

# **Public Library partnerships: Mission-driven Tools for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Success**

*Glen E. Holt*  
*St. Louis Public Library*

**Bertelsmann Foundation Publishers**  
**Gütersloh 1999**

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	3
Rationale for the paper .....	3
Method of the paper .....	3
<b>The Importance of Library Partnerships</b> .....	5
Contributions of the paper .....	6
Method of the paper .....	6
Partnerships to fulfill institutional mission .....	7
<b>SLPL Partnerships</b> .....	8
Training Partnerships .....	8
Funding Partnerships .....	9
Information dissemination / Development partnerships .....	12
Program development partnerships .....	14
Partnerships to build and share audiences .....	15
Research partnerships .....	17
Political alliances .....	20
<b>Library Partnerships in Many Nations</b> .....	23
Training partnerships .....	23
Funding partnerships .....	23
Information dissemination / Development partnerships .....	25
Program development partnerships .....	26
Partnerships to build and share audiences .....	27
Research and product development partnerships .....	27
Political alliances .....	27
<b>Managing Partnerships to Match Institutional Mission</b> .....	29
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	35
<b>Notes</b> .....	36
<b>Author</b> .....	39

## Executive Summary

This paper is an overview and an action outline for how public libraries may use partnerships to further their institutional mission. Partnerships can serve as a mission-driven library tool to help improve library services and to enhance the effectiveness of business operations.

### Rationale for the paper

The study was undertaken because partnerships are growing in number and significance in the libraries of the nations in the European Union, North America, Australia and New Zealand. Partnerships increase because networked computers create the need for cooperation among different government authorities and public libraries and because national and state government officials, recognizing the transforming power of new networked technology, have pushed local public libraries into new partnership arrangements. They also increase because of the need to share limited public resources and to meet the public's demand for one-stop services that no single library can provide alone. Finally, partnerships increase because libraries often have difficulty playing their increased equity role without help and because they want to play significant roles in community, state and national communications infrastructures.

This paper provides both a context for and an outline of steps to be taken to establish successful library partnerships. It is designed to help library leaders think about partnerships, conceptualize how partnerships fit into their own operations and how to take the steps to establish, organize and manage public library partnerships.

### Method of the paper

The method of the paper is narrative analysis. The analysis is organized into three major parts.

First, there is a discussion of several partnerships established by the author's library. This discussion includes origins, purposes, management, operations and results of part-

nerships. As part of this discussion, the partnerships are organized into a typology by the strategic purposes that brought them into existence.

Second there is a section on examples of library partnerships in the UK, North America, the EU and Australia and New Zealand. All but one of the seven types of SLPL partnerships are in existence within the library culture of nations other than the United States. The exception is discussed as a function of the differences and similarities between library culture in the US and other nations.

Third , there is a how-to-do-it framework for the establishment and management of public library partnerships.

The paper's conclusion reiterates the importance of partnerships as a library strategic tool.

## The Importance of Library Partnerships

Since the inception of public libraries, librarians have established all kinds of cooperative alliances. As one German librarian noted recently, “For many public libraries cooperation is not a completely new way of thinking and acting. Working together with other institutions has been essential and crucial for effective library work in the past decades.”<sup>1</sup>

In recent decades, library partnerships – the term I will use throughout this paper as the name for these various alliances – have grown in number and significance. Six factors have contributed to this increase. First, networked computers have created the need for cooperation among different government authorities and public libraries. Second, related to the first point, national and state government officials, recognizing the transforming power of new networked technology, have pushed local public libraries into new partnership arrangements. Third, because of limits on public resources, including recent down-sizing, “every public institution has to look for potential partners in order to maintain or to improve its services.” Fourth, “the public is becoming used to all-in-one services although no single institution can provide them.”<sup>2</sup> Fifth, citizens and policy-makers alike believe that public libraries ought to play an “equity role” in ensuring that society’s poorer citizens do not suffer from “information disenfranchisement.” Sixth, public library leaders want to prove that with new networked computers they can be “serious players in the communications infrastructure.”<sup>3</sup>

Whether public libraries initiate partnerships or are forced into them, joined self-interest is at the heart of partnership successes. Partnerships are successful when each partner gains more by working with another than by working alone. The partners may gain unequally, but each must be able to measure or to at least sense the gain. Whether formal or informal, all partnerships are relationships that need appropriate planning and sound operating principles if they are to avoid sour endings.

The recent push for library partnerships is international in scope. A new incentive in the United States is the Museum and Library Services Act of 1996. This federal law sets up a new Institute for Museum and Library Services and authorizes millions of dollars over the next several years to support partnerships between local libraries and museums.<sup>4</sup>

The federal pressure for public libraries to enter partnerships is significant in other nations as well. The UK’s partnership efforts are seen in publications like *New library: The people’s network* and *The national grid for learning*.<sup>5</sup> The UK’s latest publication,

the November 1998 *Building the new library network*, contains a dozen significant policy recommendations about partnerships, ranging from greater cooperation among different levels of government in disseminating public information to public-private funding of library projects.<sup>6</sup>

Australia and New Zealand go forward with expansive library-service partnerships between state and local governments.<sup>7</sup> And, European Union leaders push library partnerships to help set the path for their new federation. PubliCA, sub-titled "the concerted action for public libraries", is just one among several EU library policy initiatives. One of its implicit purposes is the development of more public library partnerships.<sup>8</sup>

## Contributions of the paper

This paper makes three contributions to international library literature.

First, it provides a case study of the efforts of one North American public library to use partnerships to further its institutional mission. International library literature contains many reports on partnerships but little on how partnerships can be formed and managed. This publication provides information on the processes of one library's formation and management of partnerships.

Second, the publication provides multiple examples of public library partnerships in the USA, Canada, UK, EU and Australia and New Zealand.

Third, the article presents a how-to-do-it outline of the steps in organizing and managing partnerships.

The latter outline draws heavily from a 1997 Urban Library Council publication, *Leading the way: Partnering for success*.<sup>9</sup> One of a series of ULC's *Library staff development series*, this videotape-based, field-tested curriculum kit can be used by library trainers to teach other organizational staff how to create and manage partnerships. Library trainers will find that the outline overlays the ULC materials, or they may wish to develop or adopt other materials using the outline as a starting point.

## Method of the paper

The method of the paper is narrative analysis. The analysis is organized into three parts.

First, I discuss several SLPL partnerships, their origins, purposes, management, operations and results. As part of this discussion, I have organized the partnerships into a typology by the strategic purposes that brought them into existence.

Second, I present examples of library partnerships in the UK, North America, the EU and Australia and New Zealand within the case-study typology. All but one of the seven types of SLPL partnerships are in existence within the library culture of nations other than the United States. I note the exception and comment on its differences and similarity to the SLPL partnership illustrations.

Third, I provide a how-to-do-it framework for the establishment and management of public library partnerships.

## Partnerships to fulfill institutional mission

Institutional mission should drive all library activities. The reason for seeking out or taking on new partners is to accomplish mission.

The SLPL mission statement is as simple as it is brief:<sup>10</sup>

The St. Louis Public Library will provide learning resources and information services that support and improve individual, family and community life. To support this mission, the library will organize and prudently manage its resources to:

- Ensure that the library's resources are available to all
- Promote use of the library
- Assist children and adults with life-long learning
- Promote literacy for all ages
- Assist individuals in finding jobs and educational opportunities
- Assist businesses with their development and growth
- Provide current information
- Provide recreational reading resources, media materials, and programs
- Promote public use of modern information technology.

Each partnership must help a library carry out its mission. Several SLPL partnerships support more than one goal. The role of partnerships in fulfilling mission is significant because libraries may find partnership opportunities that are not relevant to their institutional missions. English writer Samuel Butler (1835–1902) reminded us how to behave in such settings when he wrote, “An open mind is all very well in its way, but it ought not to be so open that there is no keeping anything in or out of it. It should be capable of shutting its doors sometimes, or it may be found a little draughty.”<sup>11</sup> Or, put simply, some partnerships ought not to happen.

# SLPL Partnerships

## Training Partnerships

Training staff to become more adept at the skills necessary for outstanding customer and support-services is a necessity in modern libraries.<sup>12</sup> Some US library training budgets now approximate the 5 percent of gross salary that many North American corporations are spending on this effort.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the public wants libraries to expand the training provided to them, especially training to find and manage electronic information available through networked computers.

SLPL has responded by vastly increasing its training efforts. Hardly a day passes without a training class for public and/or staff somewhere in the system.<sup>14</sup> In the process of organizing this training effort, SLPL had to obtain training skills not available on staff. Two efforts to obtain outside training expertise resulted in long-term partnerships.

*Focus St. Louis.* Five years ago, when SLPL administrators wanted all staff to engage in the development of an institutional values statement, they turned to Focus St. Louis, a region-wide, leadership-training program whose associates are experts in group facilitation. Since then Focus St. Louis facilitators have played resource, organization and facilitation roles in SLPL training, providing special strengths in meeting the needs of adult learners and authoring documents for SLPL in-service training.

*St. Louis Community College.* When SLPL began to become involved heavily in technology training, library administrators contracted with the area community college to provide computer hardware and software trainers. The use of these trainers brought knowledgeable and timely instruction without increasing permanent staff costs.

Although these training relationships are contractual, each of them has involved introducing new kinds of experts into the core of library operations. Without these extensive training relationships, the library would not have been able to move forward so quickly to improved management and enhanced ability to delivery services to constituents.



## Funding Partnerships

Private-sector fund-raising is increasingly a tool of North American library financial management, and the trend is growing in some other parts of the world. The basic theme of library funding partnerships is always the same: the institution obtains new resources, and the donor gains association with an effective, high-visibility, public-service organization working to improve the quality of community life. At SLPL funding partnerships are an important financial tool.

*Anheuser-Busch Companies.* The Anheuser-Busch Companies, headquartered in the City of St. Louis, contribute actively to the cultural and educational life of the community. SLPL's relationship with A-B began in the fall of 1987 when library board members and the director appealed to the corporation to donate to a fund that would pay for a political campaign to win a tax-increase referendum. With the new tax revenues, library leaders promised, they would begin solving their own institutional problems and would build the infrastructure to provide essential reading and information services to city constituents.

A-B, with its international offices and oldest brewing plant in the City, donated \$25,000 to make the successful appeal to voters to increase their property taxes to support the library. A-B made another \$25,000 donation to support SLPL in its successful 1994 tax-increase referendum campaign. The intriguing point about these A-B gifts is that passage of the two tax initiatives increased the brewing and entertainment giant's local property taxes. This increase was substantial since A-B is one of the largest property-tax payers in the City of St. Louis.

The Library's next major "ask" to Anheuser-Busch was for funds to support SLPL's creation of year-round programs in African-American history and culture. This request began when the library's director of development asked an Anheuser-Busch Community Relations Department executive to help plan the new year-round program. Most U.S. libraries celebrate Black History Month in February of each year, but they do not sustain year-round African-American programming. A-B donated \$50,000 to underwrite the major new all-year programming initiative, and its knowledgeable Community Relations executive shared in the responsibilities for organizing the program.

A-B's rationale for the gift was two-fold. First, the company's leaders thought that St. Louis' African-American community deserved year-round programming that celebrated their history and culture, and they wanted to be associated with the library's development of this community education initiative. Second, one of their company executives had a hand in shaping the character of the first year's events. When donors help shape the terms of their donation, giving can certainly be spoken of as a funding partnership.

This library funding partnership with St. Louis's biggest home-grown Fortune 500 company illustrates how a library can start a fund-raising relationship one way and take it another. It illustrates how a library can use the theme of "wanting to solve its own problems" and can go back to the same partner and ask for funds to support a different philanthropic effort.

These fund-raising themes have applications beyond the United States. Donors of any nationality like to give to successful cultural institutions and those laying out specific plans to solve their own problems. They like to fund innovation, especially when it involves market groups in which the company has particular interests. In public libraries anywhere, library good works and solidly-based appeals can attract private-sector support.<sup>15</sup> And, donors can be transformed into philanthropic partners, involved in making sure that the donation succeeds.

*Price-Waterhouse.* In 1987, it became clear that the SLPL's Finance Office needed a complete overhaul. The problem was complex: The library needed a new computerized accounting system and at the same time it needed an evaluation of future staff needs and effective accounting controls. The problem called for high-priced analysis and greater expertise than the library had the ability to determine or the funds to pay for.

An SLPL Board member initiated the discussion that led to a critical partnership. The board member, an attorney who specialized in tax law, called an associate at the St. Louis office of the accounting firm of Price-Waterhouse to lay out the library's financial management problems.

Price-Waterhouse responded, donating the services of one of its certified-public-accountant consultants to take over management of the SLPL Finance Office during its critical transition. For a period of more than a year, the Price-Waterhouse certified public accountant (CPA) worked as an SLPL executive staff member while being paid by his employer. Before the library completed the transition with the hiring of a highly qualified CPA as its new chief finance officer, the Price-Waterhouse "pro bono"<sup>16</sup> or "in-kind"<sup>17</sup> time donation amounted to over \$100,000.

The Price-Waterhouse example serves to make the point that individuals and businesses alike often are willing to give time or the products they manufacture rather than donate money. Price Waterhouse's pro bono gift became a funding partnership with the accounting corporation contributing the time of an expert to benefit the library and thereby the City's welfare, and the library utilized the donated staff member as if he were on the payroll.

*Commerce Bankshares.* In 1991 the library board mandated the search for a site on which to construct an expanded Julia Davis Branch Library. At that time, the branch was housed in a 2,000 SF building. The goal was to make Julia Davis into a "regional branch" that would anchor library services on one side of the city.

The search proved frustrating. Available commercial sites were few in number and expensive. Then the library's new facilities manager began talking with his former boss, the head of property management at Commerce Bankshares. The initial questions were, Did Commerce know of any available sites that would meet the library's site needs? And, Would Commerce donate the funds to acquire a site?

As the discussions were moved higher in the organizations, involving the library's director and the bank's head of community affairs, a partnership emerged. The first step occurred in late 1992 when the bank donated to the library a vacant lot adjacent to its

major north-side branch. A shared parking lot symbolized for the public the cooperative relationship between the two institutions.

On February 14, 1993, the new 16,000 SF branch opened. Over the next year, Commerce modernized the adjacent bank branch, restoring the structure's historic interior to its original condition when it opened as a neighborhood savings-and-loan bank seventy years earlier.

Over the next decade, the Commerce Bankshares-SLPL partnership bloomed. On several occasions, the corporation's philanthropic foundation funded library programs: an expansion of beginning literacy and reading programs for area daycare centers, travel and honoraria for well-known authors to speak at the library, and special African-American children's programs. It also came to involve discussions between the officials of the two institutions about how they could work together to further improve the neighborhoods where they both had locations. This public-private partnership became a rich synergism in the true meaning of that word.

*Friends of the St. Louis Public Library.* In conversations between library directors, friends' groups usually are portrayed in extremes, either as a joy or an organizational cancer. The best of the friends' groups operate profitable bookstores or gift shops, host fund-raisers and sponsor special events that build their own numbers and more general support for the library. At the other end of the spectrum, friends' groups become overtly political, attempt to dictate library policy and micromanage parts of an institution's life.

At SLPL, we speak openly about the library's partnership with the members of the Friends of the St. Louis Public Library. We do so even though the nearly 1,300 Friends constitute a membership organization with whom the library deals almost entirely through direct mail advertising and special events.

A new Friends prospect, identified from mailing lists traded with or purchased from other cultural institutions, typically will get three or four mailings through a year asking that person to consider a library Friend's membership. For a new Friend membership, the library typically gives in return an item with a library logo on it (an acrylic mug is the lowest current premium, a high-quality Friends of the Library-logo T-shirt is at a higher level). At all but the lowest levels, frequent-flyer miles on Trans World Airlines, St. Louis's dominant air carrier, are part of the initial membership premium and each year's membership renewal after that.

Along with these premiums, Friends receive multiple mailings, including the library's monthly newsletter and invitations to numerous special events. They also are invited to increase the level of their support and donate to special projects. Through the years, experimenting with countless mailings, SLPL has discovered that its Friends most want the chance to listen to and meet nationally and internationally known authors. Now organized as the "Signature Series," over the past two years, this annual set of special appearances has included best-selling authors like Gail Sheey, Mary Higgins Clark, David McCullough, David Halberstram, Susan Sontag and Toni Morrison. Virtually the entire cost of this series – including honoraria and travel expenses – is paid for with net income from the Friends of the St. Louis Public Library.

To sum up, SLPL's partnership with its Friends is one in which the soliciting friend is dominant, but also one where each individual Friends' member gets good value in distinctive premiums and opportunities to attend special events with some of North America's best-known authors. This partnership has lasted half a decade now, with more persons becoming Friends each year, higher attendance at author appearances and more funding to support high visibility library events. It is a partnership in which both sides get what they want for their resource investment.

### Information dissemination / Development partnerships

*Gale Publishing and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh.* In 1995, representatives of Gale, a major US publisher of reference tools, asked SLPL and the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh (CLP) to enter into a partnership to develop a new popular-trivia CD-ROM reference database for the public library market.

During this partnership, as part of their regular reference work, SLPL and CLP reference staff verified the correctness of hundreds of trivia "facts." For the contributed time of staff, Gale gave SLPL full acknowledgement in the publication and the publicity surrounding its issue and several free CD versions of the final product to use on its reference-material computers. In the process, work that the SLPL reference staff does locally on an ongoing basis helped create a nationally-distributed reference product needed by other libraries.<sup>18</sup> It was a partnership in which all three partners won in the enhancement of their organizational image and/or financially.

*St. Louis County Library.* One of SLPL's longest running and most successful partnerships exists because of the conservative character of library boards in the State of Missouri. When videos first appeared decades ago, SLPL and the neighboring St. Louis County Library (SLCL) established a cooperative purchasing program so that each system purchased different videos, which then were very expensive. Each system allowed cardholders in the other system to reserve and borrow those videos without cost. A simple inter-system van-delivery schedule supported this resource-sharing arrangement.

In 1993 the two boards extended their joint video checkout policy into a full-scale reciprocal-lending agreement. The policy allows cardholders in either system to check out items from the other system and to return items from both systems to any location in either system. The system whose users check out and/or lose the most materials has to pay the other library's cost of lost materials and 25 cents per item for all items checked out by users from the other system, in excess of the numbers borrowed by patrons from the other system. Both boards thereby can say truthfully that they were not "giving away" materials to another system without getting something in return, and they were not paying for the books lost by users from the other system. Paying the financial "balance" between the two systems has never amounted to more than \$25,000 annually, a small figure within annual budgets of \$20 million for each system.

The biggest winners of this SLPL/SLCL partnership are the resident users of both the City and the County. In each case the number of items and the number of places they can check out and return materials doubled, enriching their reading and study opportunities and matching their mobile lifestyles.

The SLPL/SLCL reciprocity agreement is summarized here not as a progressive example of partnerships but one in which the members of two well-intentioned library boards, working in a very constrained political situation, found a way to share their materials without causing political controversy.

*Electronic City Hall.* Electronic City Hall is a content destination on SLPL's Internet website. The page contains key-word-searchable full text of all city ordinances passed by the Board of Aldermen since 1994, field searchable indexing to ordinances going back to 1990 and (soon) a subject index of all city ordinances before then going back to the beginning of the city in the 1820s. In addition, Electronic City Hall contains key-word-searchable full text of the *Revised Code of the City of St. Louis* and the *Charter of the City of St. Louis*.<sup>19</sup>

In May 1998, SLPL added access to the daily minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Aldermen.<sup>20</sup> After that came all the license applications for the Office of License Collector.<sup>21</sup> An old anti-fraud law makes it necessary to apply for all licenses in person at the License Collector's Office in City Hall. The City License posting, however, lets each person meet all requirements before going to that City Hall office. And, since the Internet site is available at all branch libraries, those without computers can obtain the information before making a single stop bringing everything needed to fulfill the requirements for a license.

In St. Louis, the library is an "independent instrumentality," not a department of City Hall. Consequently the setting up of the ordinances and licenses pages at the SLPL website involved complex partnerships with other city agencies. The President of the Board of Aldermen, The City License Collector and the Counselor to the Board of Aldermen, the first two elected and the second appointed, all had to be treated as potential partners to bring up the current content of Electronic City Hall. One of the most significant library contributions in mounting this material turned out to be the "reference interviews" that library staff did with agency staff and potential users about what they needed from Electronic City Hall. These discussions made the electronic materials relatively easy to use.

Outstanding public libraries provide their users with essential information.<sup>22</sup> The electronic information products currently mounted at SLPL's Electronic City Hall were worth the time and effort invested in them because this information is essential for all citizens. Lawyers and citizens needing local ordinance information now get it the same way they do federal and state statutes and reports – from electronic searches rather than wading through paper indexes.

The electronic posting of the requirements for City Licenses received the same kind of favorable reaction from lawyers, from entrepreneurs new to the City and from library

staff who often are the first point for questions about how businesses can be started. Like the ordinances, the license project made essential information easy to access.

Along with the gratitude of users, the SLPL Electronic City Hall project brought an unanticipated impact: an enormous improvement in the morale of the City Hall staff who have to furnish these essential pieces of information to a demanding public on a day-to-day basis. Aldermen and their staff called and wrote library staff to thank them for making their job easier.

## Program development partnerships

SLPL enjoys partnerships with many service agencies with program and staff expertise different from the library.

*BJC Healthcare System.* BJC is the region's largest health maintenance organization. It is affiliated with the Washington University School of Medicine, which houses departments in nearly all North American medical specialties along with schools of nursing and dentistry.

In 1996 the library's director of development brought BJC's director of community information programs to the table to discuss possible joint programs. The eventual result was a highly successful senior-citizen health-information program with instruction by nursing professionals from BJC at SLPL branches. BJC provided a donation of \$10,000 to cover printing and publicity costs. SLPL staff designed materials, used its direct mail lists to attract audiences, compiled bibliographies of materials that participants could check out and hosted the events.

In setting up this partnership, BJC served its community programming function by providing excellent medical information to senior citizens, and SLPL was able to provide its constituents high-quality information from professionals not affiliated with the library. The program series has proved highly popular with seniors who see it as a neighborhood-oriented program to help them stay healthy and/or to deal sensibly with their personal health problems.

*The Muny.* The St. Louis Municipal Opera, or the "Muny" as it is popularly known, has been an annual regional entertainment since 1914. Producing 6-8 extravagant popular musicals each summer for nightly audiences of over 10,000 in a giant outdoor amphitheater in Forest Park, the Muny is one of the region's best-loved cultural institutions.

Like so many older urban institutions, however, the Muny's audience through the years has gotten older and more suburban. In 1994 the Muny created "First Stage," an adjunct experimental theater group of talented young artists who would provide exciting theatrical programs to younger audiences. The Muny had the concept and the talent. It needed venues.

The Muny First Stage organizers started meeting with the Youth Services and Marketing staff of the St. Louis Public Library. What came out of this effort was "From the

Page to the Stage,” a series of neighborhood theater productions that helped kids write and produce dramatic productions. Part of the program was repeated events at which youth actors from the Muny presented dramatic works in the intimate settings of neighborhood branch library meeting rooms. The excited and appreciative audiences for the productions usually averaged about one hundred persons, mostly youth but with parents and caregivers along as well.

The library promoted the events with its audience-generation tools. SLPL Youth Services staff researched and published bibliographies around each production. Staff also sometimes told related stories or did associated book talks before or after the productions. The result: Many city kids not only were exposed to play writing and production but they got to see their own work transformed from “their page to the branch library stage.” The Muny completed the process by giving away free tickets to its regular productions to the neighborhood youth who participated, thereby building its future audiences.

The result was as simple as it was elegant. The Muny engaged youngsters in drama and built its audiences. The Library engaged youngsters in reading about, seeing, writing about and producing drama and demonstrated neighborhood branches as community cultural resources. And the children of St. Louis got a rich personal experience with theater that they would not have had otherwise.

*YMCA (Young Men’s Christian Organization).* The Y has created for itself a broad inner-city literacy mission. One program to fulfill this mission is Babies with Books. In this program, the Y posts volunteers at pre-natal and children’s clinics to talk with low-income mothers. Each year the Y gives away about 18,000 books to such mothers and helps them start at-home programs to help their children get ready to read and to learn how to read. Finally, one YMCA program goal is to sign up each mother for a library card.

The library helped plan this program and has been the Y’s principal partner in it since 1993. SLPL Youth Services staff provide training for Y volunteer literacy trainers. The library provides card applications. The library also serves as host at many of its branches to literacy tutors helping low-income children (and sometimes their parents) as they learn how to read.

SLPL is the big gainer in its partnership with the Y Babies with Books program. It is an example of how the library’s continuing modest support helps a library partner to fulfill its own mission while promoting library programs and use. Both the Y and the library have been big winners from this program development partnership.

## Partnerships to build and share audiences

*St. Louis Baseball Cardinals.* All of North American major league baseball suffers from the same audience problem: Although its players increasingly are Latino,

African-American and, more recently, Asian, the baseball audience is almost entirely white – and it is aging.

In 1991, the director of SLPL called the marketing office of the Baseball Cardinals and asked for a few tickets as premiums to help spur kids to read 15 books as part of the library's Summer Reading Club. Out of that call has come a partnership which in Summer 1999 will result in St. Louis Public Library buying \$10,000 in radio advertising on the Cardinals Sports Network. In return, the library will receive numerous PSAs on radio, television and on the huge electronic screens during home games, several on-field appearances by library mascot Theo Thesaurus, several visits to library branches by Cardinals baseball players, Cardinal-logo merchandise like gloves and bats and 10,000 free Cardinals tickets. The total contributed value from the Cardinals will be nearly \$120,000, nearly double the team's contribution to the library in 1998.

The Cardinals' generosity is as practical as it is wonderful for St. Louis kids. Since the Cardinals-Library partnership began, minority attendance counts at Busch Stadium games has increased measurably. Just as kids take their parents to shopping centers and to libraries, once they get used to going to baseball games, they take their parents there too. The library also is a winner. Through each of the summers of 1998 and 1999, 18,000 kids participated in the library's reading club. That amounts to just under one-third of all the school-age children in St. Louis.

The Cardinals-Library audience-building partnership is a success story for both clubs. It is a partnership in which the kids of St. Louis have won as well, as they shared in the excitement of summer reading and were able to take an adult to exciting baseball games.

*Media Partnerships.* SLPL's 350,000 immediate constituents are 47 percent African-American, 47 percent Caucasian and 4 percent "other," primarily recent Latino and Asian immigrants. As part of its mission, SLPL is proactive in its communication. It mails its monthly "Check It Out!" newsletter to 54,000 households and distributes another eight thousand monthly as counter pieces at its locations and handouts at special events. SLPL also regularly runs a neighborhood billboard advertising campaign and a bus-card and light-rail-transit-card campaign. It regularly runs paid 30-second advertisements promoting its services, usually in humorous ways, on six radio stations, three with predominantly white and three with predominantly black audiences. Each of the six stations targets women aged 24–55. This demographic group almost always takes the lead in family use of United States public libraries.

SLPL would like to do more library-use promotions on television, but the relatively high costs of placing those advertisements almost always is prohibitive. However, because of SLPL's connections with the St. Louis Baseball Cardinals, the library in 1994 made contact with KPLR-Channel 11, a local independent channel that broadcasts most Cardinals games.

The relationship began with the TV station allowing its "Kids 11" troop, a popular and talented pre-teen and teen dance group, to appear at a SLPL giant party kicking off the annual Summer Reading Club. The station was delighted at the size and the response of the 2,000-person crowd that the library had gathered through its own promotional



efforts, especially through its “Club Read” directed at pre-teens and teens. The SLPL event audience – teens and pre-teens, obviously hip and savvy and just as obviously “up” on music and TV as on their support for the library – proved to be exactly the same audience that Channel 11 wanted to pull toward its own market.

The TV station’s largess opened. Channel 11’s creative staff created a series of contemporary PSAs promoting library programs and resources. One of the Library’s mascots, the overstuffed and nerdy Theo Thesaurus, was invited to appear at several “11 Kids” programs. Theo’s rave reviews came partially from his trendy behavior. Inside the costume was a young woman dancer probably already on her way to a professional career. With her talent and knowledge, Theo could teach kids dance steps that some of them had never seen before.

Channel 11 recognizes that SLPL has regular and stable access to an audience the communication outlet wants to reach. The Library recognizes that Channel 11 has the broadcasting power to reach out and attract new audiences and to add value to relationships with continuing users that SLPL could not afford without the donation of production, talent and broadcasting time from the television station.

The Channel 11 partnership epitomizes a set of media partnerships that SLPL has with its radio stations and some print outlets. The list of SLPL media partners is a long one. And their contribution of production and broadcast time is quite substantial, amounting to more than \$260,000 of in-kind value annually.<sup>23</sup>

This contributed advertising results from the \$100,000 that SLPL spends annually on its own paid advertising program. This investment sets up a situation so that stations that end up with unsold advertising spots give extra spots and/or produce and air public-service announcements for the library. For SLPL in 1997–98, every \$1 spent on media advertising brought a return of \$2.50 in donated advertising. With this kind of a bottom line, it is easy to conclude that “altogether SLPL’s communications partnerships have resulted in getting media pros to help tell the library story effectively and at good value to the institution.”<sup>24</sup>

## Research partnerships

As the current Bertelsmann Networker project demonstrates, there is an enormous need for public libraries to undertake applied research that is vital to their own futures. SLPL has an applied research tradition that extends back many years.<sup>25</sup> In the past decade, this research tradition has grown to become a major factor in the life of the institution.<sup>26</sup> Partnerships are basic to the SLPL research effort.

*Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville.* SLPL’s partnership with the social science and behavioral science faculty at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville (SIU-E) is based on contract work for hire, a respectable aside for all academic professionals. In each of its research projects, SLPL has raised the funds from a third party or paid for the research out of its own operating expenses. In almost every case, the SLPL funds have

been used to hire graduate students working under the supervision of their professors, with some modest per-diem consulting fees to the principal researchers involved. The academics, however, do get to use data from the SLPL studies to further their academic careers – within the limits of national and federal confidentiality laws.

Research partnership began with the study of St. Louis demography, an attempt to describe inter-census population movements in an effort to tailor branch services to distinctive neighborhood cohorts. This demographic research went in two directions. The first involved SLPL staff overlaying census-track population counts on the geography of library check-outs as measured by library system computer transactions. This staff exercise resulted in a significant policy document allowing library management to better tailor services to meet neighborhood population needs.<sup>27</sup>

The second demographic research direction started with SLPL staff attempted to define cohort movement and characteristics even as the detailed data from the 1990 Federal census grew more out of date. The need for current statistics led to estimation, and that led to the principal demographer at SIU-E. Before this project ended, it had yielded not only current demographic estimates for the population of the City of St. Louis but also the development of the SLPL Geographic Information System, which as soon as it was developed, was offered to the public. When information about this evolution was diffused through the library world, SLPL received recognition as the first public library in the United States to have mounted such a system for its own work and for the use of researchers from the general public.<sup>28</sup>

*SLPL, Southern Illinois University and the Public Library Association.* In 1994, the SLPL Board of Directors expressed interest in finding out if the economic benefits of public investment in library services could be measured statistically. Responding to that request and one from the Urban Libraries Council as well, SLPL's executive director undertook the research.<sup>29</sup> As his co-principal investigator on this project, he selected Professor Don Elliott, chair of the department of Economics at SIU-E.

By June 1996, this project had proceeded sufficiently to obtain a research grant from the Public Library Association.<sup>30</sup> Using these funds, the SLPL executive director and Professor Elliott, working with other library staff members, developed a matrix of services, tested this matrix with focus groups, then developed a telephone questionnaire. Other SIU-E Marketing Department and Behavioral Sciences staff were consulted to develop and administer the telephone survey questionnaire to a random sample of SLPL users.

The study yielded statistically significant results, demonstrating that SLPL users gained \$4 in benefits for every \$1 in tax revenues the public invested in the library. The investigators wrote up the results of this cost-benefit analysis study in papers addressed to the library community generally,<sup>31</sup> public librarians,<sup>32</sup> school librarians<sup>33</sup> and library leaders interested in financial issues.<sup>34</sup>

*SLPL, Southern Illinois University, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, and Four Public Library Systems.* In September 1998, the United States government's

Institute for Museum and Library Services gave a \$200,000 grant to a research team headed by SLPL staff. This project enables the library and its academic partners to join with the library systems of Baltimore County, Maryland; Birmingham, Alabama; King County (suburban Seattle), Washington; and Phoenix, Arizona in testing the cost-benefit methodology used to set the investment benefits derived for SLPL users. The goal is to develop a transportable methodology that can be used by other public library systems to determine their own benefits.

All the partners look to gain from this project. SLPL already has a cost-benefit methodology it is using in its own communications with political leaders and potential funders. SIU-E has gained research support for its departments and their graduate students. IMLS gains prestige from funding a nationally visible project most desired by public librarians. And, each of the four partner public library systems gains the advantage of helping work out the methodology as it applies to one library and other libraries like it.

*Data Research Associates.* SLPL built on its capability to undertake applied research when it negotiated a contract for a new library automation system with Data Research Associations (DRA). During the competition to determine which automation vendor to select, SLPL insisted that one requirement in the selection was the private-sector corporation's willingness to accept the library not only as a customer but as a software development partner.<sup>35</sup> The SLPL press release announcing DRA's selection noted the importance of this point when it noted, "Our association with DRA provides a great opportunity for us to work as partners in developing innovative electronic products that could benefit other organizations, businesses, and individuals. It's a partnership of which we're proud to be a part."<sup>36</sup>

The first partnership project of SLPL and DRA staff is a web-based search platform for DRA's Classic and TAOS software. This homepage and search engine is being designed especially for the use of children and for adults with low literacy skills. The principal developers of this software are three SLPL programmers and several high-level library staff led by the director of youth services, who was involved in the development of an earlier children's catalog.

The DRA/SLPL partnership is one in which everybody wins. DRA will get a new specialized youth and low-literacy search engine to mount on their Classic and TAOS systems while its own company programmers concentrate on completing sophisticated modules of the fully web-based TAOS catalog. SLPL gets national recognition for partnering with a major library automation-system vendor and the opportunity to earn income when the new search platform begins to be sold as part of DRA Classic and TAOS. And, just as importantly, City of St. Louis library users will be the first to use a library software search platform designed especially for their children and for low-literacy adults who are attempting to use library materials for their own personal, family and job research.<sup>37</sup>

*NoveList.* SLPL also is developing a public-private research partnership with NoveList, a division of EBSCO

The first goal of this project is to improve advisory services for readers. Fiction writers are not sure exactly what readers like in their books, and librarians are never sure what exactly to recommend when users ask them to ask for “the next good book.” This project sets out to analyze readers’ advisory techniques and to find ways to improve the readers’ advising process. The second goal is to develop training materials that will allow in-library trainers to train other staff members to become better readers’ advisors. The third goal is to improve EBSCO’s NoveList.

As it currently exists, the 50,000-title NoveList computer tool approaches “the next best book” problem by offering users an opportunity to check off some points about what kind of books they like to read. The NoveList profiler then matches key words from the criteria the readers have offered with fiction-book subject fields and key words in index fields describing the books in the NoveList database.

In dealing with all these research issues, SLPL staff again have called on SIU-E faculty from sociology, economics and psychology to aid in laying out and implementing the desired improvements. The principal research techniques will involve numerous discussion groups, formal focus groups and individual interviews with SLPL patrons who are avid readers.<sup>38</sup>

Like the DRA/SLPL partnership, the EBSCO/NoveList partnership will make gains for everyone involved. EBSCO will be able to improve its product, NoveList, and obtain value-added training materials in using the electronic product and improving readers’ advisory generally. SLPL will get improved readers’ advisory training for its staff, products that will help librarian-trainers to train other library staff in doing better readers’ advisory and in using NoveList, and national recognition for its research partnership with EBSCO.. And, as with the DRA/SLPL partnership, library system users also will gain. They will obtain better readers advisory and an improved computer product that will help them make better materials selection when they are looking for “the next best book.”

## Political alliances

Many United States public libraries, especially those that are “independent library districts“ need to affect the legislation that affects them. As with all partnerships or other alliances, the boards and administrative officers of libraries have to decide on the appropriateness of political activity. Board members and the executive director of the St. Louis Public Library have a broad mandate. Within the confines of the laws, including those defining lobbying, and individual ethics cannons for elected and appointed public officials, persons associated with SLPL have been involved in several political alliances.

*Missouri Public Library Directors Group.* In the early 1990s, the directors of Missouri’s public libraries decided that the office of the State Librarian needed to be moved from under the jurisdiction of the Coordinating Board of Higher Education (CBHE) to the control of the Secretary of State.

Being housed within the gigantic CBHE was for the small office of the State Librarian not unlike sleeping with an elephant. At its best under CBHE, those matters affecting the state's public libraries were subject to "benign neglect," to use the term that political pamphleteer and later U. S. President John Adams applied to the situation that brought the American colonies to revolt against Great Britain. Always an afterthought within CBHE, public libraries needed a new state government home.

In Missouri, all public library directors can register as lobbyists. In 1991 and 1992, many directors, including the director of SLPL, registered and began to spread the word that we wanted to follow the example of the adjoining State of Illinois and move the State Library to the office of the elected Secretary of State. In Missouri, this change made even more sense since the Missouri State Archives already was seated under the Secretary of State, and that the elected official was charged with the responsibility of being the state's principal information officer.

In cooperation with friendly legislators, a transfer bill was drafted. Directors and board members lobbied their respective legislators, and the group enlisted the aid of a professional lobbyist who received a regular information-gathering and lobbying fee from the Missouri Library Association. After nearly two years effort, the bill passed quietly in 1994.

Nearly everyone associated with Missouri's public libraries believes that moving the State Librarian from CBHE to the Secretary of State has resulted in improved visibility, more attention being devoted to public library issues at the state level and more responsive administration of Federal and state laws affecting libraries. It also has resulted in slightly increased funding and much easier application procedures for grants administered by the State Library. These improvements are the direct result of a statewide political partnership among librarians that brought a major change in Missouri law and in how librarians were treated by state officials.

*Stifel Nicholas.* In 1993, the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Library began to discuss the issuance of general revenue bonds to speed the capital improvement of branch facilities. The problem was that the Laws of the State of Missouri then allowed large public libraries to issue bonds only for new construction. This specific admonition prohibited SLPL from using its credit to issue bonds so that the people of St. Louis could gain "improved branch libraries before our kids graduate and we die," to use the words of one disgusted library user.

Finding out about this discussion from the public record minutes of the SLPL Board, Joseph Schlafly, a senior public bond counselor at Stifel Nicholas, a stock and bond brokerage company, offered to take up the library's cause. The Stifel offer was to pay all lobbying costs to get the Missouri General Assembly to broaden the terms of the public library bonding law.

Schlafly asked that if the change were successful and the library issued bonds, his company would be given consideration to serve as principal bond counsel for the issue. The Board agreed, after ensuring that Stifel Nicholas would have to provide documentation that the company's issuing fees were competitive. This action was taken in open

meeting and publicized with an SLPL press release. An item announcing the action appeared in the region's most prominent business weekly.

The Stifel lobbying effort was successful, with passage of the new bonding law in 1996. In July 1998, under the terms of the new law, the St. Louis Public Library issued \$16,500,000 in 15-year, insured, AAA-rated, general-revenue bonds with interest rates ranging from as low as 4.55 percent to a high of 5.2 percent. Stifel Nicholas served as principal bond counsel for the sale.

The Library's partnership with Stifel Nicholas thus is due to endure for 15 years. Like most partnerships, this one was based on a joint interest. It is unusual even by US standards, however, in that the private-sector broker and public-sector library shared risk. Stifel assumed a financial outlay to pass the bonding law. SLPL risked a shift in its public image brought on by its first assumption of long-term debt – which institutional leaders did have to explain to the press. It also risked criticism for making an alliance profitable to Stifel, although the conditions to ensure a good deal for the library were carefully defined both by Board resolution and by contract.

The real winners from the partnership, however, were the people of St. Louis, who now will have all new and rehabbed library branches in five years rather than over a 10-or-15 year period.

## Library Partnerships in Many Nations

Library partnerships are not unique to US libraries. In this section, I have assembled examples of library partnerships reported by libraries in many different nations. I was surprised to find how well these partnerships fitted into my SLPL categories. Similarity in current technology challenges and service issues seems to account for the easy fit. Here are the examples.

### Training partnerships

Training partnerships include those involving pre-service and in-service training as well as training of the public.

In 1996, staff from the Silkeborg Public Library, Juteland, Denmark, cooperated with the Royal School of Librarianship to provide instruction on topics like “starting an Internet service” and “creating a library’s homepage.”<sup>39</sup> In the early 1990s staff from the Liverpool, NSW, Australia, City Library and staff from the Macarthur Community College started “literacy classes for children accompanied by parents.” In 1997 this partnership gained a funding partner, the Reader’s Digest Get Ahead (GAP) program to expand literacy opportunities.<sup>40</sup> Through 1998-99, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Library and Information Science and Milwaukee Public Library have teamed up to add to the ALA Spectrum Scholarships. MPL Foundation supported two \$2,000 PL grants for UWM SLIS students. This partnership is intended to increase the number of minorities represented on the library’s professional staff. The program is intended to add to the library school’s minority enrollment and the pool of available minority staff who will work for the public library.<sup>41</sup>

### Funding partnerships

Funding partnerships are growing in number and importance, and just as within the US, other levels of government and other government agencies often function as library partners. There are many examples.

One such funding partnership involves support for independent and adult learning. "In the UK public libraries create special services for independent learners in cooperation with agencies involved in independent learning. ... "Some of these [public library] activities, like ... Croydon, are linked with the British Association for Open Learning and are supported by the Department of Employment."<sup>42</sup> Library leaders in the UK recognize, however, that private-sector sources of funding will be necessary to develop fully the Public Library Network.<sup>43</sup>

The San Antonio, Texas, Public Library Enrichment Campaign raised \$5 million in private-sector donations. The funding partner was the City of San Antonio which matched each dollar donated from the private sector. The library thereby was involved in a public-private fund-raising partnership that doubled their development capability.<sup>44</sup>

An application by the Lane Cove Library to the State Library of New South Wales, Australia, resulted in a funding partnership that quickly assumed multiple dimensions. The partnership resulted in a unique study on "the social role and economic benefit of a public library" unlike any other study previously done anywhere in the world.<sup>45</sup>

Advancing Internet connections in New Zealand is cloaked in partnerships. In a study co-funded by the New Zealand Library and Information Association and the National Library of New Zealand, the authors recommended partnership as a basic tool for the technological advancement of public libraries. The authors wrote: "The key partnership for the public library is its own parent local authority; both in order to promote electronic access to local authority information and in order to gain resources for the development of patron access to electronic information. The Library provides expertise related to developing, selecting and accessing information; the Council has expertise in systems and communications. If this expertise is lacking within the local authority then it is vital it is sought from outside. The Library can and should be a catalyst in promoting the availability of council information via the Internet." In less-populated districts, the authors call for partnerships between local libraries and private-sector Internet providers.<sup>46</sup> Such a partnership between Tasman District Libraries and PlaNet Nelson, an Internet service provider, bought the establishment of free Internet service for district residents and the creation of a local-information website that promoted area businesses.<sup>47</sup>

The EU also is involved as a government funding partner. LISTED (Library Integrated Systems for Telematics Based Education) is an EU funding initiative to offer FDL (Flexible and Distance Learning) material in public library environments. Public libraries in half-a-dozen nations, including two in Hungary, participate as active partners.<sup>48</sup> Speedy Retrieval of Information on the Telephone (SPRINTEL), another Telematics initiative brings together library authorities in Belgium, Germany, Ireland and the Netherlands to develop a language-neutral "prototype audio-text information service in a library environment." The prototype is now in testing.<sup>49</sup> Three UK local authorities and Voxtron Europe N.V. are test sites for a new electronic public library service, REACTIVE TELCOM (Residential Access to Information via Everyday Telecommunication Tools), easily available from homes via telephone or television.<sup>50</sup>

So important are funding partnerships with the private sector to the Vancouver Public Library that the institution in 1995 officially defined the "contracted arrangement."<sup>51</sup>



## Information dissemination / Development partnerships

“CYMRU LIP, the Library and Information Plan for Wales, was implemented in 1993 to deliver a wide range of different kinds of quality information to many different agencies such as ... libraries, colleges, health agencies, voluntary sector organizations, employing information technology.”<sup>52</sup> A consortium for the Library System of Abano Terme in the province of Padova, Italy, in the mid-1990s, undertook management of bibliographic resources for the whole political area. Central cataloging began, “freeing resources and professional skills for other aspects of the library work, from book selection to searching on remote databases.” Other Italian provinces followed the same model.<sup>53</sup>

MOBILE (Extending European information access through mobile libraries) is a co-operative experiment in providing mobile information services, like Internet access and electronic document delivery, in mobile vehicles that serve lightly populated regions. The project involves service to areas in the Netherlands, the UK and Greece.<sup>54</sup> A related project, LIBERATOR (Libraries in European Regions – Access to Telematics and Other Resources), involves developing “exemplary regional information services (RIS) in three diverse European regions.” Networked public library services, with library staff mediators, is the centerpiece of this EU four-nation project.<sup>55</sup> Integrated Library Information Education and Retrieval System (ILIERS) has six public libraries in four EU nations involved in the development of a multimedia user interface designed to help users easily find what they want. The private-sector partner is Courseware Scandinavia.<sup>56</sup>

A US-style version of national and international partnership exists in the work of OCLC (Online Computer Library Center) headquartered at Dublin, Ohio, its state “membership” organizations like MLNC (Missouri Library Network Corporation) and the thousands of academic and public libraries that work within its bibliographic, cataloging and information-distribution network. St. Louis Public Library and dozens of other public and academic libraries in Missouri are partners in producing cataloging data that is fed into the master OCLC catalog. These same libraries plan and receive technology-use and cataloging training from MLNC using OCLC databases. Libraries pay membership fees; they receive fees for original cataloging. All participating libraries gain as the OCLC database and support structure grows.<sup>57</sup>

The Metropolitan Cooperative Library System (MCLS) of Greater Los Angeles, California, shares resources at a regional level. It is an association – a long term partnership – of public libraries in the greater Los Angeles area. These libraries share resources – materials, programs and training opportunities – in order to improve library service to the residents of all participating jurisdictions. It is one of the largest cooperative library systems in the United States.<sup>58</sup> The best recent example of a redefined source-sharing among large public libraries occurred in Canada. On January 1, 1998, the former library systems of York, East York, Scarborough, North York, Etobicoke and Toronto, plus the Metropolitan Reference Library, merged to become one, new Toronto Public Library. With 98 locations, this new merged library is the largest in Canada.<sup>59</sup>

Children’s programs have been the focus of numerous resource-sharing partnerships. Stuttgart City Library led the way in the establishment of CHILIAS (CHILDREN’S LIBRARY

– Information – Animation – Skills), “The European Virtual Children’s Library of the Future.” With EU funding, this project’s webmasters have created a children’s homepage and website reference point in six languages (German, English, Finnish, Greek, Spanish/Catalane, Portugese).<sup>60</sup> Just getting under way is another youth-focused Telematics project, HERCULE (Heritage and Culture through Libraries in Europe). The project “will produce a website for European schoolchildren library users. It will contain information, links to other sites and a place for the viewing and exchange of multimedia cultural material produced by children and supported by Arts workers.”<sup>61</sup>

## Program development partnerships

Croydon, Greater London, County of Surrey started an electronic business directory in a partnership with its Council “and two local computing firms.”<sup>62</sup> Named CROYDON ONLINE, the project not only lists community information but “foster[s] the marketing of local services and products.”<sup>63</sup> Saving and making accessible local historical materials is the object of the Partnership in Preservation project between the Sebring Historical Society and the Highlands County Public Library of Highlands County, Florida.<sup>64</sup> Public libraries play a key role in the planning and production of artistic performance for local audiences as part of the California Confederation for the Arts.<sup>65</sup> A locally based program-development partnership took place when Cologne Public Library developed a “Books in Boxes” program that is in fact an instructional partnership with dozens of teachers in the city schools.<sup>66</sup>

Starting in 1995, EARL (The Consortium of Public Library Networking) has become the UK’s most extensive public library partnership. It has more than 120 partner libraries, 17 associate partners and three “supporting organizations.” EARL’s role is as simple as its website is effective: EARL “has taken the opportunities offered by networking and shown the major role libraries can have in a national service with local identity providing networked assets. “?Ask a Librarian” is one of the UK’s most utilized information services.”<sup>67</sup>

An even more elaborate partnership among public libraries is contemplated in a 1998 Australian plan. Partnership is written into the public library future in the strategic plan of the State Library of South Australia. As one of its major operating premises, the plan suggests the need to implement “the Cooperative Model”, which is based on a number of libraries within a council area, or across council areas, sharing a range of library resources. Suggested partnerships include sharing human and physical resources; electronic linking of the libraries; individual libraries specializing in certain subject areas which meet the demands of their particular communities and sharing that special knowledge with others; the use of other strategic partners such as government agencies, community agencies or private sector organizations.” The two rationale for implementation of the model are better service and “cost-saving ... achieved through sharing of resources and some rationalisation of resources.”<sup>68</sup>

## Partnerships to build and share audiences

Public Library cooperation with schools fits well into this category. In Europe, many partnerships have involved public library and public school partnerships. Bremen, Public Library, Germany, for example, provides “IT-based regular service for local schools.”<sup>69</sup> Atlanta-Fulton County Public Library, Georgia, USA, has a “High School Partnership for Internet” that provides teens and adults in General Education Degree programs with e-mail accounts that they can access from school, library branch or home. Electronic databases to help with homework and 24-hour access bring heavy use for this partnership site.<sup>70</sup> So popular is the latter theme in the US that it appeared as a Missouri Association of School Librarian (MASL) post-conference seminar after the fall 1998 meeting.<sup>71</sup>

## Research and product development partnerships

Cologne, Public Library, Germany, has been involved in research partnerships involving both the creation and the dissemination of electronic databases.<sup>72</sup> The staff of Dublin Public Library, Ireland, were involved with a database manufacturer in preparing multimedia profiles of 46 modern authors from Denmark, Ireland and Portugal. The project resulted in a CD-ROM product.<sup>73</sup>

## Political alliances

I found no examples of the kind of partnerships for direct political involvement like those I outlined in my SLPL case study. The St. Louis political situation exists because of the relative independence of the local library board. I did find potential partnerships forming. Here are two examples.

The recently created Vancouver Public Library’s Speakers Bureau sends speakers to community and neighborhood meetings. The purpose of their talks is to inform citizens about library services and to explain the impact of recent budget cuts which are affecting that library’s ability to meet customer service needs.<sup>74</sup> In US political terms, the Vancouver experiment appears as an “educational campaign,” one that provides information but does not advocate particular ways of voting. In a different national setting, the Denver, Colorado’ Public Library used a speakers bureau as part of its campaign to stop budget cuts in the early 1990s. In the latter instance, citizens upset over budget cuts became the library’s political partners, advocating for increased funding.

Another possible partnership, one advocating more funding for library educational services, occurred at a May 1997 conference on the future of Australian libraries. Ms. Lynn Allen, Chair of the Council of Australian Libraries, noted that because of the contemporary emphasis on lifelong learning, public libraries are full of large numbers of students at all levels of the education process. “This is not a bad thing” she said. “We are part of the education sector but we are not funded to have the resources on tap that

students need. Governments need to recognise this significant role and provide the necessary funding to deliver these services.<sup>75</sup>

Different national cultures bring different avenues to political power and influence. Library advocacy comes with every public library job. My guess is that library advocacy partnerships exist in most nations as they certainly do throughout the US. As in the US, however, the advocacy partnership and the political alliance are seldom written about as part of modern library work.

## Managing Partnerships to Match Institutional Mission

Whether partnerships are forced from above or develop out of organizational initiatives, they remain a powerful strategic tool to help libraries make changes. The paragraphs that follow are designed as a step-by-step outline of how to organize and manage partnerships. As I stated previously in this paper, developing this outline, I have drawn heavily from the Urban Libraries Council publication, *Leading the way: Partnering for success* (1997).

One document from *Partnering for success*, the partnership goals and objectives statement, is an excellent outline for any discussion of library partnerships. These goals are appropriate for readying any library group to organize and manage partnerships. The goals are to:<sup>76</sup>

- Examine the role partnerships play in the success of libraries today and in the future
- Focus on questions to ask and developmental steps that should be considered when forming partnerships
- Learn about ways to create partnerships without losing sight of the library's mission and goals.

These ULC partnership-training goals have the following objectives. Following the instruction, participants will be able to:

- Explain the importance of partnerships to public libraries and their communities
- Define partnerships
- Describe why partnerships work and do not work
- Name various ways to prospect for partners
- List things to consider when prospecting for partners
- Describe why communication is important through all the partnership steps
- Name some ways to set up a communication process with partners
- List ways to effectively plan a partnership
- Describe various approaches to committing in a partnership, and when each type is appropriate
- Describe various approaches to evaluating partnerships and how to implement them both during and after executing the partnership

Within this goals-and-objectives framework, I have drawn upon the totality of SLPL partnership experiences to make the following general observations and to lay out the steps that need to be taken to set up successful library partnerships.

### **1. Role of institutional leaders in forming library partnerships**

A library's institutional leaders and principal external representatives should take the lead in developing library partnerships. Through the past decade, the most significant and strategically important SLPL partnerships have been developed by those at the top of the organization: individual board members, the executive director, the principal operating officers and the staff of the library's marketing and external relations unit.

A rich array of partnership opportunities also have come from line staff. Serving as the library's eyes and ears in the neighborhood and specialized group constituencies with which they work, they often have access to community information not otherwise available to library policy-makers. Excellent SLPL partnership opportunities have come from such organizational sources as the library's head of security (i.e., a security district involving Central Library and other neighboring businesses and institutions); the head of facilities (i.e., a neighborhood redevelopment partnership); and a summer reading club partnership with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that occurred because a youth services provider was a relative of one of the United States' woman astronauts. In other words, almost any staff member can be a good source for a library partnership opportunity.

### **2. The importance of partnerships**

Through partnerships a public library can play a more essential role in its community; it can "better meet its mission and goals." Library partnerships may serve to revitalize library and community services. Library partners help "market the library," "leverage resources," "expand services," and "reach new audiences."<sup>77</sup> In short, well-structured partnerships help the library do its job better and improve community life. SLPL's partnerships have had all of these effects.

### **3. Define partnerships**

As stated at the outset of this article, partnerships are how people organize to share in action, participate in joint ventures or pursue like interests. Partnerships are joined self-interest. They have to be defined and often redefined as they progress.

#### **4. Prospecting for partners**

Libraries getting into the partnership business should follow two golden rules: “Know they community and know they partner.” Within the library organization, staff need orientation on how to prospect for partnerships. Some partnerships, especially those brought about by a federal program or initiated by a governing board or high-level managers, are intentional, some are opportunistic, some arrive through sheer serendipity. When staff think of or encounter a partnership prospect, they need to know where to communicate that information within the organization so there is personal and institutional feedback.

The ULC has compiled a lists of pitfalls and red flags to watch for during the partner prospecting phase.<sup>78</sup> The pitfalls include “not going high enough in (the) organization, not recognizing (a) chaotic organization, not looking at real benefits for both parties (and) not getting the appropriate library staff involved.”

There are two groups of red flags. The first group signals a possible wave-off from potential partners. This list includes “organization is disorganized (with) unrealistic demands or one-sided agendas.” In-library red flags include these: “not clearly presenting the library’s resources and expertise, lack of enthusiasm from staff who will administer or run the program (and) resistance to (the) partner.”

#### **5. How to settle on a partner**

Preparation for entering substantial partnerships ought to include assessment meetings where the principals who will plan and operate a possible partnership get to know each other as people and learn about their respective institutional cultures. Library leaders also need to gather community opinion about their prospective partners, asking about the organization’s potential, its record in cooperative efforts and the quality of its management. In St. Louis, there is one community organization that has a reputation for “quick dates,” hit-and-run exercises by which the organization pulls out what resources it can from a partner, puts little effort back, then walks away. Most libraries are looking for more than “quick dates” in their partnerships.

#### **6. When libraries should reject partnerships**

Libraries should avoid partnerships when “the potential partner has nothing to add to the relationship, the partner wants the library to do all the work [or] the library doesn’t have the financial or staffing resources to commit to the partnership.”<sup>79</sup> Even in the United States, with its long-established tradition of volunteerism, the climate of local public opinion may not be conducive to some partnerships. In many communities, civic leaders, board leaders and/or philanthropic or cultural institution officials may not be supportive of library partnerships, especially those involving public-private cooperation or fundraising.<sup>80</sup> International cultural differences add to this complexity. Institutional strategic

planning is a prerequisite for prospecting for library partnerships, just as it is for library fund-raising, no matter what the nationality of the library.<sup>81</sup>

## **7. Why partnerships work and don't work**

Library partnerships work when there is good planning, when communication is regular, when someone in each organization is responsible for managing the success of the joint venture and when the partners see themselves as stakeholders with their reputations or resources on the line. Partnerships don't work because the partnerships are set up and operated in antithesis to the conditions outlined in the previous sentence.

## **8. Set up a communication process**

Rules for partnership communications are as simple and straightforward as the risk is high in not establishing appropriate communication. Regular telephone conversations between a partnership's principals, regular reports to each other, regular assessments to see if a changing situation calls for shifts in operation or resource allocation – it all sounds simple. Internet e-mail is opening up all kinds of cooperative communication options.<sup>82</sup> Partnerships, however, are like outsourcing: Someone on the staff has to manage the relationship in order to ensure quality. Mission-and-goal-driven communication is the key.<sup>83</sup>

## **9. Plan and commit**

Informally or formally, partnerships need to pass through a planning process. During the planning, those designated to communicate with the partner need to “relate (the partnership) to the library's strategic plan and goals, look at the real costs, identify resources and needs of each partner, divide authority and responsibility, clarify what each partner can and cannot do, learn the strengths and weaknesses of the library and partner (and) consider what it will take to make the partnership successful.”<sup>84</sup>

Even small projects require the expenditure of institutional resources. As SLPL gained experience with partnerships, it became a general rule that no partnership can begin without a sign-off from one of three library services operating officers, one of three support services operating officers or the executive director. A decade ago, when the institution was just starting its partnership program, this control was not so tight. Now, however, SLPL gets more offers to join in partnerships than it can accept. A vast majority of these amount to little more than requests for specialized resource expenditures, not partnership opportunities. The most formal and most expensive partnerships are covered by legal contracts signed by the library director as the organization's CEO. Operating officers may sign partnership contracts in their budget domains as well.



The moment of partnership-commitment truth comes when a single question gets asked: Who will manage this partnership? At SLPL, youth services is heavily involved in partnership activities. The director of youth services, for example, is currently 75 percent committed to managing various projects. That leaves only 25 percent of her time free to act as the policy and ultimate budget officer for more than 25 employees and a total budget line of over \$3 million. Two soft-money project-management assistant positions ease her administrative load. Unless SLPL adds to staff costs, however, there can be no major new youth service initiatives no matter what their value. Quality management is where good partnership intentions hit the hard wall of resource reality.

Obviously the rules of planning and committing to partnerships change with their potential size and institutional significance. Delineation of responsibilities, planning and replanning, being specific and detailed and choosing the appropriate level of commitment are all good advice for those responsible for the success of a library partnership. In the end, these details will determine the nature of the commitment: handshake, memo or letter, formal letter of agreement, contract or, sometimes, the terms of a lengthy proposal.<sup>85</sup>

## **10. Execute partnership**

Carrying out partnerships to make them successful can be a complicated task. The person the library charges with managing the partnership has to “utilize designated resources, track events .. and make adjustments ... , recognize unanticipated outcomes, (and) ... celebrate success.”<sup>86</sup> These tasks are similar to those of a grants compliance officer. The person that the library places in charge of a partnership, in effect, is responsible for ensuring the success of the relationship.

## **11. Evaluation**

Mostly because of the professional education of some of its executive staff, SLPL makes a specialty out of measurement and evaluation.<sup>87</sup> Consequently hardly any activity, including partnerships, gets started without some thought about evaluation.<sup>88</sup> Evaluation discussions always begin early in the consideration of a project, measurement systems are put into place, and, where needed, outside evaluators are employed. As any project, including partnerships, unfolds, its monitors apply measurements to see if it is succeeding. If it is not, efforts are made to improve partnership performance – or to cut losses before they grow.

## **12. Training staff for partnerships**

US libraries have access to several sets of useful partnership training materials. Obviously, I think highly of ULC’s materials. Other helpful bibliography useful in staff

training to develop partnerships is available as well. Youth service coalition building,<sup>89</sup> corporate funding partnerships,<sup>90</sup> and community organization partnership opportunities<sup>91</sup> are subjects covered in these works. PubliCA's partnership literature, available both in print and at its websites, with many citations in this article, are valuable sources of information for the libraries of many nations.

## Conclusion

Partnerships have been a major source of strategic strength for the St. Louis Public Library. They can play the same role for other libraries in the US and other countries as well. Those who lead libraries, however, will recognize that different cultural conditions and different operating circumstances create variant partnership needs and opportunities for different libraries. With partnerships as with all other library policy strategies, differences between libraries are as significant as the similarities that join them.

No matter what their national cultures, however, public libraries in the 21<sup>st</sup> century share one mission-driven reality. They need to undertake partnerships as part of better serving their constituents. One Italian library expert writes, "The spread of co-operation, aided by technological innovations, have led libraries to come out of their isolation, to accustom themselves to matching themselves against other similar and more advanced organizations, and has strongly encouraged them towards innovation, pushed by the users, who, with the birth of co-operation, have better quality and new services."<sup>92</sup>

In this paper, I have summarized the processes by which SLPL entered into and executed seven different types of partnerships. In these and dozens of other instances, the library used partnerships to progress in carrying out its mission in major and minor ways. I have demonstrated how similar partnerships are developing in the UK, Canada, the EU, Australia and New Zealand and other US communities. That is followed by a discussion of the general steps in the planning, establishment, execution and evaluation of library partnerships with the expectation that this framework will help other libraries get started in prospecting for and using partnerships as a factor in moving the organization forward into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Library partnerships will change as libraries change. No matter what their circumstances, however, partnerships provide a significant strategic tool for advancing libraries into new times.

## Notes

- 1 Barbara Lison-Ziessow, The relationship and co-operation between public libraries and other relevant information providers. In J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H-P Thun and H. Albrechtens. *Public libraries and the information society*. Edited by M. Segbert. (Luxembourg: European Commission, DG XIII/E.4, 1997), p. 73.
- 2 Lison-Ziessow, p. 73.
- 3 Geoffrey Hare, "Public libraries and networks: a British approach to collaboration." Paper given at the seminar, 'Public libraries in the global information society', Bad Münstereifel, (April 1997), pp. 1–2. <http://www.britcoun.de/gerbm09a.htm>.
- 4 Evan St. Lifer, A "promised land" for federal library funding? *Library Journal*, (May 1, 1998), pp. 40–42. The IMLS homepage is at <http://www.ims.fed.us/>.
- 5 See the full text of these two publications and the listings under "Projects in progress" and "Collaboration and discussion" at <http://ds.dial.pipex.com/town/square/ac940/network.html>.
- 6 United Kingdom, Library and Information Commission, *Building the new library network: A report to government*. (November 6, 1998), pp. 4, 7, 10, 15, 18, 19, 21, 27, 29, 31, 61, 69. The report is available at <http://www.lic.gov.uk/publications/building.html>.
- 7 See, for example, Library Council of New South Wales, *Annual Report, 1997*. (Sydney, October 1997), pp. 33–34.
- 8 Lisan-Ziessow, pp. 74–75.
- 9 Urban Libraries Council, *Leading the way: Partnering for success. Urban staff development series*. (Evanston, IL: Urban Libraries Council, Supported with a Grant by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1997). For material ordering, the ISBN is 1-885251-16-5.
- 10 St. Louis Public Library, Mission statement. (Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Library, January 31, 1994.)
- 11 *The Forbes scrapbook on the business* 11 Glen E. Holt, Libraries that delight. *Bottom Line*, . 11:4 (1998) *of life*. (Chicago: Triumph Books, 1992), p. 313.
- 12 .
- 13 Glen E. Holt, Staff training: How much is enough. *Bottom Line*, 9:1 (1996), pp. 43–44.
- 14 Saint Louis Public Library, Master training calendar, September through November 1998. (SLPL working document, issued and updated electronically).
- 15 Glen E. Holt and Thomas F. Schlafly, A fund-raising primer for public library trustees. In Virginia Young, *The Library Trustee: A Practical Guidebook. 5th Edition*. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1995), pp. 80–88.
- 16 "Pro bono" means "done or donated without charge, free." The term's implication comes from the Latin "pro bono publico," which means "for the public good [or] welfare." *The Random House dictionary of the English language. Second edition-unabridged*. Edited by Stuart Berg Flexner and Leonore Crary Hauck. (New York: Random House, 1987), p. 1542.
- 17 "In kind" means "paid or given in goods, commodities, or services instead of money." *Random House dictionary*, p. 983.
- 18 Gale Research, Inc., *Fast reference facts*. (Detroit, MI: Gale Research, Inc., 1996).
- 19 The St. Louis ordinances, revised code and charter website is <http://www.slpl.lib.mo.us/cco/index.htm>
- 20 The Board of Aldermen's minutes can be found at <http://www.slpl.lib.mo.us/cco/minutes/>.

- 21 The License Collector's Office website is at <http://www.slpl.lib.mo.us/CityHall/License/>.
- 22 Glen E. Holt, On becoming essential: An agenda for quality in 21st century public libraries. *Library Trends*, 44:3 (Winter 1996), pp. 545–571.
- 23 St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis Public Library media partnerships with value contributed by each partner, June 1997 through July 1998. Working paper presented to the Library's Board of Directors, August 1998.
- 24 Glen E. Holt, Communications partnerships: Getting media pros to tell the library story. *Bottom Line*, 11:2 (1998).
- 25 Glen E. Holt, Pathways to tomorrow's service: The future of rural libraries. *Library Trends*, 44:1 (Summer 1995), pp. 188–213; Holt, On becoming essential, pp. 545–571; Glen E. Holt, Balancing buildings, books, bytes and bucks: Steps to secure the public library future in the Internet age. In Herbert Goldhor, ed., Buildings, books and bytes: perspectives on the Benton Foundation report on libraries in the Internet age. *Library Trends*, 46:1 (Summer 1997), pp. 92–116.; and Glen E. Holt, Quality through change: The mission of the library in the media era. In *Electronic media in public libraries – From experiment to concept. Proceedings of a conference*, Bertelsmann Foundation, Gütersloh, Germany, April 7–8, 1996. (Gütersloh, Germany: Bertelsmann Foundation, 1996). This paper is available electronically at <http://www.stiftung.bertelsmann.de/english/publika/download/index.htm>.
- 26 Glen E. Holt, Research for change: Creating strategic futures for public libraries. In Leigh Stewart Estabrook, ed., *Applying research to practice: How to use data collection and research to improve library management decision-making. Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Allerton Institute, October 27–29, 1991*. (Urbana-Champaign, IL, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1992), pp. 5–39. See Appendix A for a list of SLPL research projects between 1987 and 1991.
- 27 St. Louis Public Library, Branch user and service area studies. (St. Louis: 1990).
- 28 Anne Watts, St. Louis library's GIS disseminates public information. *Geo Info Systems*, July/August, 1993; Anne Watts, The St. Louis Public Library's electronic atlas: ArcView in the public library environment, *Proceeding of the Thirteenth Annual ESRI User Conference, 1993*, (Redlands, California, ESRI, 1993) volume 2, pp. 505–512; Anne Watts, St. Louis Public Library's electronic atlas: A successful GIS application in the public library environment. In *Geographic information systems and libraries: Patrons, maps, and spatial information*. Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 32nd Clinic on Library Applications of Data Processing, 1995, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (Urbana-Champaign, 1996) pp. 213–219.
- 29 Glen E. Holt, Something more than sound bites: Communicating value to library constituencies. *Bottom Line*, 9:3 (1996), pp. 36–39.
- 30 Glen E. Holt, Donald Elliott and Christopher Dussold, A framework for evaluating public investment in urban libraries. *Bottom Line*, 9:4 (Summer 1996), pp. 4–13.
- 31 Glen E. Holt and Donald Elliott, Proving your library's worth: A test case. *Library Journal*, 123:18 (November 1, 1998), pp. 42–44.
- 32 Glen E. Holt, Donald Elliott, and Amonia Moore, Placing a value on public library services. A St. Louis case study. *Public Libraries*, March–April, 1999.
- 33 Glen E. Holt and, Leslie Edmonds Holt, , Assessing the value of children's library services. *School Library Journal*, a forthcoming 1999 issue.
- 34 The focus groups with teachers and caregivers are reported in Glen E. Holt, As parents and teachers see it: The community values of a public library. *Bottom Line*, 10:1 (1997), pp. 32–35.
- 35 St. Louis Public Library, Library automation selection criteria. (June 1997).
- 36 The quote is cited in *DRA Direct*, (Second Quarter, 1998).
- 37 The State of Missouri estimates that as many as 35 percent of all City of St. Louis adults have "literacy problems," that is a level of literacy that makes it hard for them to function successfully in the work place.
- 38 Glen E. Holt, Blueprint for the Center for the Reader (CFR), (June 1998). Presented to Booklist and NoveList Advisory Group, June 1998).
- 39 Gitte Larsen in J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H.-P Thun and H Abrechtsen (1997), p. 321.
- 40 State Library of New South Wales, *Public library profile*, No. 2 (June 1998), pp. 5–6
- 41 Team of library school and PL match spectrum scholarships. *Library Hotline*, 27:6 (February 16, 1998), p. 5.
- 42 Lison-Ziessow, p. 76–77.
- 43 *New Library: The people's network: The government response*. (April 16, 1998), esp. chapter 5. Available at <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/services/lic/newlibrary/intro.html>.
- 44 June Garcia e-mail to Glen Holt, December 21, 1998.

- 45 Sharyn Briggs, Hans Guldberg, Sevan Sivaciyan, *Lane Cove Library: The social role and economic benefit of a public library*. (Sydney: Library Council of New South Wales in association with Lane Cove Council, 1996).
- 46 Paul Sutherland and Sue Sutherland, Public Library issues in providing Internet-based services. Published as part of *Libraries on the Net : New Zealand progress and challenges*. Published by the New Zealand Library and Information Association and the National Library of New Zealand as part of *The Next Strategy*. Edited by Alastair Smith, Gail Pattie and Isobel Mosley. The quote is cited at <http://webpages.netlink.co.nz/~nzlia/libonnet/public.htm>.
- 47 The Tasman service website is <http://www.taslib.govt.nz/tasolinf.htm>.
- 48 Lison-Ziessow, p.77. The LISTED website is <http://itpoint.org.uk/listed.html>.
- 49 The SPRINTTEL website is <http://www.iol.ie/resource/dublincitylibrary/sprintel/index.html>.
- 50 The REACTIVE TELECOM website is <http://ris.niaa.org.uk/reactive.htm>.
- 51 Vancouver Public Library, Corporate partnership policy. (October 25, 1995). The policy can be found at <http://www.vpl.vancouver.bc.ca/general/sponsor.html>.
- 52 Lison-Ziessow, p.75.
- 53 J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H.-P Thun and H Abrechtsen (1997), pp. 326–331
- 54 The MOBILE website is at <http://www.efc.co.uk/CDA/MOBILE.html>.
- 55 The LIBERATOR website is <http://ris.sunderland.ac.uk/liberator/index.htm>.
- 56 The ILIERS website is <http://hillkomm.dk/bibliotek/adm/iliers/default.htm>.
- 57 The OCLC website is <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/home1.htm>.
- 58 The MCLS website is <http://www.mcls.org/>.
- 59 The “NEW” Toronto Public Library’s website is <http://www.tpl.toronto.on.ca/About/index.htm>.
- 60 The CHILIAS website is [http://chilias.isegi.unl.pt/chilias\\_int/partners.htm](http://chilias.isegi.unl.pt/chilias_int/partners.htm). The project is described at [http://chilias.isegi.unl.pt/chilias\\_int/descript.htm](http://chilias.isegi.unl.pt/chilias_int/descript.htm).
- 61 The HERCULE website is <http://www.echo.lu/libraries/en/projects/hercule.html>
- 62 Heather G. Kirby in J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H.-P Thun and H Abrechtsen (1997), p. 288.
- 63 Lison-Ziessow, p. 76.
- 64 Sheila Miller, Partnership in preservation, at <http://www.archival.com/NA4.htmls/>
- 65 Homepage at <http://www.artswire.org/CALIFORNIA/cca.html>.
- 66 The Cologne book-boxes program is highlighted at <http://www.stbib-koeln.de/english/sba.htm>.
- 67 Hare can be found at <http://www.britcoun.de/gerbm09a.htm>. EARL’s website is <http://www.earl.org.uk/ask/>.
- 68 State Library of South Australia, Toward 2020: Long term view for the 21st Century. (April 1998). <http://www.slsa.sa.gov.au/library/parta.htm>.
- 69 Lison-Ziessow, p.76.
- 70 The website is <http://www.gii-awards.com/nicampgn/34d6.htm>.
- 71 The website is <http://magic.usi.edu/magic/subjectareas/MASL/MASL.html>.
- 72 Frank Daniel in J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H.-P Thun and H Abrechtsen (1997), p. 269.
- 73 The MUMLIB website is <http://www.dbc.dk/english/mumeng.html>.
- 74 The VPL Speakers Bureau website is <http://www.vpl.vancouver.bc.ca/general/speaker.html>.
- 75 The quote can be found at <http://www.slsa.sa.gov.au/library/media/19970501.htm>.
- 76 ULC, Participant handouts, p. 1.
- 77 ULC, Facilitation outline, p. 28.
- 78 ULC, Facilitation outline, p. 36.
- 79 ULC, Facilitation outline, p. 28.
- 80 See, for example, Craig Smith, “The new corporate philanthropy.” *Harvard Business Review*, (May-June 1994), pp. 105–116, for a discussion of the merging of corporate/cultural fund-raising cultures in the United States.
- 81 Glen E. Holt, Shared financial concerns from four continents: Themes from the 1994 INTAMEL conference. *Bottom Line*, 8:2 (1995), pp. 40–41.
- 82 Anne Meyer in J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H.-P Thun and H Abrechtsen (1997), p. 310.
- 83 ULC, Facilitation guide, pp. 40, 43–46.
- 84 ULC, Facilitation guide, p. 54.
- 85 ULC, Facilitation guide, p. 48, 50.
- 86 ULC, Facilitation guide, p. 58.
- 87 See, for example, Leslie Edmonds Holt, From superstition to science: The role of research in strengthening public library service to children.” *Library Trends*, 35 (Winter 1987): 509–520; Leslie Edmonds Holt, “Starting

out right: The effectiveness of online catalogs in providing bibliographic access to youth.” In *Computer-human interfaces: Issues for librarians and information scientists*, Edited by Martin Siegel. (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1991). Dr. Edmonds Holt also is the principal investigator on a measurements-based project, Project REAL (Read and Learn), 1997–1999, a major research project funded by the US Department of Education to develop a family literacy model program for at risk children, families, care givers and teachers. The modeling exercise includes significant measurement and evaluation to be disseminated as part of the project. Anne Watts and Dr. Glen Holt also are engaged in significant library measurement and service evaluation activity cited elsewhere in this paper.

88 ULC, Facilities guide, p. 59.

89 Sandra Feinberg and Sari Feldman, *Serving families and children through partnerships: A how-to-do-it manual for librarians*. (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 1996).

90 Leonard Kniffel, Corporate sponsorship: The new direction in fund raising. *American Libraries*, (November 1995), pp. 545–571.

91 John P. Kretzmann and John L. McKnight, *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Neighborhood Innovations Network, 1993). One section deals entirely with partnership opportunities for public libraries.

92 Susana Giaccai, et al., in J. Thorhauge, G. Larsen, H.-P Thun and H Abrechtsen (1997), p. 334.

## Author

### Dr. Glen E. Holt

St. Louis Public Library

1301 Olive Street

St. Louis, MO 63103

USA

Tel.: ++314 - 241 22 88

Fax: ++314 - 241 38 40

E-Mail: [gholt@slpl.lib.mo.us](mailto:gholt@slpl.lib.mo.us)

Internet: <http://www.slpl.lib.mo.us>