned her MLS. She attended the Snowbird Leadership Conference in 1992. She has served as an officer in the TLA New Members Roundtable and currently serves on the Library Partnerships Committee.

Roberta Schenewerk is Acquisitions Team Leader for the Fort Worth, Texas, Public Library System. She has a BA with a double major in Sociology and Anthropology and a minor in Library Science from the University of North Texas. She remained at UNT to earn her MLS. Her professional library experience has been in the public library sector. In addition to working in acquisitions, she has been a children's librarian, a business services librarian and a manager of an interlibrary loan unit. She is a member of the Texas Library Association and has recently written children's book reveiws for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Kathleen G. Strauss is Adult Services Librarian at the Denton Public Library in Denton, Texas. She earned a BS and MA in Education from The Ohio State University and an MLIS from the University of Hawaii at Manoa. She has worked in public libraries in Texas for nine years,

serving in both adult and children's services. She is a member of Beta Phi Mu, library science honor society. She is active in the Texas Library Association and the American Library Association.

Suzanne Sweeney is Research Support Librarian at Texas Woman's University Libraries. She earned a BA in History from Austin College and a MLS from the University of North Texas. She has worked in public and academic libraries in Texas and California for over twenty years, primarily in technical services. She is a member of the Special Libraries Association, Texas Library Association, and the American Library Association. She is active in the Business Reference and Services Section of RUSA where she serves as the BRASS editor.

Marleen Watling is the director of the Bedford Public Library in Bedford, Texas. She earned a BS in Education from Ohio State University and an MS in Information Science from the University of North Texas. She has worked in public libraries for almost eleven years. She is an active member of the Texas Library Association and the American Library Association.

Lea Worcester is Electronic Resources Coordinator for the Arlington Public Library, Arlington, Texas. She earned a BA in Anthropology from University of Alaska Anchorage, a MLS from Texas Woman's University and is currently a doctoral student in library and information studies at TWU. She has worked in public and special libraries in Alaska and Texas for more than eight years. Ms Worcester is active in the Texas Library Association where she serves as Orientation Chair for the New Members Round Table.

The Impact of Outsourcing and Privatization on Library Services and Management © 2000 American Library Association

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	3-18-13	Herbert K. Beals	7005 Valley View Dr.		yes
	3-18-13	Margaret E. Geier	310 E. Dartmouth St.		yes
	3-18-13	Barbara Beals	7005 Valley View Dr		yes
	3-18-13	Billie J Neel	19575 River Rd unit #3		yes
	3-18-13	Robert W Neel	19575 River Rd unit #3		yes
	3/18/13	Kirstie Richman	19729 River Rd, unit H		yes
	3/18/13	Theresa Holliman	17560 Springhill Pl.		yes
	3/18/13	[illegible]	125 E Dartmouth		Y
	3-18-13	Pam McClung	125 E Dartmouth		Y
	3/18/13	Chris Scarborough	350 W Clarendon St		Y
	3/18/13	Latessa Craft	17651 SE Hanson Ct		Y
	3/22/13	Michael Baker	17400 Webster Rd		n
	3/22/13	Mildred Wallace	915 Cornell Ave		Y
	3/22/13	Wanda Wilson	315 W Clarendon		Yes
	3/22/13	STEVE SCARBOROUGH	315 W CLARENDON ST.		YES

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	3.22.13	Julie Daugherty	19463 Abernathy ln	503-926-0482	yes
	3/22/13	Kim Baller	19605 Riverd Rd #87	ballerk@yahoo	Y
	3/22/13	William Green	14150 Addie st	will g	
	3.22.13	Brittani Strasser	580 E GLOUCESTER ST	503-260-2192	yes
	3/22/13	Chris Lodolini	125 W Berkeley St	503-504-9813	yes
	3/22/13	Ryan Stapes	1525 Windsor Drive Gladstone	~~503~~ 971-221-2750	
	3/22/13	Kelly Costigan	430 E Gloucester	503 752-7782	Y
	3-23-13	bill connors	430 E Gloucester	503 341 2131	Y
	3-24-13	Jim Galardi	540 E Clarendon	503-742-0187	Y
DUP	3/23/13	Tracy Mrs Kal	165 E Clarendon St	fish.chasers@yahoo.com 503 750 4858	Yes
	3/23/13	George Fenn	Bx 11 Gladstone	———	N
	3-23-13	Scott Tabor	234 W. Fairfield		yes
	3/23/13	Yvonne Phillips	8330 Cason Rd, #407 Gladstone		Yes
	3-23-13	Wenda Lloyd	6420 Caldwell Rd Gladstone	503 659-0628	yes
	3.23.13	Taeya [illegible]	580 E GLOUCESTER ST Gladstone		no

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
3-20-13	Catherine Rigdon	240 W. Clarendon st.	catherinerigdon@aol.com	yes 503-432-5104
3/20/13	Kelly Lemaire	2215 E. Clarendon St.	kdlemaire@gmail	yes
3/20/13	LaVizsia Miller	4484 S.E. Brandman Ave.	lavizsiam@yahoo.com	yes
3/20/13	Melinda Bangle	19185 Kelsey Ct - Gldstne	—	yes
	Dan Bangle	19185 Kelsey Gldstne	—	yes
3/21/13	Susan Liston	550 E Exeter St.	—	yes
3/21/13	STEVE Casper	Hereford St	—	yes
3/21/13	Debra Hansen	555 E Exeter St	nstxhos@yahoo.com	yes
3/21/13	Joshua Martin	247 Yale Ave	JoshuaMartin1977@gmail.	yes
3-21-13	Jeffrey Cohen	130 E GLOUCESTER	JGSITEBUILDER@GMAIL	YES
3-21-13	Debbie Reimers	7550 Spring Hill Ave		yes
3/22/13	TRACY MESKEL	165 E Clarendon St	fish.chaser@yahoo.com	yes
3/22/13	LIBERTY ADAMS	17267 Webster	l.boteeme@yahoo	YES
3/22/13	Michael Nuss	105 W Clarendon	michaeldnuss@yahoo.	yes 503 789 9821
3/22/13	[illegible] M C	565 Harvard ave.	rebeccaariens@clear.net	yes

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	3/24/13	PAUL NANCE	6220 CALDWELL RD	pdnance@q.com	YES
	3/24/13	Mary Spinnler	203 W. Gladstone Blvd	macyspinnler@msn.com	yes
	3/26/13	Amanda Ellis	19575 River Rd. #38 Gladstone	amanda.ellis2@pcc.edu 802-299-2782	Not yet!
		Susan Barber	17785 SE Oatfield Rd. 97267	suejackbarber@gmail.com	
	3/26/13	D. Kent Lloyd	6420 Caldwell Road 97027	wendakent@yahoo.com	yes
	3/28/13	WALTER FITCH	635 E Fairfield St Gladstone 97027	5035449672	yes
	3/28/13	Robert Allworth	505 E. Dartmouth	503-502-6586 theodin11@netscape.net	Yes
	3/28/13	Kathy Allworth	505 E Dartmouth	kathy.allworth@comcast.net	yes
	3/28/13	Liz Banta	650 E. Dartmouth	lizzym11@hotmail.com	yes
	3/28/13	CHUCK BANTA	650 E DARTMOUTH ST	chuck.banta@gmail.com	YES
	3/29/13	Shalene Hafner	440½ Portland Ave.	Scenicviewranch@yahoo	yes
	03/29/13	Kristina D. Ragland	470 E. ARLINGTON GLADSTONE OR 97027	MS.Kristinar@yahoo.com	yes
	3.29.13	LaRae Applebee	570 Barbary Pl. GL.	503-758-4411	YES
	3-29-13	Joseph Alley	435 Exeter St	Josephlz@MSN.com	yes
	3-30-13	Margaret Baker	710 E Exeter, GL		yes

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/6/13	Jone MacCullock	4793 SE Glen Echo Ave	macrush53@yahoo.com	Yes
	4/6/13	Caitlin Cummings	18221 Cindy Ln.	503-380-6450	yes
	4/6/13	Grace Saad	180 W. Dartmouth	grace.saad@hotmail.com	yes
	4/6/13	Ryan Still	180 W Dartmouth	rstill@pacificfoods.com	yes
ALOHA	4/6/13	Trevor Hoffmann	5965 SW 191st Ave Aloha, OR 97007	trevor.a.hoffmann.com	Yes
	4/6/13	Bill Dvorak	225 E Hereford	billdvorak@me.com	Yes
	4/6/13	Cheryl Nance	6220 Caldwell Rd	pdnance@q.com	
	4/6/13	Sandra Grand	16 St Mildred	503 742-8758	yes
	4/6/13	Gretchen Morawe	430 E Clackamas Blvd, Gladstone	503-656-8664	
	4-6-13	Monica Lodolini	125 W Berkeley St	971-221-2339	
	4-6-13	Mona Escriva	17200 SW Valley View Rd	MOMAE@HOTMAIL.COM 503-650-7730	yes
	4/6/13	JAMES ZUFFRIA	225 W DARTMOTH	503-650-1969	✓
	4.6.13	James Miller	1450 Cornell Ave.	jmducks@centurylink.net	Yes
	4.6.13	Diane Miller	"	"	"
	4/6/13	Roy W. Lunigran	240 E. Berkeley Ave	morninsunrize@yahoo.com	yes

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	3-22	Daniel Wells	4479 SE Boardman Ave		Y
	3-23	Lynette Thrasher	320 E Jersey St Gladstone	503-656-4309	Y
		~~Angie Beck~~			
	~~3-23-13~~	~~[illegible]~~	Non	Reg	✓
Milw	~~3/23/13~~	~~Marilee Clarke~~	~~18377 SE Trolley Ln Milw, OR 97267~~	" "	

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
4/1/13	Carmina Ruiz A	18905 Portland Ave	carminajosh@msn.com	no yet
4/1/13	Christine Dilag	19561 River Rd	cdilag@gmail.com	yes
4-2-13	Cicely Sullivan	335 W Clackamas Blvd	Cicelys@comcast.net	yes
4-2-13	Linda Cosgrove	190 W Dartmouth		yes
4-2-13	Margaret Johnson	5480 Abernethy		
	Skyler Dix	140 W fair feald st	skyler_dix@[illegible] 503-501-0981	no
4-4-13	Alison Zumwalt	142 E. Dartmouth St	Thenana42grls@gmail	yes
4-6-13	WILLIAM PREBLE	18300 OATFIELD RD	LPREBLE@COMCAST.NET	
4-6-13	LISA PREBLE	18300 OATField Rd.	LPREBLE@COMCAST.NET	YES
4/6/13	Candace Krause DMD	1105 Portland Ave	clkdmd@gladstonefamilydentistry.com	
4/6/13	Colette Umbras	7515 Ridgewood Dr, Glad		yes
4/6/13	Debra Mathews	115 W. Clackamas Blvd Gld.	debramathews@hasson.com	yes
4/6/13	Jamey Mathews	115 W. Clackamas Blvd	jlmathews@hotmail.com	yes
4/6/13	William Karsten	6943 OAKridge de	Karstenw@nclack.k12.or.us	yes
4/6/13	Kristy Karsten	6943 OAKridge de	KristyKarsten@Hotmail.com	yes

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/6/13	Dawn M. Hoffman	260 E Berkeley St Gladstone OR	morninsunfree@yahoo.com (503) 752-0218	yes
	4-6-13	Steve Bergeron	340 W. Clarendon St.	Steve.M.Bergeron@Gmail.com	x
	4-6-13	Toni Bergeron	340 W. Clarendon St	tonibergeron@gmail.com	x

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/6/13	Kathy Jo Coles	260 Harvard Avenue		yes
	4/6/13	Richard VanRoensway	260 Harvard Avenue		yes
	4/6/13	Steven Heckert	245 W. Clarendon St		yes.
	4/6/13	Penny Allen	5805 Barclay ST	503-808-0542	Y

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/6/13	Chris Lodolini	125 W Berkeley St	503 504 9813	Yes
	4/6/13	Steve Donner	19605 River Road 5	503-656-3025	yes
	4/6/13	Mary Accetturo	17528 SE Valley View Rd	1 marac@comcast.net	yes
	4/6/13	Luis Perez	19370 Abernathy LN.	267-8968	

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
4/7	Jina Koprowski	6285 SE Caldwell	JKoprowski.TDC@gmail	y
4/12	Melissa Mayea	18975 Addie St	melissahubbard78@gmail	y
4/8/13	Andre Ruiz	8865 SE Tiffany Ct.	andre.Ruiz@yahoo	y
4/8/13	Cheryl Hatswell	615 E Gloucester St	cherylhat@hotmail.com	y
4/8/13	Taylor Doll	214 Bluff St	taylordoll11@gmail	n
4.9/13	Patrick Anderson	180 E Berkeley St	will_anderson@hotmail.com	Y
4-9-13	WALTER A LACHAPELLE	P.625 ANDRESON CT		Y
4/9/13	MOLLY PREHN	5450 GLEN ECHO GLADSTONE 97027	namanu2@hotmail.com	Y
4/10/13	Rebecca Ariens	565 Harvard ave	rebeccaariens@clear.com	Y
4/11/13	Margaret Ayala	184 E Hereford St	mjoannebutler@yahoo	Y
4/12/13	Emily Palacios	18303 Portland Ave	itsemtime@gmail.com	
	Kevin Hornych	550 E. Dartmouth St		Y
4/12/13	Sylvia Hornych	550 E Dartmouth St	gramsilly@gmail.com	Y

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
4/17/2013	RANDY KATZ	17421 QUAIL CT Gladstone, OR 97027	randysk3@gmail.com	X
4/[illegible]	Robin Heinlen	150 E Arlington Gladstone OR	503-421-5576	X
4/18/13	Karla Chandler	305 W Clackamas BLVD 97027		X
4-19-13	Judith Ervin	18140 Stonewood Dr Gladstone		X
4.19.13	Barbara Kochevar	19725 River Road, Gladstone OR		X
4.19.13	Kim Passarge	340 E Fairfield, Gladstone OR		X
4.19.13	Kevin Geodell	" "	"	"
4-19.13	Brenda Quint Gaebel	7705 Cason Lane OR	gaebeb@comcast.net	X
4-19.13	Pat Durham	19567 RIVER D #23	Patedurham@yahoo.com	X
4/19/13	Anetta Guion	19605 River Rd #132	503 791-7017	X
4/20/13	[illegible]	7505 Ridgewood Dr	503-351-9002	X
4/21/13	[illegible] Fowler	9004 SE Risky Ave	503-505-9564	X
4/24/13	JASON JOHNSON	12335 SE Hubbard Rd.	503-882-9196	X
4/24	Joanne Brooks	7844 SE HOOD CT		X
4/25	Candi Lewelling	495 W Clarendon #5	503 723-6722	X

PETITION FOR A PUBLIC VOTE

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, DEMAND THAT ANY AGREEMENT TO PRIVATIZE OUR CITY'S LIBRARY OPERATIONS BE PUT TO A PUBLIC VOTE.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/28/13	Sarah Wylder	7200 Ridgegate Dr.	wylder.deshpande@gmail.com	✓
	5/1/13	Ryan Michel	306 Vine St. Oregon City 97045	ryrypie@hotmail.com	✓
	5/3/13	Doug Morgan	18555 McCALL CT GLDSTN	WOWORIDER@AOL.COM	✓
	5/3	Corie Lahr (Gladstone-employed)	5445 SE Harney PDX 97206	909-215-4682	
	5/4/13	Allison Adcox	355 W. Dartmouth St. Gladstone, OR 97027	503-314-5040	✓
	5/5/13	Omar Mendoza	3050 Broadway St Worth		✓
	5-5-13	Destiny clark	565 colins [illegible]	503-807-6834	
	5-5-13	Cheyenne Erickson	125 W berkeley St	971-219-1034	
	5-6-13	Dan Scally	7000 SE 87th Ave	360-910-9325	✓
	5-6-13	Amy Quattlebaum	350 First St.	abreinin@yahoo.com	✓
	5.7.13	[illegible] Ak may	950 Cornell Ave	503. 650.7153	✓
	5-7-13	Todd May	950 Cornell Ave	503 650-7153	✓
		VERNON WEASE	4670 SE JENNINGS AVE	503 ~~[illegible]~~ 333 3127	✓
	5-9-13	Karen Castner	19725 River Rd		✓
	5/10/13	Sundhan Liton	845 Cornell Ave	503-657-6055	✓

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	3-18-13	Billie J Neal	19575 River Rd unit #3		yes
	3-18-13	Robert W Neel	19575 River Rd unit #3		Yes
	3/18/13	Kristie Richman	19729 River Rd. unit M		Yes
	3/18/13	Mike McClung	125 E Dartmouth		Y
	3-18-13	Pam McClung	125 E Dartmouth		Y
	3/18/13	Latessa Craft	17651 SE Hanson Ct.		Y
	3-22-13	Michael Seller	17400 webster Rd		no
	3-22-13	Mildred Wallace	915 Cornell		Y
	3 22 13	Scott Coombe	475 E. Berkeley ST		Y
	3/22/13	STEVE SUDBERCHER	315 W. CLARENDON ST		Y
	3/22/13	Wanda Wilson	315 W Clarendon St		Y
	3/22/13	Daniel Wells	4479 SE Boardman Ave		Y
	3/22/13	Angie Beck			
	3/23/13	Marilee Clarke	18377 SE Tracy Ln Milw, OR 97267		

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
18 MAR	GERALD W. HERRMANN	19605 RIVER RD.		503-260-3432
3/19/13	Tauni Szabados	17400 Webster Rd.	mizztauni@yahoo	(971) 570 0044
3/19/13	PAUL NANCE	6220 CALDWELL RD	pdnance@q.com	503-740 0317
3-19-13	Larry McKinley	6645 Devonshire Dr.	lj_mckinley@comcast.net	503-653 2124
3-20-13	Catherine Rigdon	240 W. Clarendon St.	catherinerigdon@aol.com	503-432-9124 yes
3/20/13	Taarye Kelly	19370, Abernethy. LN Gladstone. ORE. 97027	503-438-5807	503-438-5807
3/20/13	Kelly Lamark	245 E. Clarendon	kdlemark@gmail	
3/20/13	Lavizsiam Miller	4484 S.E. Boardman Ave.	lavizsiam@yahoo.com	yes
3/20/13	Virginia Dixon (business owner)	440 1/2 Portland Ave	ginngjayne@gmail.com	yes
3/20/13	Melinda Bangle	19185 Kelsey Ct Gldstne	—	yes
3/20/13	Dan Bangle	19185 Kelsey Ct Gldstne	—	yes.
3/21/13	Susan Liston	550 E Exeter St		yes
3/21/13	STEVE Casper	Hereford ST	—	
3/21/13	Debra Hansen	555 E Exeter St	mbtxhp5@yahoo.com	yes
3/21/13	CRAIG SEGHERS	17400 WEBSTER Rd #36	cs0318@Hotmail.com	yes

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
3/22/13	Rich Simpson	1525 Windsor Drive Gladstone OR	rian.simpson@yahoo.com	✓
3/22/13	Kelly Costigan	430 E Gloucester Gl	kelly.costigan@gmail	Y
3/23/13	Bill Connors	430 E Gloucester	bill18ebtt@gmail	✓
3/24/13	Jim Galvin	510 E Clarendon	fishonv@hotmail.com	Y
3/23/13	Ana Cornejo	11464 SE Fuller Rd	anacom.1212@gmail.com	Y
3/23/13	George Finstell	7x11 Gladstone	—	N
3-23-13	Scott Tebor	234 W. Fairfield St		unleaded
3/23/13	Matt Charles	165 W Exeter	—	Y
3/23/13	Jerome Phillips	8330 Cason Rd #407 Gladstone	—	Y
3-23-13	Wenda Lloyd	6420 Caldwell Rd Gladstone	503 659 0688	Y
3-24-13	Tim Gawel	18365 Chris ct Gladstone	503-657-3138	Y
3/24/13	Mary Spinnler	203 W Clackamas Blvd 97027	marysspinnler@msn.com	✓
3/25	Paul Heinlein	160 E Clarendon St		✓

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
03/26/13	Amanda Ellis	19575 River Rd. #38 Gladstone, OR 97027	amanda.ellis2@pcc.edu 802-299-7782	Not yet!
03/26/13	D. Kent Lloyd	6420 Caldwell Rd. Gladstone, OR 97027	wendzkent@yahoo.com	yes
3/26/13	Sue Anslow	145 E Dartmouth	banslow8@gmail.com	yes
3/28/13	Robert Allworth	505 E Dartmouth	theodin11@netscape.net	Yes
3/28/13	Kathy Allworth	505 E Dartmouth	kathy.allworth@comcast.net	Yes
3/28/13	Liz Banta	650 E. Dartmouth	lizzym11@hotmail.com	yes
3/28/13	CHUCK BANTA	650 E DARTMOUTH	chuck.banta@gmail.com	YES
4/1/13	Christine Dilag	19561 River Rd	cdilag@gmail.com	yes
4/1/13	JAMES COX	705 E. EXETER ST GLADSTONE 97027	coxjim1956@gmail.com	YES
4-2-13	Cicely Sullivan	335 W. Clackamas Blvd.	cicelys@comcast.net	yes
4/2/13	Todd Anslow	265 W. Clackamas Blvd	anslowt@gmail.com	
4-2-13	Linda Cosgrove	190 W Dartmouth	none	yes
4-2-13	Rose Johnson	5480 Abernethy Ct	meosej47@comcast.net	yes
	Skyler Dix	140 W Fairfield St	skyler-dix@yahoo.com	no
3/4/13	Heather Carpenter	4760 Alder Street West Linn, OR 97068	heathercarpenter1@gmail.com	yes

654
1224

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
4/6/13	Anthony Riley	295 W Clarendon St	ironriley@msn.com	Y
4-6-13	STEVE Bergeron	340 W. CLARENDON ST.	STEVE.M.BERGERON@GMAIL.COM	Yes
4-6-13	Toni Bergeron	340 W. Clarendon st	tonibergeron@gmail.com	
4/6/13	Anne Tankersley	235 E. Hereford St.	akatss@gmail.com	Y
4/6/13	David Tankersley	235 E. Hereford st.	dltank7@yahoo.com	Y
4/6/13	Nicole Bintliff	3d 22av 13520 Tigard	?	No:C
4-6-13	Kandice Carlson	965 Cornell Ave	Kandi.carlson@hotmail.com	Yes
4-16-13	Craig Smith	19366 Abernathy LN.	880-2681	

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/6/13	Bill Dvorak	225 E Hereford	billdvorak@me.com	Yes
	4/6	JAMES ZUFFREI	225 W DORTHOTH	503-650-1969	
	4/6/13	JAMES COX	705 E. EXETER ST	coxjim1956@gmail.com	YES
	4/6/13	Sandra Grand	18816 SE Mildred	503-742-8758	yes
	4/6/13	Chris Lodolini	125 W Berkeley St	503-504-9813	yes
	4-6-13	Monica Lodolini	125 W Berkeley St Gladstone	971-221-2339	yes
	4-6-13	Mima Escriva	17200 SE Valley View Rd	MOMIAE@HOTMAIL.COM 503-656-7736	yes
	4.6.13	Diane Miller	1450 Cornell Ave.	jmducks@centurylinknet	yes
	4.6.13	James Miller	"	"	"
	4-6-13	Steven Heckert	245 W. Clarendon St	Sheckert2001@yahoo.com 503-656-2174	Yes
	4/6/13	Penny Allen	5805 Barclay ST	503-808-0542	Y
	4/6/13	JOE Allen	5805 Barclay St	503 481 1669	Y
	4/6/13	Florence Bradley	17295 Craig Ct.		
	4/6/13	Colette Umbras	7515 Ridgewood Dr. Gl.		
	4/6/13	Angela Riley	295 W Clarendon St	oceantoes@hotmail.com	Y

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER EFFORTS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/6/13	Roy Linngren	260 E. Berkeley St. Gladstone	morninsunrise@yahoo.com	yes
	4/6/13	Dawn M. Hoffman	" "	" " (503) 7527 0218	yes
	4-6-13	STEVE BERGERON	340 W. CLARENDON ST.	STEVE.M.BERGERON@GMAIL.COM	X
	4-6-13	Toni Bergeron	340 W Clarendon St	tonibergeron@gmail.com	yes

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/7	Dana Koprowski	6285 SE Cecil Cir. ecc	TKOPROWSKI.TK@gmail	y
	4/8/13	Ambre Ruiz	8865 SE. Tiffany Ct.	ambre.ruiz@yahoo.com	y
	4/8/13	Cheryl Hatswell	615 E. Gloucester St	cherylhat@hotmail.com	y
	4-9-13	WALTER A LACHAPELLE	1625 ANDRESON ST		YES
	4/9/13	MOLLY PREHN	5450 GLEN ECHO GLADTONE 97207	namanuz@hotmail.com	Y
	4/11/13	Margaret Ayala	184 E Hereford St	mjoannebutler@yahoo.com	Y
	4/12/13	Emily Palacios	18303 Portland Ave	itsemtime@gmail.com	y
		Kevin Hornych	550 E Dartmouth St		Y
	4/12/13	Sylvia Hornych	550 E Dartmouth St	gramsilly@gmail.com	Y

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION (*SUCH AS LSSI) OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	4/30/13	Darlene Kenney	17315 Craig Ct		
	5-3-13	John Van Kommer	7075 SE Ridgegate		
	5-3-13	Roger Wallenius	18110 Penny Ct		
	5-3-13	Lynn Kent	18120 Penny Ct		
	5-3-13	Lois Kent	18120 Penny Ct		
	5-3-13	Sherry Santar	18135 Penny Ct		
	5-3-13	Ronald D Taylor	1065 Clayton Way		
	5/3/13	Nancy K Taylor	1065 Clayton Way		
	5/3/13	Heidi Lorenson	1070 Clayton Way		
	5/3/13	Lori Gubrud	1075 Clayton Way		
	5/3/13	Darie Laws	17305 Craig Ct		
	5/3/13	Jerry A Peterson	17305 Craig Ct		
	5-3-13	Judy & Bert Pries	17300 Craig Ct		
	5-3-13	Robin Hogan	17280 Craig Ct		
(16)	5-3-13	Nick Hogan	17280 Craig Ct.		

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION (SUCH AS LSSI) OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	5/6/13	Elissa Mantalas	18910 Watts St. Gladstone, OR 97027	emantalas@hotmail.com 971-570-4721	yes
	5/6/13	John Mantulas	18910 Watts St Gladstone OR 97027	503 888 4633	yes
	5/7/13	Mark Eide	17515 Springhill Place		yes
	5/7/13	Lillian Madson	6620 Devonshire Dr		
	5/7/13	deborah Cach	6630 devonshire dr	503 652 2984	yes
	5/7/13	Kathy Hudolleson	319 W. Clarendon Gladstone, OR 97027		yes
	5/7/13	Shari Erland	325 W. Clarendon Gld. OR 97027		yes
	5/7/13	[illegible]	325 W. Clarendon Gld. OR 97027		yes
	5/7/13	[illegible]	7625 [illegible]	503 799-5507	yes
	05/07/13	Neal Ryan	17290 Lundgren Way		yes
	05/07/13	TERRY RYAN	17290 LUNDGREN WAY		YES
	5-7-13	Sandra Hennes	17270 Lundgren Way 97027	mssandy247@msn.	
	5-7-13	Stephanie Hammond	19150 Kelsey Ct 97027	stephyhammond@gmail.com	yes
	5-7-13	Christopher McMurtrie	19160 Kelsey Ct 97027		
	5-7-13	Ramona Larsen	775 Heatherway 97027		yes
16	5/7/13	Ben Florian	19175 Kelsey Ct		

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION (SUCH AS LSSI) OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
5/3/13	Molly McCarty	7570 Charolais Ct.		
5/3/13	Dennis McCarty	"		
5/3/13	Christy VanOrder	17220 Charolais	scvanorder@comcastnet	yes
5/3/2013	K Larrison	17275 Craig ct.		
5/3/2013	Kurt Pislari	17290 Craig Ct		
5/3/2013	Galina Pislari	17290 Craig Ct.		
5/3/2013	Michael Kennedy	17315 Craig CT		X
5/4/2013	Jason Pickelsimer	7608 Charolais ct		
5/4/13	Valerie Pickelsimer	"		
5/4/13	[illegible]	7550 Charolais CT		
5-14-13	Kelly [illegible]	17123 SE Valley View Rd		yes
5-4-13	Susan M Bousha	17590 Braden Ct.	susiebousha@comcast.net	yes
5-4-13	John Larrison	17275 craig ct		Yes
5-4-13	Brian Browning	17285 Craig Ct		yes
5-4-13	Julie Browning	17285 Craig Ct		yes

15

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	April 19, 13	Arietta Guion	19605 River Rd #132	503 791-7017	Yes
	April 19, 13	Timothy Baker	210 W. Dartmouth St.	503-998-4005	Yes
	4-20-13	Sheri M LaChapelle	210 E Berkeley St	(503) 988-7263	Yes
	~~4/24/13~~	~~Jason Johnson~~			
	4/24/13	Jason Johnson	12335 SE Hubbard Rd.	503-482-9196	X
	4/24/13	Robin Heinlen	150 E. Arlington St. Gladstone	503-421-5576	X
	4/25/13	Carolyn Wu	18115 Trevor Ct Gladstone OR	503-723-7749	X
	4/26/13	Doug Lind	245 W. Berkeley Gladston	503 722 9686	X
	4/28/13	[illegible]	7200 Ridgegate Dr.	703-635-0185	✓
	"	Vainateya Deshpande	"	301-325-1291	
	5/3/13	Doug Morgan	18555 McCall Ct Gldstn	wuworker@aol.com	✓
	5/3/13	Jeneen Granquist	15741 SE Valley View Rd, Milw 97267	jeneen75@gmail.com	✓
	5/3/13	Kristy Allen	P.O. Box 481 Gladstone OR 97027		✓
	5-6-13	Cory Duvall	140 E. Clackamas Gladstone BLVD	familyman2008@Hotmail	✓
	5/6/13	Elizabeth [illegible]	130 Park Dr Oregon City OR 97045	chaimi@msn.com	✓

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	5.7.13	Wendy A K May	950 Cornell Ave	503 650 7153	✓
	5-7-13	Todd May	950 Cornell Ave	503 650-7153	✓
	5-8-13	Dorothy Yockey	220 W. EXETER	503-657-2828	✓
	5-8-13	Carley Manning	180 E Fairfield	503-866-8624	✓
	5-8-13	Bryan Faulkner	180 E Fairfield	503-866-8624	✓
	5-9.13	Karen Castner	19725 River Rd		✓
	5/10/13	Sundra Linton	845 Cornell Ave	503-657-6055	✓

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION (SUCH AS LSSI) OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
05-05-13	Dean Hauck	18115 Penny Court		
05-05-13	MARK CHAMBERS	460 EAST Berkeley		
05/05/13	DEAN MUCHOW	18105 PENNY CT.	deanmuch@yahoo.com	✓
5-5-13	Brenda MUCHOW	18105 Penny CT		✓
5/5/13	Shannon Muchow	18105 Penny ct	None	
5-5-13	Sheila MUCHOW	18105 Penny CT		
5-5-13	Tom BLAND	7055 RIDGEGATE DR.	None	✓
5-5-13	Bruce Bland	7055 Ridgegate Dr	Bryson.ross81@aol.com	
5-5-13	Gary Nichols	7040 Ridgegate Dr.		
5-5-13	Pahma Bradstreet	17970 Monticello Dr		
"	Joseph R Bradstreet	"		
5/5/13	Peter Coiteux	17960 Monticello Dr.	pcoiteux@aol.com	✓
5/5/13	Opl Cortez	17900 Monticello Dr.		✓
5/5/13	Sarah Carrillo	17995 Monticello Dr		✓
5/5/13	SALVADOR CARRILLO	17995 MONTICELLO DR		✓

PETITION TO SAVE OUR LIBRARY

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED GLADSTONE RESIDENTS, OPPOSE THE PRIVATIZATION OF OUR LIBRARY OPERATIONS AND DEMAND THAT ALL DISCUSSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, OR ANY OTHER ACTIONS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE CITY OF GLADSTONE TOWARD THAT END BE HALTED IMMEDIATELY.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/PHONE	REG?
	5/10/2013	A.M. Krummenacker	6450 Chessington Ln	krumment39@gmail.com	✓
	5/10/2013	George Krummenacker	"	krummengg@yahoo.com	YES
	5/10/2013	Linda BELOZER	6470 Chessington Ln.	cbelozer@Aol.com	YES
	10 MAY 2013	Bear Kramer	6470 CHESSINGTON LN	bearnkramer_sb@YAHOO	NO
	5/10/2013	Arthur D. Zimmerling	6460 Chessington Ln	DZIMMERL@INNOLVEO.com	Yes!