

**MINUTES**  
**System and Resource Library Administrators' Association of Wisconsin**  
**South Central Library System**  
**3:00 PM; Monday, February 16, 2015**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Grant Lynch called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

**QUORUM DETERMINATION & PROXY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Lynch declared there was a quorum, and reported on the proxies held and noted below.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Those in attendance introduced themselves: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Mark Arend (Winnefox), Amy Birtell (ESLS), LeeAnn Briese (Kenosha County Community Library), John DeBacher (DLT), Bruce Gay (MCFLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (Winnefox/Oshkosh PL), Sue Heskin (Superior PL; via telephone conference), Terrie Howe (DLT), Paula Kiely (Milwaukee PL), Susan Lee (Madison PL), Grant Lynch (Waukesha PL), Jessica MacPhail (Racine PL), Connie Meyer (WCFLS), Gerrie Moeller (OWLS), Stef Morrill (WiLS), Steve Ohs (LLS), Becky Petersen (MCLS), Jeff Platteter (ALS), Kathy Pletcher (COLAND; guest), Collene Rortvedt (Appleton PL), Krista Ross (SWLS; via telephone conference), Joy Schwartz (Winnefox; telephone conference moderator), Jane Schumann (Friends of the Racine Public Library; guest), Marla Sepnafski (WVLS; proxy for Ralph Illick, MCPL), Bruce Smith (WiLS), Cherilyn Stewart (Manitowoc PL), Lin Swartz-Truesdell (Kenosha PL; proxy for Barbara Brattin, KPL), John Thompson (IFLS), Jim Trojanowski (NWLS; proxy for Sue Heskin 4:00pm-), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), Kris Adams Wendt (WVLS and WLA LD&L Committee; guest).

**AGENDA**

Arend moved and Thompson seconded approval of the order of the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

**MINUTES**

Thompson moved and Kiely seconded approval of the minutes of the November 4, 2014 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**TREASURER'S REPORT**

SRLAAW Treasurer Anderson summarized revenue and expenditures in 2014 and reported that \$.07 in interest had been received thus far in 2015, leaving a fund balance of \$820.98. The Treasurer's Report was received and filed as presented.

**SRLAAW OFFICER ELECTIONS FOR 2015**

Chair: Current Chair Lynch nominated himself to chair SRLAAW for another year. There were no additional nominations from the floor. Arend moved and MacPhail seconded acceptance of the nomination. The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair: There being no nominations from the floor, Trojanowski volunteered for the position. Sepnafski moved and Thompson seconded acceptance of the nomination. The motion carried unanimously.

Treasurer: As a permanent appointment, Anderson volunteered to continue as SRLAAW Treasurer for another year.

## **NATIONAL LIBRARY LEGISLATIVE DAY (NLLD) – SRLAAW REPRESENTATIVE**

Chair Lynch indicated his willingness to again represent SRLAAW at NLLD in Washington, D.C. Kiely commented on the benefit for Chair Lynch to attend again, both for consistency and for developing relationships, on behalf of SRLAAW. As no one else volunteered, Chair Lynch will attend the 2015 NLLD and follow-up with a report to the group.

### **LSTA 2015 AND 2016 (this discussion came after the following agenda item)**

DeBacher reported that DLT did not meet the IMLS maintenance of effort requirement in federal years 2011-2012 due primarily to the 10% budget cut in the state's support of public library systems. DLT applied for a waiver of the MOE penalty, but the IMLS denied the request. DLT appealed, and the appeal was also denied. As a result, the 2015 LSTA appropriation was reduced by 4.7%, and DLT received \$135,000 less than they would have otherwise received. Fortunately, the 2015 budget planned for this to occur.

Howe talked about an "indirect cost", a new option available to LSTA grantees. While this new expenditure option may be considered as soon as this year, the reassessed grant budget would need to be negotiated with DPI. Additionally, inclusion of indirect costs would not increase grant amounts.

### **COLAND'S STRATEGIC VISION FOR LIBRARY SYSTEMS IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY (this discussion came before the agenda item above)**

Pletcher, COLAND representative, reviewed the recommendations and roadmap "Strategic Vision for Library Systems in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" documents shared with SRLAAW. She mentioned that a major recommendation which came out of the December 2014 joint meeting of the COLAND workgroup and LEAN Study Committee was to focus first on system service redesign, and then on system consolidation. COLAND then asked the LEAN Study Committee to create a roadmap for moving the process forward. WiLS (Smith) drafted a roadmap, and presented that document along with a statewide ILS report to COLAND at its January 2015 meeting. The roadmap suggests a process for service design with involvement by the library community and a budget of \$500,000 for two project managers, travel costs for committee members, etc.

Sepnafski asked if it was okay to share the two documents with member libraries. Pletcher indicated that both documents were now on the website and could be shared as needed. She mentioned that while the documents were approved in January 2015, COLAND wanted to discuss the documents with State Superintendent Evers before sharing them with the library community. She noted that Evers endorsed the process and timeline and encouraged COLAND to seek funding for it.

Kiely wondered if there was a fiscal analysis or feasibility study done over the long term and, if not, when that would be done. Pletcher referred to cost savings in the LEAN study, and Kiely commented that the costs in the LEAN study were not complete and that the implementation costs were not included in that report. She suggested that a long-term ROI analysis be done prior to finalizing any decisions. Smith indicated that cost assessments and comparisons of different models and options would be done, and pilots of recommendations would be tested prior to full implementation. Kiely asked if funds were available for fiscal planning expertise outside of what was available through project managers. DeBacher indicated that funds were available for specific subject experts.

Pletcher then highlighted the next phase of the process which was to find funding for the proposal. As DPI's budget had already been submitted, and the Governor's draft budget already completed, COLAND's strategy was to influence the Joint Finance Committee process. A visit

with one JFC member was completed and others were being scheduled. Should the proposal get into the state budget through JFC, the project will move forward on July 1<sup>st</sup>. If not, a new strategy to move this project forward would need to be developed.

Trojanowski shared a concern that SRLAAW and the WLA Board were the only groups that knew about this proposal, and that it likely that information about the project had not reached more than 10% of public library directors in the state. He stated that we needed to ensure communication across the state and opportunities for libraries to participate in the process. Pletcher replied that a meeting/webinar had not yet been scheduled but that it was a helpful suggestion.

DeBacher indicated that COLAND may be sharing information through the *WI Libraries for Everyone* blog but did not want this to occur prior to WLA's Library Legislative Day. Official language had not yet been developed, and presenting inconsistent messages to legislators could confuse the process. Pletcher mentioned that official language may be available in March.

Wendt mentioned that the best message to give legislators during WLA's LLD was that we were here as a resource for our representatives in the future.

Gilderson-Duwe questioned what should be shared with legislators following WLA's LLD, as Winnefox had planned to meet with a legislator to do a READ poster. Chair Lynch recommended that standardized talking points be available. Wendt indicated that talking points were not available now, but that they would be soon. Pletcher stated that she would follow up with the group, pending the outcome of her visit with another JFC member. Gilderson-Duwe requested that COLAND let SRLAAW know when and how to discuss this proposal.

Birtell commented that SRLAAW leaders should be empowered to speak, that being told to not speak is disheartening. She understood that consistency of message was necessary but that, collectively, we could have been sending a message tomorrow rather than having to wait a month.

Gilderson-Duwe clarified that he didn't feel disempowered. He trusts the strategy and will hold his fire until it is most effective.

Birtell asked for a timeline of the bill. DeBacher said that this would not be a bill but rather a part of the much larger budget bill.

Pletcher asked for patience during this process. The "ask" wasn't on the table yet, and COLAND was still having exploratory conversations with leaders. If a legislator were to champion this project, a strategy for moving it forward would be available.

Thompson advised that the LEAN Study Committee looked at this project as a reallocation of costs to improve services rather than as an analysis of "savings". An analysis of savings would focus on cuts to funding.

Pletcher mentioned that the theme coming out of the JFC is about saving money.

In conclusion, Pletcher reminded SRLAAW that the documents shared with them were on the COLAND website. If anyone had additional questions or concerns, members were encouraged to contact Nita Burke (COLAND) or Rosalyn Wise (DPI).

## **LIBRARY RENTAL FEES**

Stewart mentioned that *The Atlantic* article “Rethinking Government: Why We Need Library Rental Fees” (<http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2011/07/rethinking-government-why-we-need-library-rental-fees/242266/>) had circulated throughout the Manitowoc community several times over the last few years, and most recently at last year’s community planning session. During that session, in which community members and local leaders addressed the budget gap, people offered that they would pay to be members of the library, and expressed disappointment when they couldn’t do that. Stewart enquired if other states allowed this. The local school superintendent mentioned that they offset budget challenges by implementing fees for such things as athletic, textbooks, etc. As Wisconsin libraries were not likely to implement fees, Stewart asked for suggestions for responses to elected officials who want to push this idea.

DeBacher mentioned that several years ago he did an FAQ on library fees which provided two Attorneys General opinions interpreting Wis. Stats.43.52 which, in summary, stated that libraries shall be free to use, and which rejected charges for services that were fairly unique to libraries. Meeting room and equipment rental fees were deemed allowable as those services may be available elsewhere in the community. Libraries could also charge rental fees for books and video titles provided sufficient free copies were available to meet long-term needs.

Stewart mentioned there was also a view that a person shouldn’t have to pay for services they are not using. Kiely suggested that our professional ethics and standards address that comment – libraries exist to create equal access for all people, and to all materials in all formats.

## **E-BOOKS USE & COUNTY PAYMENTS**

Gilderson-Duwe mentioned Winnefox libraries were surveyed for their reactions to a WI Libraries for Everyone blog post in which DeBacher shared his opinion that inclusion of e-book circulations in county formulas ran counter to Chapter 43. A lengthy discussion ensued.

DeBacher clarified that if e-book circulations were included in county funding formulas, that county reimbursements would likely decrease due to the distribution of broadband. Arend said that he disagreed in part, and shared his view that if both the county and member libraries agreed to it, that this count could be included in the county funding formula as long as the county funding was above minimum statutory levels. He pointed out that he had done calculations, both with and without e-book circulations, and the amounts were not that different from what libraries were currently getting. He also mentioned that library directors were concerned that counties might view circulation decreases as a way to reduce their support.

Chair Lynch commented that he found this (county) view to be absurd. He explained that the Waukesha Public Library had gone to great lengths to raise efficiency in materials selection. For example, ten years ago one might have checked out five books to get the one-half of the one book needed. Because of improved catalog search and holds processes, a patron now can receive the one book actually needed. He pointed out that there are certainly artificial ways to increase circulation if necessary, and that we need to be clear about what is valuable and what is not.

Trojanowski said that DeBacher’s blog post proved very helpful in a recent experience in which he was responding to concerns from a new library director about dropping circulations. He then met with the director’s library board and shared usage graphs which indicated circulation drops across the state. He advised the board to focus less on circulation and to look at other service trends and ways in which libraries across the nation were thriving. He said that NWLS was planning to do a webinar on this topic for their member libraries in the future.

Chair Lynch again cautioned against the application of artificial quantitative measures to a qualitative patron experience.

Trojanowski commented that circulation was easy to measure.

Gilderson-Duwe agreed it (circulation count) was a bad proxy, but that it also was a powerful one that was substantiated in Chapter 43 and funding formulas, and locked in the minds of funding authorities.

DeBacher stated that discussions prior to the implementation of Act 150 explored ways to represent nonresident use to total use. Because checkouts were often tracked by automated systems and because patron registration procedures were fairly consistent, circulation use was recommended. He wished the bill language calculated the ratio of nonresident use against total operating costs to come up with a county payment, rather than the cost per checkout multiplied by circulation.

### **E-RATE EFFICIENCIES**

Van Pelt asked DeBacher if there was a way to refine the e-rate reporting process in such a way that each library wouldn't have to complete the entire form. DeBacher replied that there wasn't anything to make reporting easier at this time, but explained that within two years only broadband and internet would be available for libraries as telephone service would be phased out. He reminded all that libraries applying for e-rate for their internet need to filter to be CIPA-compliant, and able to turn off the filter upon request. In many cases this makes e-rate more trouble than its worth. He noted that e-rate discounts do not apply to the cost of filters, only to the administrative cost of implementing filters.

### **STATE BUDGET DISCUSSION**

Chair Lynch stated that he didn't think there was a need for discussion on this topic as the draft budget was now available. However he solicited questions/comments about the budget and there were none.

### **IMPROVING COMMUNICATION, OPENNESS & TRANSPARENCY IN THE LIBRARY COMMUNITY**

Trojanowski shared his observation that communication within the library community was very uneven. He cited examples of helpful information sharing as well as situations where broader distribution would have been beneficial, and then challenged the group to do a better job of communication.

Morrill stated that DLT's blog was a good place to focus their energies, and that WiLS would work with DLT staff to more widely share their ILS presentation done at a recent COLAND meeting.

Chair Lynch suggested that information be aggregated/headquartered in one place.

Trojanowski said that this might work for a while, but one could forget to check it. A feed of some sort might be a good compromise.

DeBacher mentioned the DLT blog allows for guest blogs and suggested that people share ideas for posts with DLT. He indicated that DLT was investigating Google Communities as a way to transition from WISPUBLIB.

Kiely expressed appreciation that this topic came up because communication was one of the most difficult things we have to do. As she was listening to the earlier she reflected on the assumptions we have about what people were hearing and about their buy-in for something, without it being tested. There was an important topic on today's agenda – COLAND – and when we communicate about it – we should think not about what is effective for us (the communicator) but on who needs to hear about it. All of us need to hear important information more than once, and the way people take in information varies with each individual. To really get buy in on important issues, there needs to be a communication plan designed to reach key individuals and as many individuals as possible. The strategy for the communication plan depends on the topic – there is no single strategy that will work for all issues. She said she would have liked more communication on COLAND activities.

Chair Lynch agreed that project updates would have been helpful.

Kiely commented that receiving timely information on issues that impact the library community in WI was really important. Redesigning systems was a complicated issue, one that impacts our individual libraries and our systems in different ways. She stated there was a lot of risk within this one agenda item and that we hadn't talked about the risk. Requesting \$500,000 was one scenario, what was another scenario? Having more open and timely conversation, instead of making sure every "t" was crossed and "i" was dotted before communicating and sharing information was not helpful. She suggested that if (COLAND) wanted to trust us to share the information in the way they (COLAND) wanted, that they needed to make sure we bought into it.

Trojanowski mentioned that he was okay if there wasn't buy in, however he wanted an opportunity to be heard. He said that we've talked about the value of keeping information close - there was validity to that, but there was also a risk of losing control of the message. He emphasized that we each need to try to make sure that information about the good work we are doing reaches everybody.

Birtell mentioned how helpful the LEAN study and ILS report were to ESLS.

Trojanowski hoped this discussion would not end with this agenda. Chair Lynch too thought this discussion should be an ongoing agenda item.

#### **AFFILIATED ORGANIZATION REPORTS**

**DLT:** In addition to what was mentioned earlier in the meeting, DeBacher announced: There was an opening on the LSTA Advisory Committee, and if anyone was interested to contact Terrie Howe. The next LAC meeting was in April. DLT planned to decrease the committee from 15 members to 12 to reduce issues of finding people who can attend meetings and to ease the cost of conducting meetings.

Jamie was still collecting collaborative activity data from system annual reports and would get that information out when it was completed.

Digital Learning Day was March 13<sup>th</sup>. Information was available at [DigitalLibrary.org](http://DigitalLibrary.org) and Ryan would let people know how they could participate.

There was a collaborative CE pilot project for youth and special services staff that would provide \$5,000 (which was undesignated in the Growing WI Readers project) to a few systems who partnered in a regional way.

DLT hoped that DOA's TEACH budget request would include grants for wiring and training but that was not the case.

Six teams (rather than five) I-Lead USA-Wisconsin teams were selected. The first of three week-long sessions was slated for March. More information about this project was on the PLD website.

An assistant director and content/outreach librarian were being hired by RL&LL.

DLT planned to establish a workgroup to help with Public Library Standards redevelopment.

*Wisconsin Libraries for Everyone* was the new blog to be used for major announcements, updates, and historical pieces.

**WILS:** Due to the lateness of the meeting, Morrell indicated she would provide information in a written report (attached).

**WPLC:** Van Pelt noted that the next WPLC meeting was in two weeks.

**WLA:** Wendt mentioned that 200 people registered for Library Legislative Day. She hoped that systems were forwarding the legislative newsletter to their all "subscribers" lists. Ohs indicated that the Lakeshores Library System partnered with the Beloit Public Library to organize a very successful joint listening session and that they were hoping to develop a template of the process for others to use. Platteter mentioned that the Beloit Public Library Director did a great job of facilitating this event and in gathering patrons to speak on behalf of libraries. Arend mentioned that Winnefox was doing the READ posters with legislators, that an article about this project appeared in the latest *Communique*, and to contact him for more details.

**COLAND:** Reported previously.

#### **MEMBER ROUNDTABLE**

Due to the lateness of the meeting, Chair Lynch tabled this item.

#### **NEXT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**

The next meeting will be held the day before the WAPL Conference in Wisconsin Rapids.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The group's enthusiasm for the meeting to end made it difficult for the meeting recorder to identify who motioned adjournment and who seconded. However the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marla Sepnafski, Meeting Recorder