

MINUTES

System and Resource Library Administrators' Association of Wisconsin

Hilton Milwaukee City Center, Walker Room

1:30 p.m., Tuesday, November 1, 2011

Call to Order: Chair David Weinhold called the meeting to order and determined there was a quorum present.

Present: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Mark Arend (WLS) Linda Bailen (NWLS), Doug Baker (KCLS), Jim Gingery (MCFLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS/Oshkosh), Tom Hennen (WCFLS), Kristen Hewitt (LLS), Ralph Illick (Marathon County, proxy for WVLS), Kelly Krieg-Sigman (La Crosse), Rick Krumweide (OWLS), Jessica MacPhail (Racine), Ruth Ann Montgomery (ALS), Becky Peterson (MCLS), Steve Platterer (MWFLS), Krista Ross (SWLS), Tasha Saecker (Appleton), Lynn Stainbrook (Brown County) Cherylyn Stewart (Manitowoc), John Thompson, (IFLS), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), David Weinhold (ESLS), Martha Berninger (DLTCL/RLLL), Bob Bocher (DLTCL), John Debacher (DLTCL), Terrie Howe (DLTCL), Kurt Kiefer (DLTCL), Stef Morrill (WiLS)

Introductions: Those in attendance introduced themselves

Changes/additions to the agenda: There were no changes or additions to the agenda

Approval of the minutes from the August 12, 2011 meeting: J. Thompson moved approval; T. Hennen seconded. One correction, the spelling of Kristen Anderson, was proposed. Minutes were unanimously approved with this revision.

Treasurer's report (K. Anderson): The Treasurer's report was distributed. No expenditures or credits were reported since the last meeting, except for \$1.22 in earned interest.

District library legislation (D. Baker): The work of the committee was coordinated with SRLAAW and WLA. A draft document was sent out. The idea that came out of the last SRLAAW meeting was to take time at the convention to discuss the draft, along with systems discussing the proposal with their libraries and boards and answering questions. Questions can be asked of L. Stainbrook, J. Macphail, D. Baker, J. Debacher, or D. Weinhold. The community needs to be aware and questions needs to be answered so that when we move forward with sponsor and drafted legislation, there are no cold feet. M. Arend reported that they are receiving "relatively favorable" feedback on the draft as they explain it and ask people to call with questions. No one has felt it isn't a good idea. L. Stainbrook reported the LD&L committee heard reports that there were some libraries out there that were misconstruing the purpose of the legislation. There is fear that big libraries would take over the small libraries from some. It is apparent that education about the draft and the issue is critical. There is nothing mandated by the bill, and to form a district requires an extensive planning process. We don't want the bill introduced and then have people in the community speaking out against it. J. Thompson reported that the WISLR board is concerned about the 6,000 minimum population threshold because it doesn't work for smaller libraries. There is concern that bigger libraries will take townships and will take away county funding.

Paul Nelson will be speaking with the WISLR board about it. The 6,000 was added in this draft because it is the level that requires a grade 1 librarian. As a separate entity, the library district will be responsible for human resources, legal, payroll, etc., and there was the belief that linking that to a Grade 1 certification made sense. The concern that caused this addition was that, for smaller libraries, it would be too much to handle all of the necessary business functions of the district. There was some discussion about requiring a Grade 1 certification regardless of size of district, and discussion of removing this requirement from the draft. J. Gilderson-Duwe expressed that the word “consolidation” may be the concern. There has been loss of local identity in communities as school consolidation has occurred, and the library may be the last local institution. J. Debacher had suggested 10,000 as a threshold based on other states, and believes that there needs to be a critical mass of population for a district because of the need to carry out elections, etc. There was further discussion of lowering the threshold to a grade 2 certification because a district could certainly be doable with a moderately sized village and surrounding townships. W. Burkhalter expressed concern that if a district is undertaken without thought being given to the complexity, the system will need to do a lot of the guiding and directing for district creation. It’s important to have someone with the proper qualifications forming the district. L. Stainbrook supported this statement. Without a city to rely on, everything would be on the district personnel: facilities, legal things, etc. T. Hennen raised the question about Milwaukee County: why is there no exception for them as in other legislation? There is no need for it. T. Hennen raised the question of sponsors for the bill. D. Baker believes there are sponsors, but there is a question of the timeline. Right now, we are making sure that the library community is up to speed, and then the next thing is looking for sponsors. The League of Municipalities has been asked to review, and they will do that in early 2012, and may include it in their legislative agenda. It has all of the touchstones related to local control that they look for in a proposal. We need to be cautious in working with the legislators. Because of redistricting, we can’t be certain who will be there, so we may look for people to sponsor in the Spring after things are settled. Libraries should be encouraged to continue to ask questions of the committee members. The committee members are also available for webinars for other library systems. It is important to emphasize that creating a district is not mandatory.

LSTA Evaluation Plan 2008-2012 (T. Howe): In the last couple of months, many groups have been asked to provide feedback in an effort to gather as much information as possible for the five year evaluation.

The first question posed to the group was, “Are there certain LSTA projects or grant categories that you thought were valuable or noteworthy?” Projects mentioned were:

- Job support grants: they were timely and well used.
- E-content summit and licensing.
- Broadband connections.
- Intersystem delivery funding.
- System technology projects.

- Innovative technology.

D. Baker asked if there was still a need for shared system grants. B. Bocher reported that about 95% of libraries are in shared systems. We've reached a critical mass where most large libraries are in shared systems.

The next question posed was, "What categories have not been so valuable in the last five years?" Categories mentioned were:

- WISCAT.
- While digitization categories could be useful, they are often not because of restrictions placed on what can be done.
- ILL at RLLL or RLLL in general, if you want to go further.
- Statewide library card access project.

B. Peterson asked what happens to LSTA funds that are not applied for in the special needs categories? There is a two-year window for spending the funds received, so they can be returned to the general pot and reallocated for projects the following year.

The next question posed was, "What projects would be appropriate for statewide library needs to be addressed with LSTA funds?" Projects mentioned included:

- Construction projects: construction used to be covered. It's not highly likely that it will be added back in, but we can still say it.
- Statewide ILS.
- More broadband.
- More e-book content; more manpower to do selection and coordination of the statewide e-book collection.
- Pilot projects for experimenting with music download stations and other types of download stations in libraries.
- Further follow-up on other e-book summit recommendations.
- Additional support for job creation: with the current environment, working with small business and chamber of commerce and other business partnerships could bring additional funding.
- Use for staff for pilot programs: Pay for one year of staffing for a project in order to prove value and convince others to fund it.

Annual report 2011 stuff (J. Debacher): At a national level, there are not new data elements to be included in the annual report. There were some proposed that would take the place of the annual technology survey that has been done in conjunction with the Gates Foundation for the past years. This is the final year of the survey.

A memo has been sent to directors and to the IT list explaining that the only changes are “books and serial volumes in print” is changing to just “books in print.” There is no longer the need to figure out volumes, just what is bound. Hopefully, more systems will want to pre-load data for their member libraries this year. A template will be created for each system to pre-load number of e-books, downloadable video/audio, system-owned databases and usage of databases, federal grant money distributed to libraries, grants from the system to the libraries from state funds, etc. J. Debacher can then upload this data to pre-populate information for the library annual report. If libraries are comfortable with numbers supplied from the system for things like circulation, then those can be pre-populated as well. The numbers can’t be locked after being pre-populated, so the libraries can still edit them.

DLTCL is starting a new contract period with the vendor, and it looks like we can continue with Counting Opinions.

J. MacPhail asked if there is discussion at the federal level on electronic use and if there has been any change? There has not been anything established nationally for electronic use. These numbers can’t be counted as circulation. Trying to change this in the state may elicit some pushback from counties, as reimbursement covers all costs, and paying for all costs, including overhead, building, and staffing for an electronic transaction may not seem proper. If there is a legislative review, the formula for reimbursement needs to be reviewed.

D. Weinhold asked that, for electronic resource use, does it include any resources? Local databases can be included, but that is probably a fuzzier number. All of us are becoming more adept and comfortable in how these numbers are tracked, but there is still inconsistency. We need to develop a framework and more consistency.

S. Platterer asked if there is a system-level Advantage account funded by the system, would the use be put at the system or the library level? It’s one collection of works owned by the state or system. Member libraries should report it for circulations, but the dollars are reported at the system level. This is another area for discussion.

D. Baker commented that the biggest problem as we move to digital resources is that we are still trying to compare physical and digital circulation, and we can’t compare them as apples to apples. While there is a focus on reimbursement right now, in a few years from now, more than half of the use will be digital, and there will be a great need to explain the change and compare. With consortial arrangements, breaking down the formats – particularly dollars spent on formats -- to compare to physical items will get more difficult.

L. Stainbrook thought there would be value to know how many circs per e-audio or e-video per dollar amount. We may want to look at dollars and circulation for different kinds of e-content.

There was more discussion about reimbursement. We are at the beginning of a huge shift of what we consider to be a patron. There will be different types of patrons, including people who use the library and never come into the building. This shift will impact how we view reimbursement.

T. Hennen asked if any system was seeing an increase in physical book circulation system-wide. No system is seeing such an increase. The number of physical items checked out is down across the state. Video and audio is probably dropping off more than books. Virtual visits and online use is already increasing, though e-book use still pales in comparison with physical circulation.

Status of concealed carry decisions by member library boards and library system boards (Weinhold, on behalf of Mead PL): Nine of the group reported banning concealed weapons. None of the group reported taking no action. Most of the group is waiting for their municipalities to take action. S. Platterer reported that, in their case, they don't have to do anything as there is a preschool in their building. M. Arend sent an email out to their directors to see how many of them would not ban. Three out of 30 said they would not ban.

K. Hewitt asked if the question of increased insurance rates has been mentioned. CIVMIC has backed off from their original stance that posting signs would increase rates. Since a number of good-sized cities and counties are banning, they obviously don't see a problem with it. Two small libraries in OWLS are not banning.

WPLC Statewide Buying Pool: The buying pool is a go. The selection committee will be revamped and a selection policy is being developed in light of some concerns about the collection. The collection is intended as a popular materials collection. It may help to build a mechanism for recommendation of titles to acquire. A patron recommendation mechanism will be added to OverDrive soon. There was concern expressed that if the selection committee gets too large, it won't be functional. The process for selection is being revamped to deal with the size of the committee and also the amount of dollars to be spent. There were questions about the bills and about some recent privacy issues that will be taken up by WPLC at their meeting next week.

Wisconsin User/Non-User Survey: The survey is still in the works. Money has been collected from system, WLA Foundation, and SRLAAW. The survey will be a mail survey with an online component, and may be done in early 2012 to match the time period of previous surveys (though a year later) and to help with response rate. Unless there is objection, the WPLC board will be asked next week to postpone the survey until early 2012.

SRLAAW e-mail list – update subscribers, hosting (Weinhold/Appleton PL): Thanks to Appleton PL and to OWLS for maintaining the SRLAAW list. Because of an old listserv tool and restrictions related to the size of the message, Appleton PL would like to not host the list anymore. It will move to Lakeshores. The subscriber list currently has a lot of retired people on it and lots of people no longer working in

Wisconsin. The group decided to prune the list to include only current SRLAAW participants, including WiLS, WLA, and DLTCL.

Reports from affiliated members on items not covered in the agenda:

DLTCL:

B. Bocher reported that hiring for Mike Cross' position is moving forward. Barb Huntington's position is currently open and advertised. The next position that will be opened and advertised is Al's position of data coordinator. He appreciates everyone's patience as they just try to keep the lights on!

M. Berninger reported that the assistant director position has been filled by Lisa Weichert, the BadgerLink coordinator. They are working on BadgerLearn with WiLS and WPLC. They are also working on, "Found in Wisconsin," an extremely helpful adjunct to the Wisconsin Heritage Online project. It allows discovery of digitized collections held by various libraries. The reduction of the collection is complete. Madison Public Library will be moving their collection in soon.

K. Kiefer thanked all of the DLTCL team for working so shorthanded. There has been a creative and willing attitude while looking at repurposing resources in the team. He reported that, at the meeting of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA), there were some consistent themes:

- Funding isn't getting any better at state or federal level. The best we can hope to do is to stay even.
- There was a spoken emphasis on prioritizing what is of most value and is most important for the customer.
- Things could be a lot worse than what we're seeing in Wisconsin. Some of the stories they heard were shocking. Texas was cut by 2/3, with no systems and no revenue sharing. With all of these stories, the thought that kept being spoken was being creative and continuing to add value. Partnership is key. Even within DPI, the teams have to assist one another. The school library team has lost their federal funding, so teams will have to partner to support them.
- If there is one thing to convey, it's the combination of two words: libraries and learning. It's important to convey the lifelong learning aspect of libraries.
- We should also be thinking about how libraries can help with workforce development. Libraries as community resources can help provide resources and places for people to get their business plans created, etc.
- We have to continue to look at how to provide the most efficient service possible. We need to have hard conversations about how we look as a state going forward.

WiLS

Thanks to all of you who attended the WiLS community meetings. The meetings served two purposes: to gather information for WiLS strategic planning and to get people together to talk and build new

relationships. The results are being compiled and will be shared after the strategic planning process is completed.

A committee is forming for WiLSWorld planning, and S. Morrill asked for volunteers. K. Hewitt volunteered to be part of the committee.

In the cooperative purchasing area, negotiations are underway for a large variety of databases. S. Gold has received calls from individual libraries in systems asking for pricing. She has been in touch with libraries that are not Level 1 members about this. If you have five or more libraries interested in a database, it's probably worth asking S. Gold for a quote.

WiLS will be showcasing their Order Direct vendors at WLA, and is looking for suggestions for additional vendors.

There is a new ILL borrowing service underway, and seems to be going well. The service is really geared toward libraries that are having retirements or refocusing of staff and looking to outsource some work.

The virtual reference group met. The original plan was to survey interest and then have another meeting. However, instead, costs are being compiled and responses will be collected after that. There will probably not be another in-person meeting.

WLA: No report

Around the table:

Final budget decisions based on 2012 System Aid reductions

K. Hewitt reported that they will be sharing technology staff with another system, have renegotiated their lease with their landlord to save \$15,000 next year. They also applied for a Madison Community Foundation grant.

K. Ross reported that they have a building for sale.

J. Thompson reported that, after many decades of service, their books by mail service will end on March 31, 2012. It was a tough decision for their board.

W. Burkhalter reported that they will be sharing a position. Another employee went from full to ¾ time. They will be subscribing to OverDrive Advantage, but their resource library will be paying for it, so the resource library contract went down. They will be going to four day delivery for intersystem delivery. For intra-system delivery, they have a contract with no increase.

J. Debacher asked that if systems hear of libraries getting higher than a 8-10% reduction, please let him know so he can keep a tally on it. Spring Green is taking a 33% cut. There is one library in the Indianhead system potentially taking a 50% cut. It's also looking bad for Waukesha Public Library.

Other

M. Arend mentioned that Karen Boehning is compiling a large spreadsheet of technology information. He has spreadsheets to distribute so that systems can fill in the missing information.

Set date and location for next meeting

February 13th / Legislative day: February 14th