

## 5-Year Landscape

Each small group was asked to work from its 20 year landscape vision, and determine what the landscape would look like in 5 years: What needs to be done to get to the 5 year landscape? What are the barriers to getting there?

### Awareness group:

- Fewer systems
- Fewer resource libraries
- Focus on spending dollars and communication
- Be more “pioneering” not reactionary
- Changes in skill sets
- System staff: multi-functional/experts
- Fewer full-time -> more part-time staff
- Barriers:
  - Patron value?/opinion
  - Not seen as vital
  - Sacred cows
  - Job loss
  - Communicating personal value
  - Funding
  - Time
  - Staffing issues
  - Boldness
  - Priorities
  - Change
- How to get there?
  - Change curriculum
  - Cross training
  - Ongoing training
  - Expand political boundaries
  - Small steps
  - More effective “library school” training
  - Targeted publicity now!
  - Look at commonalities
  - Look outside library model
  - Involve patrons to push change
  - Increase “value” level
  - Consolidation with directors/politicians
  - Statewide ILS and communicate its value

## **Funding group:**

- Changing the law:
  - By 2018, there will be X number of systems... (gives time for mergers to happen, and allows staff to find new jobs)
  - Allow ease of systems merging
  - Eliminate resource library mandate
  - Allow libraries to change systems easily
  - Allow library district taxing authority
  - Municipality can create library-dedicated tax
- Review and update Wisconsin Public Library Systems report (Pearlmutter, 2005)
- Create incentives for systems to merge
- Barriers:
  - Wisconsin Legislature/Government bodies (i.e. municipalities)
  - Library staff (fear of losing jobs/resources)
  - Taxpayers/voters
  - Lack of a shared vision
  - Library systems
  - Regionalism
- Overcoming barriers:
  - Give people options
  - Created shared vision
    - Update Pearlmuter report
  - Create incentives to merge
- First steps:
  - Solidify shared vision
  - Update Pearlmuter report

## **Library Law group:**

- Actions:
  - Libraries create a “task force” to modernize Chapter 43.001 (WLA)
  - Libraries create a task force to modernize statute regarding system services (WLA)
  - Libraries create a task force to modernize resource library statutes (WLA)
  - WLA approaches DPI or a legislator to take results from the task forces to the Legislative Council.
  - Fix the provisions in statutes that govern reimbursement for non-resident use.
  - Note: WLA is a credible state-wide voice and is charged with creating these task forces.
- Barriers:
  - Lack of crisis (no motivation)
  - Pride of ownership (turf)
  - Librarians/libraries don't pass the laws
  - Lack of consensus among libraries
  - What's in it for the legislators?

### Resource sharing group:

- Change Chapter 43, especially mandates
- Develop effective strategy to work with legislators
- System services: ILS and delivery, advocacy, communication/collaboration, CE
- System specialties contracted out
- Work toward fewer systems with greater depth of expertise
- Funding districts?
- Fewer systems
- Consortia share 1 ILS {53 libraries, OWLS and Nicolet}
- Flexibility/open minds
- Barrier: Territorialism: who pays for what
- ILS – purview of WiLS or DPI
- Licensing agreements vs. ownership
- Changes in chapter 43 consistent with vision
- System collections of non-print stuff (cake pans/seeds)
- ILS include all members of system
- Statewide borrowing
- Adequate reimbursement for non-reciprocal borrowing
- Fair reimbursement – county libraries
- Fewer systems/admin and more specialists will help financial situation
- Develop effective strategy for working with legislators so they feel solutions are “win-win”
- Systems specialize and offer contract services
- Hybrid: geography and peer-to-peer [similar sized libraries]
- Help desk – triage
- Technology
- ILS
- Marketing
- Advocacy
- CE
- Cataloging – central
- Ignoring mandates: are they important?
- System specialists
- Special needs
- COLAND recommends changes to Chapter 43
- SRLAAW requests DPI to recommend

## Service implications of technology group:

- Common ILS: statewide or systemwide
  - Standardize policies
  - Statewide library card
  - Affordable cost/maintenance
  - Discovery layer
  - Barriers:
    - Geographical distance & delivery of materials
    - Number of materials from outside the system
    - Equitable access: who gets materials first?
- Continuing education
  - Share resources/staff between systems
  - Webinars, Skype, GoToMeeting
  - Role of resource library?
  - Core competencies: “23 things on a stick” Charlotte-Mecklenberg
  - Barriers:
    - Lose face-to-face with peers
    - Lose moral support from peers
- Group purchasing
  - Authentication/setup from vendors
  - Discounted prices
  - Hardware/software support
  - Barrier: agreement among systems
- Reporting/statistics
  - Showing relevancy beyond the “numbers”
  - Change how we track stats and how we report them
  - Funding based on reports
  - Barriers: statute definitions

## Technology infrastructure group:

- Collaborative workspaces
  - 5 years: library as “makerspace”
  - Barrier: existing building infrastructure
- Larger pool of digital content
  - Barrier: publishers, business models, moving “culture” to digital
  - WI Digital Library is a step in right direction, but are libraries large enough to the publishing industry?
- Role of public access computing
  - Will we need more or less? What changes?
    - More wireless
    - More bandwidth
  - Steps: Reform USF...
- System mergers
  - Barriers:
    - The will to merge at the local level
    - Fear with regards to staffing/benefits
    - Resource library laws get in the way
    - Local control of the system boards
  - Steps: incentives from the state level
- ILS mergers
  - “Like Amazon”
  - Barriers
    - Different software
    - Different versions
    - Different cost sharing arrangements
    - Future upgrades once 2+ systems come together
    - Policies and mergers of 2 or more consortiums
  - Overcoming barriers
    - Involve public (?)
    - Being able to market and “sell” enhanced services to the patrons and the staff at the libraries
    - Financial incentives (grants?)
    - Larger pools reduce costs (economies of scale)