

*System and Resource Library Administrators Association of Wisconsin  
Minutes of the Meeting December 15, 2000; Madison, Wisconsin*

Those present: Jessica MacPhail, Bernie Bellin, John Nichols, Ken Hall, Karen Krueger, Paul Nelson, Larry Nix, Alan Zimmerman, David Weinhold, Bob Bocher, Kathy Schneider, Peter Hamon, Heather Eldred, Sally Drew, Thomas J. Hennen, Alan Engelbert, Sharon Winkle, Paula Kiely, Ruth Ann Montgomery, Michael Tyree, Matthew Bollerman, Joan Airoidi, Rick Krumwiede, Janet Jennings, David Polodna, Tom Strange, Mark Morse, Milton Mitchell, Barbara Dimick; Cal Potter joined the group for the afternoon session.

- I. Call to order: Chair Milton Mitchell called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.
- II. Quorum determination: The Chair announced that a quorum was present.
- III. Additions/changes to the agenda: Winkle asked that the Kettle Commission report be added to the agenda. Item X (Comparative Library Statistics) was tabled to the next meeting.
- IV. A motion to approve the minutes from the August 11, 2000, meeting was carried unanimously. (Polodna/Bellin)
- V. Legislative Update: Based on recent meetings, Nix reported that the future of the bill to enable multi-county systems to borrow money from the State Trust Fund looks good. The TEACH Board has forwarded as part of its budget package provisions that were part of SB 60, i.e., enabling TEACH recipients to borrow funds for equipment; including branch libraries in the program, and allowing municipalities to share T1 lines.

Paul Nelson, Chair of L, D & L, thanked everyone for the letters about System funding that were sent to DOA; they helped to draw attention and raise the issues. A contingent from L, D & L will be meeting with George Lightbourn and McCallum aide Scott Kelly. More letters are welcome.

Nelson also reported on the UCITA conference he recently attended, and the status of UCITA in Wisconsin. UCITA has been included in the Republicans new economy agenda, but it has not shown up lately in Scott Jensen's latest Speaker's reports. "Large" consumers, such as the insurance industry, and other consumers will oppose this. Nelson thinks it is unlikely to appear in the Thompson budget. Nelson has been working with an informal group, including Attorney General Jim Doyle. Momentum has slowed nationally on this; many businesses that "consume" computer software will be concerned about this bill. He referred people to the AFFECT Web site (<http://www.4cite.org/>).

The Legislative network structure continues to be an L, D & L issue. L, D & L is looking at a Library Advocacy Round Table in 2001-2003. This group would need to

work with L, D & L to carry out legislative activities. Perhaps regional legislative networks will be developed.

Weinhold described the situation in his System where the City of Mequon's tax rate is adequate, according to Mequon, but less than the county library tax threshold; this is a unique situation.

The group agreed to take up the Kettl Commission addition to the agenda at this point. Winkle shared a draft of recommendations from the Report concerning the current shared revenue program in Wisconsin. Regional cooperation in certain services is to be rewarded with a "growth-sharing" incentive payment, and one of the services listed is libraries. Dimick reported that requiring savings from regional cooperative efforts can be problematic without service cuts. Nichols reported that "Smart Growth" plans require that land use plans be in alignment, which is of concern among towns. The group agreed that these issues need to remain on our radar screens.

Nelson reminded the group that Governor Thompson may be offered a Cabinet position, so we need to be finding out where McCallum stands on library issues. This next budget, however, will probably be Thompson's.

Polodna reported on a legislative initiative to allow parental access to children's library cards. Nix responded that the library community is divided on the juvenile privacy law issue. Does parental responsibility supercede right to privacy? Bellin added that the age of the juvenile is a major question. Plus, parents now sign to take responsibility for their children's library use, but then they can't know what their child has checked out? Another issue that needs to remain on the radar screen. Hennen alerted the group to the Gunderson proposal to end double whammy taxation – stop the funding from both the municipality and the county for some services.

Nelson announced that Legislative Day in 2001 is February 13. Mitchell announced that the IFLS Legislative Day is next week. Eldred mused that perhaps there should be a northern Wisconsin Legislative Day, since travel to Madison is so difficult in February. Nelson responded that this fits in with the regional meeting concept proposed by L, D & L. Eastern Shores will be arranging meetings for legislative contacts. Nelson asked for notification of such meetings.

Krueger asked whether Library Boards must endorse the entire Legislative Agenda? Is it all, or nothing? Nelson responded that at this point, the answer is yes.

VI. (no item VI.)

VII. Review of feedback from Unifying Vision Program, and discussion of where do we go from here: Krueger reported on the WLA program. There was some sentiment that we focused only on public libraries, and we should have broadened to multi-type issues. There was also a contingent that felt that they should have been asked up front what Systems should do. Mitchell added that people were asking why SRLAAW was

leading this issue. Krumwiede added that there was a vocal minority who had an agenda with their local system. Jennings would have liked to offer comments on particular issues. We do need options for generating additional information. Nix added that this was another forum where the multi-type issue has come up. Multi-type regionalization is still an issue in Wisconsin. Eldred reported that people are asking whether change to systems will be forced, or will there be some local control. Nichols reported that members of his System want self-determination; Hall added that the status quo is comforting.

Where do we go from here? Weinhold thinks that the SRLAAW survey helps us to argue for 13% funding. Do we need more information before we move to restructuring systems? Nelson pointed out that we need to take positives from the survey to encourage support for 13% funding for systems. Nichols asked whether it might not be a good idea to pull some new money out of possible 13% funding to allocate to electronic resources, given survey responses. Bollerman suggested that we release the results from the survey in a widespread way; use the survey to support our position, and set aside the structural issue for now. The top three themes from the survey were: Access to electronic resources; BadgerCard, and minimum standards. Krueger suggested we might want to include new money for electronic databases in system funding. Nelson wondered if this would affect BadgerLink funding. Polodna stated that systems could work toward meeting some of these identified themes with 13% funding; these might be different in each system. Krueger asked about the overarching vision; where will we get money for statewide issues, i.e., BadgerCard. Nichols added that he wondered how legislators would see this issue of BadgerLink funding, and the need for unique local electronic databases. Hennen asked whether we would need another rendition of this for more discussion for the 2003-2005 biennium. Nix responded that this information was not gathered for this budget cycle; it was meant for the next legislative period, and not for the 13% issue. We should not interface this with the 13% funding push. Nichols asked whether the restructuring of systems was a dead issue. Krueger asked if we could use some of the 13% new money on a statewide basis, to further some of our "themes." MacPhail suggested a press release should be put out on the agreed upon top themes. Hennen asked who would deal with the system models issue?

*Weinhold (Hennen) moved to refer the survey results to committee for a final report and a statement that SRLAAW could vote on.* (The Unifying Vision Committee: Nix, Krueger, Krumwiede, Lang, Polodna, Strange, Houston, Mitchell.) Nix stated that we still need a process for bringing consensus to the library community. Hall again asked if there was any support among member libraries for a new system model. Krueger stated that we should not link the unifying vision with the 13% issue for this budget cycle. Let's wait until after the budget is released, and meet within three weeks of that. Polodna asked if we didn't need some movement on this process? The data suggests an approach to the future. Can we move forward with that, at least? We need something for people to address. Engelbert stated that there is a need to define the first four themes. What do they really mean? Krumwiede stated that the committee needs to issue a report. *Motion passed unanimously. Krueger moved that*

*the group hold a special meeting within three weeks of knowing what happens to System Aids. (Strange) Unanimous.*

- VIII. Future of WISCAT: Drew and Bocher reported on WISCAT and LITAC (Library Information Technology Advisory Committee.) WISCAT must be re-bid, since the contract is up. A linked systems pilot is proposed for 2002 with LSTA funds; the Division will advocate for inclusion of shared automation systems in LSTA. DLTCL will promote direct Internet access and will work with TEACH and E-rate programs to help reach this goal. Potter reported that the TEACH Board will help with direct Internet access. It is estimated that it would cost \$10 million to have all libraries part of shared automation systems. We are hoping for an increase in LSTA for next year, to perhaps help with the issues in DLTCL's draft Technology and Resource Sharing planning paper. We will need to work with WEMA to further these automated goals for all libraries. Hamon reported that we are working on getting money from TEACH for software for automated projects.

Nichols called for a WISCAT discussion at SRLAAW. Potter responded to some of the WISCAT issues. Schools don't have enough resources to share their collections with others, and what they do have is for curricular use; even so, some do share. Statewide systems are expensive operations, and Wisconsin does not have the money to move forward with this; right now, LSTA funds 75% of DLTCL staff. A primary objective of DLTCL is to get schools on WISCAT and to get them to be part of resource sharing statewide. Nichols asked what SRLAAW members think about the timetable for linked systems, and the future of WISCAT. Drew explained how use of LSTA funding has changed and that R & L is definitely not just focused on public libraries. Morse is concerned about the technicalities and cost of participating in WISCAT or OCLC. LITAC will be looking at recommendation for the future of WISCAT. Weinhold wants LITAC to look at what a new statewide database would be, and how we get from where we are today to the future. Hall wants LITAC to come up with a timeline for migrating off WISCAT to whatever the future alternative is. Potter reiterated that we need to keep schools in mind as part of total educational community in Wisconsin.

*Hennen moved the endorsement of the Technology and Resource Sharing report as a good and solid beginning and urges thoughtful and careful consideration of the transition to the new millenium WISCAT. (Polodna). Krueger state that we need to look at costs of resource sharing; linked systems would need local protocols depending on what technology would allow and what systems would agree to. Nichols wondered what we are saying about a timetable for WISCAT if we endorse this DLTCL plan. Do we want to leave the door open for other alternatives? It was pointed out that DLTCL has asked for feedback, not action at this time. Motion fails, ten for votes, 12 against.*

- IX. SRLAAW membership: *Hamon moved to refer to a SRLAAW committee the addition of four to six at-large representatives to SRLAAW, taken from WAPL membership, in order to have a tie-in with WLA. (Hennen) Motion failed.*

- X. (No item X.)
- XI. NetLibrary Project: NetLibrary should be available for the public in February; almost 2100 electronic items have been ordered, and new systems have been added to the consortia, for a total of ten.
- XII. Filtering: Given the recently passed federal legislation, Krumwiede introduced the issues of filtering in a networked environment. He wants to not re-invent the wheel in dealing with server/client structure. Do we address this in a WAN environment or on the workstation level? He would like to discuss the technical issues on implementation with others who will be/are dealing with this on a system level. He will seek people to get together for problem solving on this issue.

Nominating Committee: Strange and Airoidi will serve as a nominating committee for presenting a slate of officers for the February meeting.

- XIII. Updates/Reports: State Budget: LSTA: will be adding up to \$30,000 to shared automated systems, and \$16,000 for connecting “needy” libraries to the Internet. Reauthorization of LSTA is next year.

Delivery of Library Materials: A report will come to SRLAAW on this; they are talking to other groups beyond public, school, and universities. They want costs to be equalized and they are looking for ways to fund this.

It was noted that we don’t know where TEACH is going, after its initial authorization of five years.

Library Discussion Group: This diverse group’s next meeting is February 12. At the last meeting, they discussed the dial 211 information service. This is aimed at I & R and human resource/social service agencies. Due to the information function of libraries, however, library representatives should be at this table.

Observations on System Plans: Some of the plans submitted to the Division were very thorough; others were not. The group was reminded that these plans need to be qualitative statements of system intent, to justify state support of systems.

- XIV. Other reports: Treasurer’s report: *Bellin moved to have the 2001 fee be \$50. (Strange) Passed.*  
WiLS report: Schneider reported that she would like to get a better handle on what public libraries would like WiLS to look into regarding licensing.  
COLAND report: Potter reported on the new appointments.

Meeting adjourned somewhere after 3:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: February 9, 2001.

Barbara Dimick, Recorder

