

MINUTES
System and Resource Library Administrators Association of Wisconsin
November 4, 2008
Middleton Public Library

1. Call to order

Chair Walter Burkhalter called the meeting to order at 1:35.

In attendance were: Mark Arend (WLS), Bernie Bellin (LLS), Bob Bocher (DLTCL), Walter Burkhalter (MWFLS), Phyllis Christensen (Marathon Co.), Inese Christman (WVLS), Mike Cross (DLTCL), Phyllis Davis (SCLS), Barb Dimick (Madison), Sally Drew (DLTCL), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (Oshkosh), Jim Gingery (MCFLS), Bob Hafeman (MCLS), Tom Hennen (WCFLS), Terrie Howe (DLTCL), Janet Jennings (Superior), Rick Krumwiede (OWLS), Jessica MacPhail (Racine), Bryan McCormick (Janesville), Stef Morrill (SCLS), David Polodna (WRLS), Krista Ross (SWLS), Kathy Schneider (WiLS), Marla Sepnafski (WVLS), Lynn Stainbrook (Brown Co.), John Stoneberg (Eau Claire), John Thompson (IFLS), Al Zimmerman (DLTCL)

2. Quorum determination

Chair determined a quorum of the membership was in attendance.

3. Introductions

Members introduced themselves.

4. Changes / additions to the agenda

No changes to the agenda.

5. Approval of the minutes from the April 30, 2008 meeting

Motion by Gilderson-Duwe, second by Hennen to approve the minutes of the April 30, 2008 meeting.

6. Treasurer's report (Polodna)

Polodna reported that there has not been a lot of activity from one year to the next, other than expenses for ALA Legislative Day and for meeting refreshments. In 2009, it is recommended that each system contribute \$50. Hennen seconded this recommendation. Motion carried. The treasurer's report was placed on file.

7. WebJunction demonstration

Michael Shapiro from WebJunction presented an overview of the site.

WebJunction was born out of Gates Foundation work in 1998. In 2002, OCLC awarded a

grant to build an online portal to support library staff in maintaining public computers. Other areas have been added including TechAtlas, Spanish Language, and Rural Library Sustainability. A new site, created with money from the Gates Foundation, was launched August 4, 2008. Everything on the site is free, except for the courses.

WebJunction gives library staff the opportunity to connect with other library staff, to create content, and to learn. There are some social networking components in the site that allow staff to receive updates based on their interests, associate and “friend” other people to see information about them, join or create groups, discuss professional needs/interests, bookmark courses, and affiliate with organizations or communities of practice.

The basic WebJunction site is available to everyone. 15 state libraries have created their own unique portals, which has a charge associated with it.

WebJunction has partnered with many organizations to offer self-paced online classes. There are over 600 courses available. Staff have 1 year to complete a course once enrolled. Some providers include SkillSoft, UNT, LE@D, and the Illinois State Library. Classes are available on a variety of topics, including library administration, technical skills, project management, customer service, and trustee training. There are social aspects built around the courses.

Wimba Classroom is an online conferencing tool available through WebJunction.

What WebJunction can offer to groups like SRLAAW can be divided into two categories: learning and portal. The portal is a copy of the portal available to state libraries, with local content added. The learning component is the Wimba classroom and volume purchase of courses.

\$45,000 per year would include:

- 300-600 course units per year that the state makes available to libraries.
- Hosting, support, and development of the portal

- Wimba classroom

This would require a 2 year commitment.

Volume pricing for only the courses is also available:

- 1-49: \$40/unit
- 50-149: \$35/unit
- 150-299: \$30/unit
- 300 up: \$25/unit

Wimba is also available for \$2500/year/institution.

Polodna asked if Wimba is part of what is available through the state program. It is, however, it is not a blanket license for all libraries in the state to use. That instance of Wimba would be available for the state library to use. Each system would need its own \$2500 license, which would be discounted 10% if the state had a partnership with WebJunction.

Bocher mentioned that there was \$55,000 left from the Gates Rural Sustainability grant, and the Division asked if that money could be used to buy a year membership with WebJunction. The Gates Foundation would not allow that use, so the money was given back to the Foundation. This was a great opportunity for WebJunction. Now, if the state is interested, there would be a need for other sources of funding (LSTA funds, for example). One of the concerns with WebJunction is the assumption that libraries are doing their technology on their own, and that isn't true in Wisconsin because of well-developed systems providing the support for their member libraries.

Shapiro stated that it isn't immediately obvious how a portal would best serve Wisconsin libraries. There would have to be discussion about what the portal would be. Different states use the portal differently. From the WebJunction homepage, there is a link to "Partners" where the different partner sites are available.

Howe stated that OCLC should consider being more flexible in pricing to accommodate states. It would be great if all states could take advantage of the customized product. Wimba may be of interest to us, but the courses are not. They have been tried in the past, and did not work.

Shapiro left packets for all attendees with brochures and other promotional information. The information is available from their site as well.

8. WiLS report/OCLC update (Schneider)

Schneider presented an update on the direction of OCLC. It does appear that WiLS will continue to have a relationship with OCLC for the foreseeable future. The billing will not change, as WiLS will handle billing and marketing, but not sales. WiLS will continue to do training, but as part of a collective of all organizations working with OCLC. The emphasis of this collective will be online training, but WiLS hopes to do some face-to-face training, since there was an indication from public libraries that they still want face-to-face training. Support will primarily be handled by OCLC, who is expanding their support network to be 24/7 and multilingual. WiLS will continue to do some support, at least during the transition period. Support for cataloging will be continued if possible, since there are support questions not necessarily related to OCLC in that area. The transition will take place in July, and, starting at that point, WiLS will no longer be able to charge a surcharge on OCLC products. It is unknown if OCLC will charge a surcharge themselves. More information on that topic will be available in April.

Davis asked if the discussion among Midwestern networks is also still moving ahead.

Schneider responded that it has been put on hold, but not completely stopped. The training partnership with MINITEX is successful, and WiLS plans to continue it. There are still conversations, but all networks are in a “regrouping phase.” There are some changing partners. For example, the Nebraska State Library has decided to get out of the regional network business. It’s unclear if their libraries will be served by OCLC directly or by another network. There may also be a merger between Michigan and Indiana.

Everyone is also developing alternative services. WiLS is trying to do some things that were on the back burner, a workflow analysis service (Madison Public Library is a pilot). After July 1st, less staff will be devoted to OCLC. There may not be the same number of staff. However, this change gives WiLS the flexibility to look in other directions. For example, Tom Zillner did a presentation to the SCLS Board on open source software. If any other library is interested in having this type of presentation, contact Zillner or Schneider.

WiLS staff is also working on some follow-up to the library visioning conference in the area of database licensing. They have compiled a list of “who has what” at the system and

individual library levels, and will then look for opportunities to build bigger groups and reduce costs for libraries licensing products.

WiLS is, along with DLTCL, working with a group organized by Ohio State Library, to develop an open-source resource sharing system. Originally, this project was going to be done with an IMLS grant. The Ohio State Library has decided that they don't want to wait because they would not know for a year, and will instead use a large portion of their LSTA funds for this project, and will continue to ask other states to contribute. There is a draft RFP that is currently under review. If anyone is interested in reviewing it, that would be helpful. The RFP will likely be released in January.

Kathleen Imhoff was elected to the OCLC Board of Trustees, and should be a "feisty friend" on the Board.

9. Act 420 (Group)

This item came from David Weinhold (ESLS), who was not in attendance. Item was not discussed.

10. Delivery (Group)

This item also came from Weinhold, and was not discussed.

11. Advocacy for next biennium (Group)

Davis added this item to the agenda, and began the discussion by sharing some advocacy activities happening in SCLS. She has been encouraging member libraries to do more advocacy by setting a system goal at Library Legislative Day. Paul Nelson will be speaking at the SCLS Board meeting in November to educate board members on the legislative agenda. A tour of Delivery was arranged for Mark Miller and his staff. Mark Pocan will be coming after the election. A group of people, including Paul Nelson, Jo Ann Carr, and SCLS staff, visited Maria Bundy, the governor's education policy person.

Bundy indicated that it will be a tight biennium. Elizabeth Burmeister put ½ of the statewide delivery amount into her budget request. This item, along with higher system funding, has to be in the Governor's budget to be part of the final budget. Now is the time to encourage people to contact the Governor and their legislators. SCLS has been encouraging citizens to make these contacts, with the message being, "We value libraries. Keep them in mind in the next budget!". Davis urged other systems to encourage these same types of contacts.

Ross mentioned that SWLS did a "tell us your story" project last year, and took these stories to their legislators. There was an enormous response from people, and the legislators appreciated the project. Ross also mentioned that SWLS could make posters, if people were interested.

Arend mentioned that Winnefox had used the message created by Mark Ibach at SCLS. In Marquette County, users were interviewed and a DVD was made about how important libraries are to them as part of the budget process. It was very effective. The video will be on the libraries' webpages soon. Arend will send a link to the video once it is available.

Davis mentioned that some citizens have copied us on what they sent to the Governor and legislators. 8 or 9 letters were sent in about 3 days. ALA has also put out a press release discussing the value of libraries and using libraries as economic stimulus engines. SCLS is sharing this press release with people, too. Hennen mentioned that the press release worked well, though the number suggested for library funding seemed pulled out of a hat.

Krumweide mentioned that in every packet for WLA, there will be a new piece on the economic impact study. The plan is to mail this piece to legislators and other leaders. There may be the possibility of printing more copies, if that would be useful.

Bellin asked if, since Burmeister is retiring, we have any indication on how her possible successor would feel toward library funding. Cross responded that he does not yet have a formal program, so nothing could be said yet.

MacPhail encouraged the “Librarian of the Year” (Bellin) to write letters, and consider TV spots or infomercials as possible advocacy tools.

12. Election of new SRLAAW chair (Group)

In the past, there has been a nominating committee. However, nominations were accepted from the floor. Davis nominated Arend; Hafeman seconded the nomination. Burkhalter closed all nominations; Bellin seconded. Stainbrook moved to cast a unanimous ballot; MacPhail seconded. Arend is willing to serve as chair. The group expressed their overwhelming appreciation for the new chair.

13. DLTCL Reports

Mike Cross distributed a handout describing the DPI budget request for the next biennium. A statutory review of Manitowoc-Calumet was triggered because 30% of libraries expressed dissatisfaction with the system. The review is a public record, and can be obtained from Cross.

Al Zimmerman reported that the annual report forms should be ready in December, but they will have the same problems as in past years. The real problem with the current collection mechanism is getting the data cleaned up once it is collected. The Division is taking a serious look at Baker and Taylor’s data collection product. Zimmerman will mention this product to the LSTA Advisory Committee because the funds to pay for it will have to come from that committee.

Library system plans are going through the process. The biggest issue with the plans is “undesigned reserves” and the need for systems and public libraries to designate these funds. The DPI auditor discussed this issue at the system meeting, and she does the reviews of the system audits. Cross mentioned that having large amounts of money sitting undesigned is an advocacy concern, since it looks like the systems do not need more if there are large amounts sitting there. Hafeman asked, “If a system or library has a plan for undesigned reserve, and the board approves the plan, does that make the funds designated?” Zimmerman stated that these funds would be designated once an auditor looks at it. Having a contingency is acceptable, and this issue does not apply to contingency funds. The issue is with large amounts of funds collected for a specific purpose, such as an ILS migration, and not designated as such. The purpose must be firm and clearly stated. Dimick mentioned that her municipality has asked that the library have 5% of the current levee in a contingency fund, which is “undesigned” but is for contingency.

Bob Bocher reported on the Gates Grant process. By the end of the year, all eligible libraries must run TechAtlas, which will give the Gates Foundation information on what computers are eligible for replacement. Some systems are running the tool for the libraries and others are not. For systems where the individual libraries are running the tool, the libraries have received their login information. For systems where the system is doing the work, systems should let the libraries know the system will be doing this. There are webinars available on TechAtlas, and attending a session before using the program is recommended. Gilderson-Duwe asked about what would qualify a computer for replacement: is it based on age of the computer? Bocher stated that a secret formula determines how many public access machines a library should have based on population and percentage in poverty. If a library has more public access computers than the Gates Foundation thinks it should have, the library will not get any replacement computers. The number of computers each eligible library will be eligible for will be determined by March. The Gates Foundation has not given Bocher a definitive answer on allowing system funds as

the in-kind match for the replacement computers, but he does not think they are going to allow this source of match.

Cross mentioned that this grant could be viewed as an opportunity to leverage local money as the matching funds. If libraries qualify, they will have to come up with X number of dollars. The grant is about advocacy, and getting local matching funds, and using system funds is circumventing the purpose. Gilderson-Duwe stated that he did not think it was circumventing the purpose. Winnefox has decided not to participate in the Gates Foundation Grant. They are rejecting the red tape, but may do something within the system to provide the libraries with the same benefits. Bocher stated that all of us are concerned about sustainability, but if sustainability can be achieved from the system level, shouldn't that be an option? Why should the Gates Foundation decide this? Polodna stated that this grant is a continuing example of how poorly Gates Foundation programs work in Wisconsin. Sustainability is much less of a concern here because of the level of support and the systems, and there are too many hoops to jump through for the Gates funding. Gingery stated that systems have different models. In Milwaukee, the philosophy is that the computers are the libraries' responsibilities. The system does not have money to pay for computers, but even the wealthy communities may not be replacing computers. The Gates Grant, with the idea of sustainability, develops a more long-term commitment and educates these communities. Morrill stated that libraries that received the first round of Gates Grants, and took the responsibility of replacement seriously are now being punished. Those libraries have already replaced their original Gates computers, and therefore won't be eligible for any funding this round. If they hadn't done what they were supposed to do, they would be eligible.

Bocher mentioned that Gates is now doing broadband sustainability grants. The Foundation is trying to determine how much bandwidth libraries have, which is not an easy process. They have identified 18 states to give money to in the first round, but Wisconsin is not one of them. They may eventually roll the program out to all 50 states.

The group discussed the WebJunction presentation. Bocher mentioned that only \$3000 out of \$20000 in courses purchased with the Rural Sustainability Grant were used in six months. It appears that library staff do not have time to do these courses. There was money left at the end of the Rural Sustainability Grant, and Gates actually took the money back rather than allowing us to use it for WebJunction, which was extremely frustrating. Polodna asked if DLTCCL had a vision of how the state program for WebJunction would work for us. Cross said that DLTCCL is looking for feedback from SRLAAW. If the group is enthusiastic, DLTCCL will work on a way to fund it. Polodna felt that Wimba would be interesting, but the statewide version of WebJunction doesn't give us much access to that tool. Davis mentioned that the current state certification courses are pricey, and wondered if at some point certification could be fulfilled by something outside of the current sequence of courses (like the ALA courses in WebJunction). Howe mentioned that the certification courses from ALA are directed at MLS librarians who want training beyond library school, not at Grades II and III library directors. Hennen wondered about WebJunction's business plan and their ability to be self-sustaining by 2012. Cross shared that the LSTA budget for 2009 is already budgeted, and that WebJunction would not be considered until 2010 at the earliest. Hafeman clarified the pricing model: \$45,000 for the state plus \$2200 per system for Wimba, which adds up to over \$80,000 per year. Howe clarified that only the system headquarters would be able to use Wimba. Individual libraries would have to buy it separately. Krumwiede suggested that there are a lot of web conferencing packages out there, and wondered if Wimba is worth this amount of money. Howe stated that Wimba is more tested and stable than OPAL, but also confirmed that there are lots of products out there for this purpose. Krumwiede shared that OWLS has been using GoToMeeting, and is looking at GoToWebinar. GoToMeeting is \$50/month. Drew mentioned that Reference and Loan uses WisLine Web, and suggested that the university might be able to cut the systems a deal on that product. Howe expressed concern with WisLine because it doesn't allow interaction, and it is difficult to use for web presentations. OPAL is also not easy to use for web meetings because the

microphone can only be used by one person at a time. Hennen moved that DLTCL give WebJunction careful consideration based on this conversation and act in our best interest as it sees fit. The motion did not have a second, as the group felt that DLTCL would take this path without needing a motion. Cross will consider the options and alternatives.

14. Set date and location for the next meeting

The next meeting will be at the South Central Library System/WLA Offices on February 2nd.

15. Adjourn

Arend moved adjournment; Hafeman seconded. Meeting adjourned at 3:25.