DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 800   IR 054 549

AUTHOR   Crosby, Barbara S.
TITLF   The Public Library Services to Disadvantaged
                Populations Grant Project, 1988-1992. A Summative
                Evaluation.
INSTITUTION   Texas State Library, Austin. Dept. of Library
                Development.
PUB DATE   92
NOTE   38p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) --
                Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Adults; *Disadvantaged; Eligibility; English (Second
                Language); Evaluation Criteria; Federal Aid; *Grants;
                Librarians; Library Development; Library
                Expenditures; *Library Services; Program Evaluation;
                *Public Libraries; State Aid; State Programs;
                Summative Evaluation; Telephone Surveys; *Users
                (Information)
IDENTIFIERS   Library Services and Construction Act; Texas

ABSTRACT
                This summative evaluation of the Public Library
Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant program describes how the
grant program is meeting its stated objectives, how it is
contributing to library development in Texas, and how Texas State
Library activities and policy impact the program. The Texas State
Library initiated this grant program with funding from the Library
Services and Construction Act, Title I. Most of the evaluation
information came from documents and records that the state already
had from program fund recipients. Telephone surveys were conducted
with those no longer receiving grant funds. The segment on needs and
services and the segment on location and distribution discuss all 39
funded projects (including the 10 funded in 1992), but the other
sections discuss only the 29 projects that no longer receive funding.
In 1991, the number of applicants dropped, as did state promotion of
the grant program. The two populations that 75 percent of the
recipients chose to serve--adults with less than 12 years of school
and people for whom English is a second language--are the largest
target population groups in Texas. Criteria for the grant award and
the survey interview form are included. Six tables provide study
results. (SLD)

A SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES TO DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS GRANT PROJECT

1988-1992

Barbara S. Crosby
Special Services Consultant

The Texas State Library
Library Development Division
1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

A Summative Evaluation is an accurate description of a program which summarizes what has transpired during a particular time period. It is used:

> To determine and to document that services promised have been delivered.
> To assure that a lasting record of the program remains on file.
> To serve as a planning document.*

This Summative Evaluation of the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant program describes how the grant program is meeting its stated objectives, how it is contributing to library development in Texas, and how Texas State Library activities and policy impact the program.

Most of the answers to these questions came from an examination of the documents and records we already have.

Documents:

Applications
Criteria Evaluation Sheets
Project Evaluation Forms
Project Publications
Uniform Statistical Reports

Records:

Data bases of all applications with
  primary characteristics
Reports to the Commissioners with scores
  and summaries
Notes of and reports of monitoring
  visits
Record of Consulting and Continuing
  Education activities

Some answers came from the grant recipients. The Special Services Consultant telephoned all recipients who are no longer receiving funding and asked them all the same questions about the current condition of the project services.

The segment on needs and services and the segment on location and distribution discuss all 39 funded projects, including the 10 funded in 1992. All other segments discuss only the 29 projects which no longer receive funding.

Observations and information provided by Texas State Library staff appear in the text in *italics*.

*Lynn Morris, EVALUATOR'S HANDBOOK. Sage Publications, 1978. p. 79.

THE VISION

People who do not use public libraries are often people who are at a disadvantage in society as a whole. The poor and racial minorities in the United States suffer, per capita, more teenage pregnancies, more school dropouts, more unemployment and underemployment, more cancer, heart attacks, fetal deaths, and AIDS than do the racial majority. They enjoy, per capita, less access to power and influence, less security, and less reflection of the power and beauty of their cultures. One out of five children in the United States live in poverty with women kinfolk. These women and children enjoy less access to everything.

Social and economic inequities generate the conditions which foster these inequalities. Libraries, as institutions, cannot change the inequities. Libraries can provide knowledge, information, experiences, skills which may ameliorate the situation, may provide alternative choices within the situation, may reveal the inequities and open possibilities for changing the conditions. Libraries can collect and reflect the beauty and power of the cultures. Libraries can provide a healthy escape, an escape which may renew people for the daily struggle.

Librarians can provide library services designed for real people, people who have a culture and a language which is their own, a value system, a model of behavior, and a motivational structure which is their own.

Library directors can recruit and promote from the groups they serve so that among the people designing and providing service are people who look like, sound like, and share similar values with the people served.

THE OPPORTUNITY

Libraries need not mount extraordinary special programs to make this vision a reality. The American Library Association, Planning and Role Setting for Public Libraries, advocates a generic process for developing all library services. The planning process asks the librarian to learn about the community in order to assess community library needs, to evaluate those needs against current library services, and then to determine the library's role in meeting those needs. Receiving individualized attention to one's person and neighborhood and specific needs, attracts people to the library--attracts even those who are not currently using it. In theory, a library staff need only apply the Planning and Role Setting process to all groups in the community and that library will serve the disadvantaged as well as the advantaged.

In reality, communicating with people you are not now serving, and whom you do not know, takes extra staff time and energy. Once you discover their cultures, value systems and interests, then purchasing relevant materials and hiring appropriate staff takes extra money. The word "extra" is seldom used to describe Texas library staff or funds; the more common term in "not enough."

The Library Services and Construction Act, Title I, grants monies to states to develop a variety of public library services, among them services to people who seldom use the library and whom the LSCA describes as socially, economically, or culturally disadvantaged. For years the ten regional library systems had helped member libraries serve these groups through collection development, circuit collections of large print and Spanish materials, and tutor training. In 1987 the Texas State Library, Library Development Division, decided to offer local libraries that "extra" in actual funds and in staff to help libraries serve new people. The State Library used $500,000 to introduce a competitive grant program which funded local public libraries to develop services for disadvantaged populations.

THE GOALS AND THE OBJECTIVES

Background

In 1987, the economic and demographic changes of late twentieth century America were well underway in Texas. Ethnic minorities were about to become majorities in many communities. Unemployment and poverty increased, the population aged, adult reading levels dropped and school children dropped out.

Library Development Division named the grant program PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES TO DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS and selected from the LSCA list of disadvantaged categories six groups which were increasing in Texas.

Library Development Division allocated $500,000 for this project. Texas has 446 public libraries and a great many people in the targeted populations. We had more need than money. Because the disadvantaged populations were increasing, we knew public libraries would eventually have to serve these people with local funds. This grant money had to do much to help Texas meet the future.

To discover what approach would achieve the most with the least, we analyzed personal observations of and formal research on services to the disadvantaged. We found that successful programs to serve disadvantaged populations had the following characteristics:

1. The library staff chooses to serve a population which is visible in the community. If the people are distinctive in their appearance or language they will be seen or heard in the neighborhood. If they are non-users because of their condition: poverty, unemployment, inability to read, that condition will affect the community. If there are enough people in this group to create their own social dynamics, clubs or churches or social service agencies, then the new services are even more likely to succeed. When a new user enjoys an event at the library or finds something fun or useful at the library, that new user will tell someone about it. The more someones there are to tell, the more likely the group will become visible in the library.

2. The library staff asks members of this group what they do, what they like, and what they want in their everyday life. The staff does this before they plan new library services. They may learn that the people they interviewed will use the old services in a different location, in a different language, and from different people. "i want car manuals in Spanish on my side of town and somebody to talk to me in Spanish about my car."

3. Small responsive grant projects, i.e., small changes in services, changes which respond to what the unserved people in a community want, do more good for the library and for the community than do big, extraordinary projects, and they last longer.

These three observations informed the grant program's purpose, influenced the length and focus of funding, and contributed to the criteria for award.

Purpose

The purpose of the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant became:

To develop library services to meet the special needs of and to encourage library use by:

Unemployed persons
Children of migrant workers (including their families)
People for whom English is a second language
People with incomes below poverty level
People over 65 (including residents of nursing homes and the homebound)
Adults with less than a 12th grade education (including high school
        dropouts)

To give such services impetus to generate local funding and community support so that appropriate services for these groups become normal library services.

Characteristics of successful programs influenced the decision to limit the length of funding. A small responsive program can establish itself in a year. Hoping to inspire small responsive programs, the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant allows recipients to apply in open competition for two years. If they apply for a third year, then the applicant must provide 50% of the project cost.

A small responsive program works best in a limited service area so the grant guidelines invite single outlet libraries or branches of large systems to apply.

Grantors have one major tool to influence project success and that is the criteria for award. Success factors can be built into the criteria and weighted so they contribute heavily to the final score.

So the first two criterion for the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant award process are based on the first two characteristics of successful programs. To encourage applicants to serve a visible community and to respond to expressed interests and needs, the two criterion award up to 25 points for percentage of population and for needs assessment.

The Texas State Library, Library Development Division's mission and the Library Services and Construction Act's purpose is to develop library services. So the ultimate purpose of any Title I funding is library development in Texas. If developing services for non-users takes extra time and money to accomplish, librarians need reward for the effort. So, the ultimate goal must be to strengthen the library. Toward this end, the third and fourth criteria encourage the applicant to integrate the new services with the old. The third criterion asks the applicant to describe how the new activities will be introduced into existing services and to existing staff. The fourth criterion asks the applicant to demonstrate how the objectives will meet the objectives of the local funding agency.

8

Equal Opportunity for Award and for Success

The Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant is competitive.
The playing field for this competition is the state of Texas. Because of its
large size, because of its varied topography and the resulting wildly uneven
distribution of its population, because of extremes of income and education,
Texas is a rocky, uneven playing field. Some small town librarians believe they
cannot compete against professional grant writers in Houston or Dallas.

Many fear that small libraries and small towns cannot spend grant monies
appropriately and on time. The federal government and the State Liorary have
high standards for financial transactions and reporting and strict rules on uses
of the money. Spending grant money under the rules requires sound judgement.

To allay these fears and to even the field, Library Development developed what
might be called an equalization strategy with the following tactics.

1. Express the criteria so they serve as a guide for the applicant to follow,
step by step, to plan the grant project and to write the proposal.

2. Announce the grant project to every possible applicant.
    *Library Development Divis;on mailed the guidelines directly to every
    library and branch for three years. The last two years the division
    ma·'ed announcements which invited potential applicants to request the
    guidelines.*

3. Request that all applicants discuss their project ideas with the State
Library Special Services Consultant before they begin developing a proposal.

4. Assist potential applicants throughout application development, including
reviewing draft proposals. Assist each with the same technique: direct each to
the grant purpose as inspiration and help each use the criteria as a step-by-
step guide for planning the project and for writing the proposal.
    *Not everyone called as requested and, once having called, not everyone
    continued contact, but 58 of the 91 applications received assistance.
    Dallas Public Library and El Paso Public Library invited the consultant to
    do an orientation to the criteria for branch librarians. The consultant
    did the same orientation for staff of four small East Texas towns.*

5. Provide workshops across the state about how to serve the disadvantaged.

FY	WORKSHOP	LOCATIONS
1988	Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant: How to Plan a Program, How to Write A Proposal	10
1989	Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant: How to Plan a Program, How to Write A Proposal	8
1990	Intergenerational Literacy: Programs for Adults With Children	5
1991	No workshop. Special Services Consultant spoke about the grant at System Meetings	4
1992	Getting To Know Your Community	7

6. Orient all city or county financial officers who receive a grant for the first time. Monitor all grant projects by telephone or by visiting the sites and provide technical assistance on achieving project objectives and on spending the money appropriately and on time.

The Special Services Consultant, sometimes with the Grants Administrator, made approximately 28 visits in four years. The two staff members talk to project staff an average of four telephone conversations a year and, in some cases, as many as twenty.

10

THE RESULTS

NUMBER OF AWARDS

In five years, 91 applications for the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant requested $3,674,159. The State Library awarded $1,970,815 through 57 grants to 17 city main libraries, 31 city branches, 3 county main libraries, and 4 county branches. Three libraries received funding for three years and fourteen received funding for two years. Three libraries did two distinct projects. So, the 57 awards distributed nearly $2,000,000 to 39 projects in 36 library locations.

For the first two years the program budget was $500,000. Then it dropped to $350,000. When available, money left after final awards were made in other competitive grant programs was added to the Disadvantaged Grant fund.

Year	Applications	Amount Requested	Awards	Amount Awarded	# Not Funded
1988	27	$1,201,013	12	$485,366	15
1989	17	764,334	13	422,513	4
1990	22	790,919	13	403,967	9
1991	11	416,127	9	336,187	2
1992	14	501,766	10	322,782	4
TOTAL	91	$3,674,159	57	$1,970,815	34
				63% funded	37% not

The number of applicants dropped in 1991. Many social and economic factors may have contributed to that reduction, for example, the State Library and many local libraries reduced budgets that year. At the same time State Library promotion of the grant program lessened. Grant recipients, when interviewed, said that the workshop presented the first two years, How To Plan Programs, How To Write Proposals, inspired applications. It made people aware of the possibility of getting extra funding. They got excited about doing something. The Intergenerational Literacy Workshop, offered the third year, provided a program idea which several applicants emulated. Then the State Library did no workshop for the 1991 grant cycle and for 1992 did a workshop which neither inspired nor provided a program model.

To reduce printing and postage costs in 1990, the State Library stopped mailing the guidelines directly to all 446 libraries and 225 branches and began sending an announcement that the guidelines were available. Since then some libraries have missed the opportunity to apply. They either did r t recognize what the notice was about or they waited too long to write for guidelines.

1̇

POPULATIONS SERVED

Better than a third of the applications (35%) were to serve adults with less than 12 years of school. Applications to serve people for whom English is a second language comprised almost another third (30%) of the total. Those two categories together equal 65% of all the applications. No one applied to serve the children of migrant workers.

In the awards, adults with less than 12 years of school climbed to 40% and people for whom English is a second language to 35%. The two dominated the awards with 75%.

When asked why they selected a particular population to serve, 51% of the librarians said that this group was a visible population in the community. Librarians' comments on the size of the population ranged from the observation that they are the dominant group ("They are the majority minority in the neighborhood; "They are our neigh..orhood." "There are so many of them.") to the modest observation that there are enough in the population to be concerned about serving them. People for whom English is a second language and adults with less than 12 years of school are the largest target population groups in Texas.

Size of the populations was not, however, the only reason so many choose to serve those two groups. Forty percent of the project librarians wanted to do a particular kind of program. They selected a population which suited the program. They wanted to support a literacy program or to offer adult education or English as a second language classes. Or they wanted to do a life skills program or a job information program and they believed that life skills or job and employment information answered the greatest needs of these people.

No one named children of migrant workers as the group to serve. No one has mentioned them in the grant applications. The grant process itself provides no explanation as to why no one chooses to serve them.

12

POPULATIONS SERVED

	Number of Applications	% of Applications
Less than 12 years of school	32	35%
ESL	27	30%
over 65	16	18%
Incomes below Poverty level	13	14%
Unemployed	3	3%
Children of Migrant Workers	0	0%
TOTAL	91	

	Number of Awards	% of Total Awards
12 years of school	23	40%
ESL	20	35%
over 65	5	9%
Incomes below Poverty level	7	12%
Unemployed	2	4%
Children of Migrant Workers	0	0%
TOTAL	57	

13

NEEDS AND SERVICES

The grant guidelines require applicants to design services to meet the special
needs of the targeted population. The grant recipients designed 39 distinct
projects, but they identified only 6 categories of need. Frequently the
librarian's desire to offer a certain service presaged the need.

1. Closer Services

At two projects, the population needed services closer to their neighborhoods.
The Emily Fowler Public Library in Denton was not serving the people who lived
in and around the public housing projects. The library took books, cassettes
and videos into the projects to a spare room at the Martin Luther King
Recreation Center. Denton emphasized children's materials. Storytimes and
family reading activities made up the programming. Laredo went to an former day
care center in a completely Spanish-speaking neighborhood in South Laredo and is
currently trying to offer full library services there.

2. Home Delivery of Large Print

Four librarians observed a need for large print books and for home and/or
nursing home delivery. All of the projects with this need served people over
65. Two of them were in libraries in semi-rural communities, Sweeny and Mount
Pleasant. One in Sherman, a small city, tried to meet this need with a grant in
1988. Use of large print books increased in the nursing homes and at the Senior
Center and the city could not keep up with the demand. The number of people who
need help reading also increased. So Sherman reapplied for a disadvantaged
grant in 1992. In a large city, Austin, the North Loop Branch developed a
sophisticated delivery program which sent trained volunteers into private
homes. Project Walking Books volunteers provided readers' advisory and some
reference, as well as delivered books and visited with the homebound.

3. Other Languages

Three librarians found a need for Spanish language and bilingual materials,
staff, and activities. The libraries, Eagle Pass, Freeport, and Walnut Hill in
Dallas used the grant to provide all of the above. Providing all of the above
for Spanish speakers made the library a community center. The librarian at
Garland's Walnut Creek Branch observed many Asian people in the neighborhood who
were not using the library because they were not able to use English. The
branch is in a shopping strip mall and new Americans from Asia were buying the
small businesses. The library reserved a section of the library for ESL classes
and surrounded it with self-study materials in English and several Asian
languages. The library offered programs on American social mores and on
American business methods.

4. Impoverishment

Four saw a need for fun, for entertainment, for social events and for a connection between the library and lives. Delta County described the need as "impoverishment due to poverty." Delta County offered crafts, painting, quilting, doll making and extended storytimes. Martin Luther King Branch in Dallas reached out to every youth, adult or community agency and participated in their parades. They made the library visible and advertised what the library could offer. That branch also purchased many self-help and Black history videos. Also in Dallas at Dallas West, the library produced an MTV style video. CHECK IT OUT AT THE LI-BRA-RY shows young adults using the library how to sing, dance, play, fix a motorcycle and apply to college. Dallas West held a gospel meeting in the parking lot. These libraries chose to serve the poor.

The fourth library, Liberty, really just wanted to support its literacy program. When the staff surveyed the literacy students, they discovered impoverishment. For the grant application, Liberty developed an elaborate program to have displays, events and family entertainments for literacy students and their families. The Extension Agency, which was supposed to develop many of the programs, lost staff and could not fulfill its contract. As a result, many of the entertainments were not produced. But enough were done to transform the clientele. In Liberty's year-end grant evaluation, the librarian noted they had dirty people and noisy people in the library. They had families with unruly children. They had people who, until then, had believed the library was for someone else, not for them. People had come to laugh and play, to look at quilts and hear stories told.

5. Specific Information

Five projects described a need for specific information such as job skills, career choice, job seeking techniques and life skills.

Four libraries established a career or job information center. Corpus Christi did this in the main library and emphasized networking among potential employers to build a large job listing. Austin Public did it at the Riverside Branch and served people with less than 12 years of school by offering individuals help on each task they must do to get a job. Arlington Public Library served the same group. All offered training in resume writing, interviewing and job search skills. San Antonio, at the Pan American Branch, offered vocational testing and invited bookkeepers and janitors to talk about their jobs.

Fort Worth Public Library at the Diamond Hill/Jarvis Branch believed the greatest need was for general life skills like parenting and check-writing. The library produced bibliographies on each topic and a collection of pamphlets in Spanish.

15

6. Educational Needs

Twenty-one projects, 56% of the total, identified educational needs.

A. Support for Adult Education

El Paso Public Library actually surveyed the needs of the many adult education centers in the Clardy Fox Branch neighborhood. The adult educators said they needed help in providing texts and workbooks and supplementary reading to their students. They needed supplementary teaching materials such as computer software and they needed help referring students to appropriate programs. So, the library provided all that.

B. Inspiration to Read

Pearsall Public Library, a small, rural library in the San Antonio area, interviewed students in the literacy program. The students said they wanted something to encourage their children to read. Pearsall recruited off-duty teachers to come in after school and be there to help and to inspire children. Then they bought a collection of materials to attract beginning, slow and reluctant readers. It included read-along books, finish-the-story, and picture books. The librarian displayed these in two clusters in the open area of the library, one cluster for elementary, another for junior high and older.

C. Computer skills for Reading

Both Houston and Dallas Public Libraries saw a need in the Spanish language communities to improve computer skills and to use the computer to help children learn to read. Houston's Stanaker Branch invited parents of pre-school children to formal classes where the parents and children learned a variety of software programs for the very young child. Walnut Hill Branch in Dallas attracted elementary and middle school children. The children's librarian, with help from a Spanish-speaking computer expert, used a variety of software to create an integrated system which allowed the children to progress through several layers of reading, art and some math programing.

D. Adults need to read to their children

Many librarians believe that libraries are the ideal agents to "break the cycle of illiteracy." Libraries can do this by teaching adults to read to their children and to play with them in ways which allow the child to develop reading readiness. Six librarians described this as a need.

Houston Public Library developed a curriculum for a reading readiness program. The Parent Reading Program at the Stanaker Public Library contracted with an educator, Dr. Luis Cantu, to produce a manual. The original title was READING READINESS IN THE BARRIO because the Stanaker neighborhood is Hispanic. Parents learned how to develop reading readiness by reading to the child or, if the parent could not read, by reciting the story of a book or making up a story with a picture book. They learned to make flannel boards and fabric books and how to recognize number or word patterns by using color and shape patterns. While the parents played with patterns and colors in the class, their pre-school children played with the children's librarian and with educational toys.

16

Houston used the disadvantaged grant to replicate this at Fifth Ward and Tuttle
Branch Libraries. After the State Library presented this model as a segment of
a workshop on Intergenerational Literacy, three other libraries tried it.
Denton used it as part of the children's programing in the project's Recreation
Center as described above. Alice Public Library, in a small largely Hispanic
Community outside Corpus Christi, started a similar program and added "My First
Library" which gave the children books to keep.

Longview Public Library did a parent reading program with the East Texas
Literacy Council and the Junior League of Longview. The classes were held in
locations away from the library so a library visit was added to the curriculum.
The children's librarian created a pre-school collection in a special place in
the children's area. The parents and children visited the library once a month
to spend time with the children's and the adult services librarian and to select
books to take home.

Four branches of the El Paso Public Library hosted another model which the El
Paso Community College developed. That project also produced a manual which
included activities, like cooking, which required equipment. When the grant
ended, the community college moved this family reading curriculum into the
public schools.

Sterling Municipal Library in Baytown adopted the Kentucky, Kenan Trust Family
Literacy Model to provide a library-sponsored family literacy program in an
elementary school.

    E. Adults need to learn to read and speak English
            and
    F. Adults need to read

All the rest of the projects addressed these two needs. Many libraries applied
for the disadvantaged grant in order to support a literacy program. Winnsboro,
Liberty, Ector County, Deaf Smith County, San Antonio's Collins Garden and Bazan
branches, Austin's Govalle Branch, and San Marcos all used grant funding to
support tutoring. Deaf Smith and Bazan tried new techniques to teach English
reading to Spanish-speaking adults. San Marcos developed a new delivery system
which allows learners to drop in for evaluation, for tutoring or for ESL
informal classes. Some of these programs expanded the adult education
activities a little, because the grant guidelines required it, but most were
focused on educating.

Harris County offered formal English as A Second Language classes but expanded
this to offer simultaneous children's programing with play times and
storytimes. The grant funds bought educational toys and games to stimulate
reading readiness in the children.

Corpus Christi Public Library offered two projects at the Greenwood Branch. The
first provided support materials for people learning English, text books,
videos, software, bilingual books. This project revealed that many people could
read a little in English but needed help to be able to take the GED
successfully. Greenwood offered textbooks, videos and software for GED
preparation and provided volunteers to help people study.

Eighty percent of the grant recipients did not ask members of the target population what they thought they needed. Instead, the librarians either decided themselves or they conferred with educators or social service providers. Fifty-six percent identified educational needs. Forty percent started with a service they wanted to provide and then picked a population to serve. Most then asked members of the population to confirm their decision. They did this with surveys which asked "Would you like Spanish language materials in the library?" "Would you like classes to help your child to read?"

Although the grant writer's intent in the second criterion was to inspire applicants to ask people about what they do, what they like, and what they seek in their every day life, the language of the criterion inspired a different response. The criterion reads, "The applicant describes clearly the target group and their special needs and how the library is not currently meeting those needs." "Need" is an ambiguous noun. "Need" suggests a great void asking to be filled. "Need" is a word the American Middle Class frequently translates into "education." This word misdirected many librarians to think in terms of programs to fill a deficit instead of asking the people, "What are you doing that the library can help you do?" As a result, many of the funded programs are more formally structured and less flexible than programs which respond to people's interest.

1 8

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT SUCCESS

Met Objectives

The twenty-nine projects met or exceeded 80% of their objectives. All the adult literacy or ESL programs served more people than planned.

Nature prevented reaching some objectives. Brazoria County, Sweeny Branch, and Franklin County lost half their homebound patrons to death or to severe illness.

Fort Worth/Diamond Hill Jarvis Branch presented the life skills programs promised but attracted very few people to them. The project did, however, video tape them and created a bibliography and packet of pamphlets for each topic. The packets are now used in all branches.

Most other unmet objectives were peripheral to the main goals of the project - an assessment of a collection not completed, fewer topics presented than planned, staff members did not learn Spanish, supportive software not purchased.

Although they eventually met their class objectives, all the family literacy programs which offered family classes had trouble attracting and maintaining attendance at the classes. These programs served parents of pre-school children. In inner-city Houston, Denton, and El Paso and in rural Longview and Alice, these parents attended fitfully. Houston and Longview simplified the classes and took the activities to housing projects and baby clinics and used former students as volunteers.

Houston's first Family Reading Program at the Stanaker Branch was an exception. Those classes were very well attended and were a rousing success. The winter that year was dry and warm, while the other programs faced cold, wet winters with many viral infections about. The Stanaker neighborhood had a lot of Spanish-speaking people who were working and who were hopeful about the future. Denton and Longview and the other Houston locations served African American neighborhoods with many people not working and many less hopeful about the future. The El Paso program served a Mexican immigrant neighborhood.

Served the Target Population

With the exception of Corpus Christi's Job Information Center, no project recorded exactly what population group was using the new services. The project directors did watch the users, however. From visual observation, they estimated what percentage of total users were members of the target population group.

Group % of Users	Projects Reporting	% of Total Projects
100%	6	20%
80%	6	20%
75%	7	24%
60%	3	10%
50% or less	7	24%

Projects which took books to the homebound, or which offered ESL classes or materials, or which occurred in a socially isolated, high population neighborhood like Dallas West, reported the highest percentages. Projects which offered self-help and general interest content programing reported the lowest percentages. There the people using the services were part of the general population who were interested in the content or who enjoyed the activity.

Spent Money Appropriately and On Time

One-half of the projects took one to four months to hire staff. A small portion of these had difficulty in finding a good person, but most delay was due to big city hiring practices. Seven replaced the first hire as a bad choice or lost the first person hired to another job and had to hire again.

Two of Texas' largest cities took a long time to purchase equipment costing more than $300. El Paso's director assigned a library staff person to carry purchase orders through the system. The children's librarian at Walnut Hill did the same thing. He carried his computer equipment order from one desk to the next in the Dallas Purchasing Department so his children's computer program began almost on time.

Many projects purchased equipment for much less than estimated or received unexpected discounts on books.

These problems were the largest sources of extra funds to spend near the end of the fiscal year. A problem which occured in both large and small communities was that the project director frequently did not know how much money had been spent. Their cities or counties did not report to them or did not report to them in forms they could understand.

As you can see from the Expenditure Analysis chart below, in 1989 the projects spent 99% of the money by the end of the grant year. In 1988 and 1990 the projects spent 98% In 1991 they spent only 95%, but this percentage still more than meets federal and state standards.

Two factors led to so many individual project successes. The criteria provided a step-by-step plan for developing a program. State Library staff followed the steps when helping applicants. Several librarians complained that writing the proposal was as difficult as passing a graduate class, but most recipients said that the completed application served as an action plan. It laid out what they were to do and how and when they were to do it and they just did it. Most of the difficulties the projects encountered were situational: they came from the local situation and were not a product of faulty planning. The State Library's Special Services Consultant monitored the projects. When the local problems arose, the consultant helped project staff find effective ways to meet the objectives, develop successful methods to attract the service population and spend the extra monies appropriately.

2U

Expenditure Analysis

Library	Grant Award	Grant Expended	Percent Not Spent	Not Spent
1988				
Dallas Public Library	$61,623	$61,623	.0%	$0
Corpus Christi Public Library	53,303	51,176	4.0%	2,127
Sherman Public Library	12,555	12,555	.0%	0
Eagle Pass Public Library	13,545	12,929	4.5%	616
El Paso Public Library	86,419	82,767	4.2%	3,652
Harris County Library	58,748	58,748	.0%	0
Houston Public Library	28,955	28,955	.0%	0
San Antonio Public Library	46,295	46,295	.0%	0
Austin Public Library	44,695	44,685	.0%	10
Ector County Library	40,000	40,000	.0%	0
Liberty Municipal Library	18,200	17,595	3.3%	605
San Marcos Public Library	21,031	20,541	2.3%	490
	$485,369	$477,869	1.5%	$7,500
1989				
Dallas Public Library	$62,673	$62,673	.0%	$0
Delta County Public Library	14,000	14,000	.0%	0
Emily Fowler Public Library	41,048	41,048	.0%	0
Corpus Christi Public Library	45,488	45,361	.3%	127
Franklin County Public Library	24,350	23,878	1.9%	472
Brazoria County Library,Sweeny	17,393	17,393	.0%	0
Brazoria County Library,Freeport	23,890	23,878	.1%	12
San Marcos Public Library	19,211	18,452	4.0%	759
Harris County Library	51,336	50,938	.8%	398
Houston Public Library	32,240	32,240	.0%	0
Nicholson Memorial Library	24,044	24,044	.0%	0
Austin Public Library	41,840	41,840	.0%	0
Gilbreath Memorial Library	25,000	25,000	.0%	0
	$422,513	$420,745	.4%	$1,768
1990				
Dallas Public Library	$22,867	$22,867	.0%	$0
Delta County Public Library	16,200	16,200	.0%	0
Emily Fowler Public Library	49,479	49,479	.0%	0
Austin Public Library	63,673	60,718	4.6%	2,955
San Marcos Public Library	7,000	6,993	.1%	7
Pearsall Public Library	18,210	18,210	.0%	0
Alice Public Library	27,170	26,933	.9%	237
Dallas Public Library	55,180	55,180	.0%	0
Deaf Smith County Library	13,375	13,375	.0%	0
Houston Public Library	32,887	32,887	.0%	0
San Antonio Public Library	40,879	40,879	.0%	0
El Paso Public Library	55,355	53,903	2.6%	1,452
Longview Public Library	24,005	20,418	14.9%	3,587
	$426,280	$418,042	1.9%	$8,238

2⁻

Library	Grant Award	Grant Expended	Percent Not Spent	Not Spent
1991				
Dallas Public Library	$84,227	$83,043	1.4%	$1,184
Corpus Christi Public Library	15,000	14,999	.0%	1
Alice Public Library	25,573	25,501	.3%	72
Austin Public Library	37,150	35,722	3.8%	1,428
Fort Worth Public Library	25,000	23,626	5.5%	1,374
Houston Public library	38,862	34,616	10.9%	4,246
San Antonio Public Library	44,523	43,657	1.9%	866
El Paso Public Library	50,000	44,449	11.1%	5,551
Longview Public Library	15,852	14,617	7.8%	1,235
	$336,187	$320,230	4.7%	$15,957
FOUR YEAR TOTALS	$1,670,349	$1,636,886	2.0%	$33,463

22

LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

The following information comes from structured interviews of the librarians for the 29 projects which no longer receive funding.

The librarian at Franklin County Library in Mount Vernon, a small impoverished community in East Texas said, spontaneously, during the structured interview, "The grant helped the library's development."

Most libraries became highly visible in the community. Every one of them reported community attention. Most observed improved public relations. "The grants made the library visible in non-user neighborhoods." This was the effect in all four Dallas projects according to the Assistant Director of Dallas Public Library. He felt those branches needed community notice to survive.

Newspaper articles and radio comment, library participation in public events and patron thank-yous, all made library staff feel good. Most of the library staff described the grant impact on them as giving them a sense of doing something good.

The Pearsall librarian thinks that the city built a new library because city officials heard community enthusiasm for the grant after-school project. Every day those same officials saw 30 children crowded into that small town library after school. They concluded: 1) the library was serving a real need and 2) the library was crowded. The new library is safer to walk to from the schools and has room for sixty readers. The average daily attendance is 35 and they have room to spread out.

Delta County also thinks the grant made the library visible to the community and to the county. The library is in a 70 year old house. The attic serves as an adult education center. Children's books are in the dining room and adult materials in the living-sitting room. Circulation is just outside the kitchen. The senior citizens club and the Summer Reading Program frequently meet on the verandah. During the multiple activities produced by the grant, the staff frantically moved furniture between events. All the adult chairs and the table in the living room at 2:00 for the nursing home visit had to be moved into the dining room to accommodate the various ages coming for the 4:00 Story Hour. Now the library board is developing building renovation plans.

At Eagle Pass Public Library, also in an old building with multiple entrances, the librarian is now troubled by book loss. So many people drop in the library for a brief visit with acquaintances and then walk out with a book. The book 's not always checked out. The city is attempting to raise money to renovate the building.

The grant program has profoundly altered library collections. It allowed libraries to address needs of groups they had for years neglected. The Brazoria County Director described what happened in Freeport. The older population increased so much and so rapidly that the library, without the grant, could not offer older users a real choice of materials. "The grant allowed a critical mass collection." The grant allowed the library to purchase enough large print material to give the users a real choice.

Many other grant recipients were libraries in neighborhoods which had changed greatly since the collections were first established. Walnut Hill in Dallas had a collection designed for the neighborhood thirty years ago. The branch director says, "The grant allowed the branch to do what it had to do - serve the Spanish language taxpayer who is now the majority in the community." By purchasing Spanish language magazines and books the branch integrated itself into the community. With Spanish language materials came Spanish-speaking staff. Now the Walnut Hill Collection is the core Spanish language collection for all the Dallas branches.

Some new collections brought surprises. Longview Public Library purchased pre-school books to support the Literacy Council's Family Reading Program. With grant funds they purchased low display shelves for the new books and put them in their own corner of the children's section. That collection circulated so much the shelves were frequently bare. With 15 copies of Are You My Mother?, the children's librarian was lucky if there was one copy in the library on any one day. Longview now has a collection development dilemma. The library's usual collection policy authorizes buying only one copy of a title. As they maintain this pre-school collection, without grant funds, should they change that policy?

All projects reported increased library use - more walk-ins, more library cards and increased circulation. This occurred no matter who they were serving or what services they offered.

Library Use	Percent of Increase Reported
Circulation	7% 13% 17% 23% 35% 39% 45% 74% 85%
In-House Use	25% 28% 200%
Walk- ins	10% 25% 52% 150%
Staff Interactions With New Patrons	45% (12,650 in person, 4,421 telephone calls.)*

	Number Issued
Number of New Cards	85 175 178 375 804 135

(*This number is from Corpus Christi's Career Center. This project kept the most varied and the most detailed records of all the projects.)

In January, 1992, most former grant recipients reported continued increases. At Dallas' Martin Luther King Branch, circulation has increased 100% since 1988.

All projects reported new people in the library. African Americans from the Martin Luther King Recreation Center neighborhood are now seen in the Emily Fowler Public Library downtown. In all the projects serving People for whom English is a second language, you hear Spanish spoken in the library. In poor neighborhood branches you see people who are comfortable being there. As the librarian at Dallas' Martin Luther King Branch says, "Patrons no longer feel that the library is a place where they are afraid to go or feel that it is out of their league."

24

Libraries serving ESL populations note individuals seldom come alone; they bring friends, children, and other family members to the library for a visit. San Marcos is used to capacity. Afternoons and evenings every chair is filled with busy people, people of two languages, both sexes and many ages. San Marcos just passed a bond issue to build a new library. The new building will have space designated for an adult education center.

The Library director in San Marcos observed, "I think these grants really did what they were supposed to do. They brought new people into the library."

Most libraries developed stronger ties with other community organizations. Both El Paso and San Marcos were a partner with a Private Industry Council in a Texas Literacy Council Partnerships Grant project. Other partners were the Adult Education Cooperative, the non-profit literacy councils and the local employment commission and human services offices.

Houston's Fifth Ward Branch now does joint programing with other social service agencies. Those agencies, as well as health clinics, community councils and Title II parents, distribute library leaflets and ask the library to do an occasional presentation. Dallas West offered many more special events programs than planned because community groups offered to do free programs. Corpus Christi's Career Center has a massive network of business and community leaders.

The people who surveyed the neighborhoods, who designed the services, and who wrote the grant application did all these activities for the first time in their careers. Ninety percent of the first time applicants had never written a grant, had never designed or budgeted a program and had never run a program before this experience. Their first such experience was an attempt to serve the most difficult to serve. Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant taught them how; it developed librarians.

The most celebrated example of librarian development is Library Journal's first Librarian of the Year. Peggy Goodwin "was chosen as Library Journal's 1988 Librarian of the Year for her fine work at the Walnut Creek Branch of the Nicholson Memorial Library in Garland, Texas...for building library service to new Americans." That work realized the goal of "enhancement and expansion of library service to the community, or the strengthening of the library's role and position in the community." (Library Journal, January, 1989)

25

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The table below shows grant recipients ranked according to the population the
library serves. The size categories are those used by the Texas State Library
as part of its annual statistical analysis of library service. The library
sizes are based upon 1988 statistics. The smallest grant recipient was Delta
County which serves almost 5,000 people. There were 58 Texas libraries which
serve fewer than 2,500. None of those libraries applied for the grant.

The distribution displayed in the table seemed to be a fair distribution in
terms of population density. Twenty six (45.6%) of the awards, went to
libraries which serve under 250,000 people. Fifteen (26%) went to library
systems which serve over a million people. Sixteen (28%) went to libraries in
between.

This seems to be a fair distribution in relation to library sophistication.
Ironically, the expectation that big city librarians know how to write grants
applies to administrators much more than to branch librarians. The staff at
Delta County, Franklin County, Pearsall, Winnsboro, Deaf Smith and Eagle Pass
libraries had never written a grant before they applied for the Public Library
Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant. But neither had the staff at the
large city branches - Dallas West, Walnut Hill, Martin Luther King, Walnut
Creek, Diamond Hill/Jarvis or Collins Gardens Branch libraries. They all
started from scratch and learned how to plan a program and how to write a
proposal with help from the State Library's Special Services Consultant.

26

Award Recipient	Range of People Served	Number in Range*	Awards
DELTA COUNTY	2,500 - 4,999	91 libraries	1 library received 2 awards
DELTA COUNTY			
FRANKLIN COUNTY	5,000 - 9,999	119 libraries	1 library received 1 award
PEARSALL	10,000 -24,999	105 libraries	3 libraries received 3 awards
WINNSBORO			
DEAF SMITH COUNTY			
EAGLE PASS	25,000 - 49,000	54 libraries	5 libraries received 9 awards
ALICE			
ALICE			
SAN MARCOS			
SAN MARCOS			
SAN MARCOS			
LIBERTY			
SHERMAN			
SHERMAN			
DENTON, EMILY FOWLER	50,000 - 99,999	20 libraries	3 libraries received 5 awards
DENTON, EMILY FOWLER			
Baytown, STERLING MUNICIPAL			
LONGVIEW			
LONGVIEW			
ARLINGTON/North Branch	100,000 - 249,999	19 libraries	5 libraries received 6 awards
GARLAND/Walnut Creek			at 6 locations
BRAZORIA COUNTY/Freeport			
BRAZORIA COUNTY/Sweeney			
ECTOR COUNTY			
LAREDO			
AUSTIN/Govalle	250,000 - 499,999	4 libraries	4 libraries received 14 awards
AUSTIN/Govalle			at 8 locations
AUSTIN/North Loop			
AUSTIN/Riverside Drive			
Austin/Riverside Drive			
CORPUS CHRISTI/Main Library			
CORPUS CHRISTI/Greenwood			
CORPUS CHRISTI/Greenwood			
CORPUS CHRISTI/Greenwood			
EL PASO/3 branches			
EL PASO/Clardy Fox			
EL PASO/Clardy Fox			
EL PASO/Clardy Fox			
FT. WORTH/Diamond Hill/Jarvis			
HARRIS COUNTY/High Meadows	500,000 - 999,999	1 library	1 library received 2 awards
HARRIS COUNTY/High Meadows			at 1 location
DALLAS/Dallas West	1,000,000-	3 libraries	3 libraries received 15 awards
DALLAS/Martin Luther King			at 9 locations
DALLAS/Martin Luther King			
DALLAS/Walnut Hill			
DALLAS/Walnut Hill			
HOUSTON/Tuttle Branch			
HOUSTON/Fifth Ward			
HOUSTON/Fifth Ward			
HOUSTON/Stanaker			
HOUSTON/Stanaker			
SAN ANTONIO/Bazan Branch			
SAN ANTONIO/Collins Garden			
SAN ANTONIO/Collins Garden			
SAN ANTONIO/Collins Garden			
SAN ANTONIO/Pan American			

27

*1988 populations and ranges

NORMAL LIBRARY SERVICES

The Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant supported new services for the targeted populations in order to generate local funding and community support so that services to these groups become normal library services. In January, 1992, the Special Services Consultant, using a structured interview format, asked all the past grant recipients about the current condition of the services. Ten projects received grant funding for 1992. They were not included in this survey.

Directors of 29 projects answered the question, "Would you say the grant services have become part of normal library services?"

Eleven answered unequivocally, "Yes." Four answered with an equivocal "Yes, the services continue but we do not pay for all of them." Five said the program goes on although the library is not providing the services. Four answered "No." Five said, "We are not doing all the activities we did during the grant project but we still experience the results."

```
  11 "yes"    = 37% successful
+  4 "yes, but" = 51% successful
+  5 "goes on"  = 68% successful
```

These were complicated answers to a simple question. The 68% successful figure tempts one to conclude that the grant program was a great success. That would bring us to a simple closure on the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant program. Examining those complicated answers give us a much more interesting view of how Texas librarians used the grant program.

"Goes On"

The five who answered that the program "goes on," although the library is not providing all the services, were literacy programs. The literacy programs used the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant to fund instruction for a year. Most still instruct. After the grant, Liberty funded the literacy coordinator as a library position. After the grant, the Ector County Literacy Council sought funding elsewhere. After the grant, the Deaf Smith Library Director and the Winnsboro Adult Education Coordinator continue to marshal volunteers and offer tutoring through sheer personal determination. The county spends about 10% of the book budget on adult new reader materials. The Winnsboro Library entered an Adult Education float in a Winnsboro parade and won an award. In Longview, the grant intended to help the East Texas Literacy Council establish a family literacy program. The Council now offers it without library money. After the grant, the library continues to give library orientation to parents and children and dedicated a portion of book money to maintain and expand the pre-school reading collection.

Two of the projects which answered "no" were also literacy programs, but ones without focused support. Austin Govalle Literacy Center was a literacy program artificially created for the library by a friend. It was a program with no library advocate, with no alternate source of support, and with no interest from the city. When funding ended, the project ended. The El Paso community college devised a family literacy curriculum and used library funding to try it in three branches. When the 1988 library grant ended, the college moved the curriculum to the public schools.

"Yes, but"

Active projects continue in three library systems but the librarians do not agree on whether the services "have become normal library services." The director of San Marcos Public Library says her busy walk-in literacy tutoring and English as a Second Language project is completely normal library service. Her city council approved a half-time salary for the project coordinator. The community expects help at the library: AFDC sends its clients who need educational aid to the library for twenty hours a week. The library staff handles all the traffic, but the teaching depends on outside teachers. The Ten-County Adult Education Cooperative sends adult education teachers to the library for 35 hours a week to offer assessment, tutoring and informal classes.

All the Houston Public Library Family Reading Projects depend on outside teachers. The library committed $24,000 a year to hire a literacy coordinator who oversees all the Family Reading classes. The classes occur once or twice a year in fourteen branches. Three of those branches used a disadvantaged grant to support the teachers. The Family Reading Program is part of Houston Public Library's long range plan for developing its branches. The first project at the Stanaker Branch now cooperates with Houston Community College in offering family reading to Head Start parents and receives $7,000 in Head Start funds. The Fifth Ward Branch attracted Houston Car Sales Association sponsorship for the reading club: they paid $2.00 for every book read. The literacy coordinator, like the San Marcos director, believes firmly that Family Reading is a part of normal Houston Public Library Services.

Houston's assistant director feels it is not normal services because the library does not pay the teachers and the library will never pay the teachers. The assistant director of Harris County agrees with him. Her grant project, ESL classes accompanied by stimulating children's activities, continues at the High Meadows Branch. The county pays for a person to do bilingual story hours there and at other branches for twenty hours a week. The county maintains the Spanish, bilingual and children's materials collections with 20% of branch book total, but Harris County Community College and Houston Read pay the ESL teachers.

Nine equivocal "yes" answers and two "no" answers come from projects which described education as the most important need. Seven "no" and "no, but" answers came from libraries which can just barely fund daily operations.

"No" and "No, but"

Inadequate financing led Eagle Pass and Delta County to answer "no, but we still see the results," even though the grant funding considerably altered their services.

Delta County, who offered enrichment to those in poverty, could not continue the special crafts and art and games programing because, although the presenters volunteered time, they needed money for supplies. People still come in and ask for special programs and flock in to anything the library manages to do. The one grant activity still in place is the Story Hour which draws crowds.

Eagle Pass cannot provide any special programs either, but the grant served its purpose. The library is a community meeting place. People come to town to run errands and they drop into the library for a half hour. The Spanish and bilingual collection is popular enough that a local family gave the library $20,000 for materials.

26

These two libraries were poorly funded, but during the five years of the Public
Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant, ten libraries struggled
with budget reduction threats during or immediately after the grant project.
Eight suffered staff shortages or actual staff reductions or staff freezes.
Ector County lost Regional Library System membership and reduced staff by half
in the year after its grant. Houston and Harris County were in a hiring freeze
and could not hire anyone for the grant; they contracted for project services.

Fort Worth lost staff and reduced library hours during the grant project, so
circulation dropped at Diamond Hill/Jarvis instead of increasing during the
grant year. Life Skills programs had no real audience. When the grant ended,
they ended. The programs were video taped and they are showing on cable. With
the grant, the library produced a fotonovella library information brochure. It
was produced late in the year, so it is just now bringing people into the
library.

Denton and Alice could not ask for matching money to fund a third year of their
grant projects because each city struggled with an extreme budget cut. Emily
Fowler Public Library hoped to apply for a third year grant. Without it the
library expected its MLK Recreation center to close, but RSVP took it over.
RSVP pays a retired librarian to keep the collection open 20 hours a week. RSVP
comes to the main library once a month to rotate materials. They ask people to
use the materials there; none circulate. The Center is the Reading is
Fundamental distribution point for that area.

The City of Alice could not match even a small amount to continue grant funding
for the Family Literacy classes, so the classes stopped with the grant. The
literacy class families, however, continue to come to the library and take books
home from the grant collection.

During the entire disadvantaged grant period, San Antonio has repeatedly reduced
library budget and staff. The Job Matching program at San Antonio's Pan
American Branch did well during its funding year. After the grant ended, the
library director took responsibility for coordinating volunteer speakers. She
committed money to maintain the career collection. Levi-Strauss donated $2,000
for Job Matching. The former program coordinator volunteered to work with
people on choosing jobs and she maintained the employment network. After two
years she moved on. The city reduced the library budget. A staff person left
and could not be replaced. The Branch Director said, "I could not run the
program and run the branch." The project fizzled out.

During 1991, Dallas Public Library prepared to reduce full services to just six
branches. All others would be circulating collections only. The City Council
decided against that measure, but by the time they declined, Dallas Public
Library staff were exhausted. No branch applied for a 1992 Disadvantaged grant;
they were without energy or hope, temporarily.

Despite the troubles, only one Dallas disadvantaged grant site answered "no,
but" about normal library services. Like San Antonio's Pan American branch,
Dallas West has been without grant funding for four years. Like San Antonio's
Pan American, Dallas West lost regular as well as grant staff in the years
following the grant. There was no one and no time to keep up all the special
events which the library produced during the grant year. But the community
leaders still come in and some new user comes in every time the library shows
the music video in the neighborhood.

30

"Yes"

Three programs who answered "yes," also lost staff at the end of the grant period. They continue with high hopes, but they sound like the Pan American director one year after funding ended.

Walking Books at North Loop in Austin trains a large volunteer corps. The volunteers are all strangers to the people they visit, so the library trains them to serve as reader advisors and non-threatening visitors. The Austin Junior League paid the coordinator's salary for one year then moved on to another interest. The City Council passed a resolution expressing support for Project Walking Books and acclaiming its great service to the homebound. It offered a budget trade. The city would hire the coordinator and the library would close all branches on Friday afternoon. The library director declined. G. K. Hall awarded the project $1,000 and a Large Print Outstanding Services to the Elderly award.

The branch director is supervising the volunteers. The former coordinator donates training for new volunteers. In terms of actual funding, the librarian uses 8.9% of the branch materials budget for a standing order for large print books and for replacing books, and 3.5% of the total budget for purchasing audio cassettes.

One year after the grant ended, the children's librarian at Walnut Hill describes his project much like the North Loop director. The integrated software, computer aided instruction continues once a week. The former paid coordinator volunteers weekly and the children's librarian now coordinates it. The city maintains the computers, prints advertising flyers, and uses 1% of materials budget for software.

Every African American business or professional organization in Dallas chooses to meet at the Martin Luther King. The library is still very visible in the neighborhood, but without extra staff, the librarian makes fewer of the visits to community services and organizations that marked the grant period.

Two projects which answered, "Yes, the grant services had become part of normal services," were programs which engendered lots of publicity and served the broader business community.

Corpus Christi's Career Center served so many people - from unemployed desperately seeking work, to employers desperately seeking workers - that the media loved it. When the City Council considered funding the center's coordinator, the users, jobseekers and business leaders came and testified. City Council added the center co-ordinator's salary to the 1989-1990 city budget.

The ESL Center in the Walnut Creek shopping center received similar attention in Garland. Business relations improved among the people who used the ESL Center. The shopping center held an international fair in honor of its many immigrants. A business organization called ECOLAB gave the branch three donations of $1,000 to $1,700 to maintain the ESL and foreign language collections. Individual businesses gave small donations.

Everyone else who answered "yes" talked about small responsive changes of collections and in services. All attracted the support they needed to continue.

Pearsall, attracting reluctant readers with alternative materials and friendly volunteers, received a $5,000 increase in the book budget, $3,000 to expand the Summer Reading Club and two half-time library assistants to help with the crowds after school.

Two projects transformed their collections with relevant materials. Two hired staff who speak the language. At Dallas's Walnut Hill all the staff speak some Spanish and 20% of the book budget now purchases Spanish language material. Spanish speakers convene in the library in Freeport where Brazoria County funds a half-time position for a Spanish-speaking aide and maintains the collection. The large print collection at Sweeny and the catalog produced with grant funds are so useful for surrounding small libraries that the Houston Area Library System granted system money to expand the collection so system members can borrow.

Franklin County's small project to take books to nursing homes used a half time library assistant to organize delivery and order large numbers of books. When the grant ended, the library divided an existing half-time position. The library aide spends one quarter time ordering and processing library materials and one quarter time managing the delivery service. The county judge liked all this.

The Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant Program did not completely achieve its purpose to make services to disadvantaged populations a part of normal library services.

One reason it did not was the interpretation of the word, "need" discussed in the section on Needs and Services. Had the criterion clearly asked for an assessment of the population's interests and activities, "What are they doing that the library can help them do," more projects would have been truly responsive. The responsive projects all continue.

The main reason projects did not continue, however, was a factor independent of program design. Twelve of the participating libraries were barely able to maintain or had to reduce existing services. Most of the participating libraries had limited financial and staff flexibility. Integrating new services into an established routine requires financial and staff flexibility. Without adequate funding for normal public library services, grant funded services remain grant dependent.

Length of funding does not seem to be a significant factor in making the new services normal library services. Of the 29 libraries surveyed for this section, nine had received funding for two years and one for three. Only two of those answered with an unequivocal "yes," that their project was now normal services with staff. Those projects, San Marcos and Corpus Christi's Career Center, continue with staff because the city had some funding flexibility and the library director was willing to ask for a half-time position. Adequate city or county budgets and the director's willingness to ask for position allow projects to continue.

32

OBSERVATIONS

This section is a compilation of the staff observations which are shown in *italics* throughout the rest of this report.

Number of Awards

The number of applicants dropped in 1991. Many social and economic factors may have contributed to that reduction, for example, the State Library and many local libraries reduced budgets that year. At the same time State Library promotion of the grant program lessened. Grant recipients, when interviewed, said that the workshop presented the first two years, *How To Plan Programs, How To Write Proposals*, inspired applications. It made people aware of the possibility of getting extra funding. They got excited about doing something. The Intergenerational Literacy Workshop, offered the third year, provided a program idea which several applicants emulated. Then the State Library did no workshop for the 1991 grant cycle and for 1992 did a workshop which neither inspired nor provided a program model.

To reduce printing and postage costs in 1990, the State Library stopped mailing the guidelines directly to all 446 libraries and 225 branches and began sending an announcement that the guidelines were available. Since then some libraries have missed the opportunity to apply. They either did not recognize what the notice was about or they waited too long to write for guidelines.

Populations Served

The two population groups which 65% of the applicants chose to serve, Adults with Less than 12 Years of School and People for Whom English is a Second Language, are the largest target population groups in Texas. Size of the populations was not, however, the only reason so many chose to serve those two groups. Forty percent of the project librarians wanted to do a particular kind of program. They selected a population which suited the program. They wanted to support a literacy program or to offer adult education or English as a Second Language classes. Or they wanted to do a Life Skills program, or a Job Information program and they believed that life skills or job and employment information answered the greatest needs of these people.

No one named Children of Migrant Workers as the group to serve. No one has mentioned them in the grant applications. The grant process itself provides no explanation as to why no one chooses to serve them.

Needs and Services

Eighty percent of the grant recipients did not ask members of the target population what they thought they needed. Instead, the librarians either decided themselves or they conferred with educators or social service providers. Fifty-six percent identified educational needs. Forty percent started with a service they wanted to provide and then picked a population to serve. Most then asked members of the population to confirm their decision. They did this with surveys which asked, "Would you like Spanish language materials in the library?" "Would you like classes to help your child to read?"

3̣3̣

Although the grant writer's intent in the second criterion was to inspire applicants to ask people about what they do, what they like, and what they seek in their every day life, the language of the criterion inspired a different response. The criterion reads, "The applicant describes clearly the target group and their special needs and how the library is not currently meeting those needs." "Need" is an ambiguous noun. "Need" suggests a great void asking to be filled. "Need" is a word the American Middle Class frequently translates into "education." This word misdirected many librarians to think in terms of programs to fill a deficit instead of asking the people, "What are you doing that the library can help you do?" As a result, many of the funded programs are more formally structured and less flexible than programs which respond to people's interest.

Individual Project Success

Two factors led to so many individual project successes. The criteria provided a step by step plan for developing a program. State Library staff followed the steps when helping applicants. Several librarians complained that writing the proposal was as difficult as passing a graduate class, but most recipients said that the completed application served as an action plan. It laid out what they were to do, and how and when they were to do it and they just did it. Most of the difficulties the projects encountered were situational: they came from the local situation and were not a product of faulty planning. The State Library's Special Services Consultant monitored the projects. When the local problems arose, the consultant helped project staff find effective ways to meet the objectives, develop successful methods to attract the service population, and spend the extra monies appropriately.

Normal Library Services

The Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant Program did not completely achieve its purpose to make services to disadvantaged populations a part of normal library services.

One reason it did not was the interpretation of the word, "need" discussed in the section on Needs and Services. Had the criterion clearly asked for an assessment of the population's interests and activities, "What are they doing that the library can help them do," more projects would have been truly responsive. The responsive projects all continue.

The main reason projects did not continue, however, was a factor independent of program design. Twelve of the participating libraries were barely able to maintain or had to reduce existing services. Most of the participating libraries had limited financial and staff flexibility. Integrating new services into an established routine requires financial and staff flexibility. Without adequate funding for normal public library services, grant funded services remain grant dependent.

3ᴸ

Length of funding does not seem to be a significant factor in making the new services normal library services. Of the 29 libraries surveyed for this section, nine had received funding for two years and one for three. Only two of those answered with an unequivocal "yes," that their project was now normal services with staff. Those projects, San Marcos and Corpus Christi's Career Center, continue with staff because the city had some funding flexibility and the library director was willing to ask for a half-time position. Adequate city or county budgets and the director's willingness to ask for position allow projects to continue.

Last Look

The last observation on the Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations Grant Program might best be a look at Liberty Public Library. The Director of Liberty Public Library just wanted money to support her literacy program. She sent staff to the *How To Plan Programs, How To Write Proposals* workshop. Staff came home and told her the only way a literacy program could get funding with this grant was to offer library services that Adults with Less than 12 Years of School really wanted. So staff went out to talk to the community. They asked people about how they spend their lives, about what they like to do and what they want to know.

Staff described the need as impoverishment, or a need for visual and social entertainment. For the grant application, Liberty developed an elaborate program to have displays and events and family entertainments for literacy students and their families. So, Liberty won a grant.

Then, the roof leaked and all services were severely hampered. Then the Extension Agency, which was supposed to develop many of the programs, did not fulfill its contract. Then the City of Liberty attempted to reduce its budget across the board by cutting staff. The librarian warned the city council that if they reduced her staff, she would have to cancel this grant project and return the money. City council did not reduce her staff.

As a result of all the above, many of the entertainments were not produced. But enough was done to transform the library's clientele. The librarian reported that they had dirty people in the library and noisy people in the library. They had families with unruly children. They had people who, until then, had believed the library was for someone else, not for them. People had come to the library to laugh and play, to look at quilts and to hear stories told.

At the end of the grant year, the city council hired the literacy coordinator as library staff.

35

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Phone Number _____

In <year> you had a Public Library Services to Disadvantaged Populations grant to serve <target group>. I would like to ask you about the grant project and about what has happened since it ended.

1. Why did you choose this particular group?

2. Were the people who used these services really members of this group?

3. If not, who were they?

4. Was there local support for this project? What kind?

5. Did the city or county ever put money into this program?

How much?

Into what?

6. What is left of the program?

Activities:

Staff:

Equipment:

Materials:

7. Why did it succeed?

8. Why did it fail?

36

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS
GRANT GUIDELINES

CRITERIA FOR AWARD

This grant program is competitive. To choose which of many projects to fund,
the Library Services and Construction Act Advisory Council will score proposals
on eleven components which the council and state library staff believe are key
factors in successful services to disadvantaged populations. The total possible
score is 100. The factors are:

Percentage   Percentage the disadvantaged group is of the TOTAL population in
of   the geographical area served by the library or branch library
Population   which will provide the services. (0-10 points)

Target   The applicant describes clearly the target group and describes
Group   the information and pleasure they seek and the language, format,
Involvement   style and location of services they desire; has verified that
                the target community wants the proposed new services (e.g., by
                doing a community survey or by involving individuals or community
                organizations in project planning, etc.) and provides
                documentation of community involvement in designing the proposed
                services. (0 - 15 points)

                                        or

                For Services to Persons over 65 in Resident Facilities or
                Community Centers: The applicant describes the need for proposed
                services; has verified that the custodians in the institution
                agree to and help plan the proposed services; and provides
                documentation that the custodians will cooperate.

Services   The applicant describes services, programs, activities, material
                to be purchased; shows how these meet the community's documented
                needs described above; and describes how new activities will be
                introduced into existing services and to existing staff.
                (0 - 15 points)

Objectives   The applicant defines objectives which are measurable;
                demonstrates how project objectives will help meet the objectives
                of the local library funding agency (and/or objectives of any
                other local agency involved in the project); and presents a
                reasonable method to collect data. (0 - 10 points)

37

Staffing	The applicant has already selected potential staff and volunteers for the grant project, or presents official job descriptions for hiring staff during the grant year who have these characteristics: they have status in the target community, speak the language of the community, demonstrate enthusiasm about working with the community, and possess the necessary skills to do the job; the applicant has made a plan and included expenses for training or sending to library school (if the governing agency has authority to do that) personnel who are members of the targeted group and lack necessary skills. (0 - 10 points)
Advertising	The applicant submits a plan for advertising the new services, activities, and materials; the plan uses a variety of techniques; and includes community lines of communication. (0 - 5 points)
Timetable	The applicant presents a timetable for project activities within the fiscal year, i.e., a list of actions with a date by which they will be accomplished; and provides verification that facilities will be available, equipment and materials delivered, staff hired and trained in time to carry out the activities as planned. (0 - 5 points)
Expenses Justified	The applicant fully explains the budget by describing how budget items will be used in providing services and quotes a source for the stated cost (e.g., city pay classification for staff, manufacturer's catalogs or city/county bid lists for equipment, dealer's estimates for materials); justifies large or extraordinary costs for capital equipment or leasing in terms of the situation, supplier, or prevailing conditions; the costs seem reasonable to achieve project objectives. (0 - 10 points)
Local Support	The applicant offers local support for the grant project (matching funds in cash or in-kind services); integrates local resources in the grant project, (e.g., assigns locally funded staff to the project); and submits a plan for generating local funds to continue the services after the grant funding ends. (0 - 10 points)
Evaluation	The applicant presents a method to evaluate the impact of the project on the library; on the community; and on any cooperating group. If the project proposes to educate individuals, the applicant describes educational outcomes and how they will be measured. (0 - 5 points)
Cooperation	The applicant planned the project with some other agency (another public agency, a volunteer organization, a community organization); negotiated an agreement on who would do what during this project; and submits the agreement. (0 - 5 points)

39