

LSTA Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Comfort Suites, April 4-5, 2007

Wednesday, April 4: Noon – 4:00 pm
(*new member orientation 10:00 – 11:45 a.m.; public hearing 1:00 p.m.*)

Present: Paul Onufrak, Elizabeth Richmond, Phyllis Davis, Jim Gingery, Jane Pearlmutter, Jan Adams, Roxane Bartelt, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Bea Lebal, and Mildred McDowell

Absent: Terrance Burton, Paula Kiely, Terry Dawson, Zora Sampson

Division Staff: Peg Branson, Bob Bocher, Kate Bugher, Mary Clark, Mike Cross, John DeBacher, Sally Drew, Martha Farley, Rick Grobschmidt, Barb Huntington, Donna Steffan, Al Zimmerman.

Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Branson. She welcomed the committee and asked the members and staff to introduce themselves.

Public Hearing

Connie Meyer, Director of the Dwight Foster Public Library in Fort Atkinson, provided comments on her library's migration to a new automated library system in January. There are issues that lead the libraries to be dissatisfied with their current automated system vendor and the limited options that are permitted (such as one enhancement per consortium per year in their agreement). She discussed the Georgia "Pines" open source system. She contacted staff at Georgia and received some information. While their product still does not have acquisitions or serials, it is a viable product with more than 200 libraries in Georgia currently using it.

She wondered whether additional funds could be allocated to the "Innovative Uses of Technology" category, so that an opportunity might be available for a system or two to submit an application to try out this open source solution, which would be better than the "duct tape and bailing wire" solution they have now.

Davis noted that the Innovative Uses of Technology category now has \$5000 per library and wondered how much might be necessary to undertake such a product. Meyer noted that open source does not necessarily ensure that the product is free, since local expertise is necessary. On the other hand, the local library will have funds formerly paid to the shared system vendor. Libraries would save on licensing fees and other costs.

Gilderson-Duwe asked if Pines is being used by consortia outside of Georgia. Meyer reported that the King County Library System in the Seattle area is installing it on an experimental basis.

Lisa Strand, Executive Director of Wisconsin Library Association and Wisconsin Library Association Foundation, thanked the committee for the funding for the economic impact study in 2007 and reported that WLA and WLAF budgeted \$35,000 to contribute to the study and that some additional funds will be budgeted to promote the study. She asked that additional LSTA funds be made available for conducting training around the state to promote and disseminate the results of the study.

Branson added that a letter had been submitted from John Thompson at the Indianhead Federated Library System, asking that the Merging Shared Systems category be continued in the 2008 budget and in the LSTA long-range plan. Gingery asked what dollar amount might be required, since none was mentioned.

He wondered whether Innovative Use of Technology category might be used for such projects. Gilderson-Duwe asked whether that would fit in the category now. Branson noted that the draft amount for the Merged Systems category is \$75,000 to \$150,000 and that the Innovative Use of Technology category is proposed for \$40,000-\$60,000, with individual libraries eligible for up to \$5000. Bocher said he believes there are only two projects eligible for the Merging Shared Systems category, the Brown County and Nicolet/Outagamie Waupaca library shared systems, and the Barron County Library Consortium and Indianhead shared systems.

The public hearing concluded at 1:15 p.m.

Review Agenda

Branson reviewed the agenda for the meeting. She encouraged members to ask questions and make comments during the initial review of the proposed categories.

Onufrak moved, seconded by Davis, to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved as submitted, with a correction to the date of the second day (to April 5, 2007).

Review Minutes of November 29-30, 2006, Meeting

Pearlmutter moved, seconded by Richmond, to approve the minutes of the November 29-30, 2006, committee meeting. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Onufrak moved, seconded by Pearlmutter, to approve the minutes of the conference call meeting of February 14, 2007. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Grobschmidt, on behalf of the State Superintendent, welcomed new members and welcomed back returning members to the advisory committee. He encouraged participation, input, and discussion by the members and said their recommendations would be forwarded to the State Superintendent.

LSTA Coordinator's Report

Branson provided updates on the federal budgets for 2007 and 2008 and the LSTA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) penalty. The 2007 federal budget was not signed by the President until February 14. DPI allowed some of the projects to get started using remaining 2006 funds and 2007 funds released as part of the continuing resolutions passed by congress. All of the remaining 2007 projects had started as of March 1, 2007. Despite the federal budget being passed, the exact amount of the allotment for Wisconsin has not yet been released from the Institute of Museum and Library Services. It is expected to be about \$10,000 less than anticipated.

Branson said that the request for a waiver for the potential penalty of \$110,000 against the FY 2007 funds was approved, as well as a waiver for a potential \$35,000 penalty against the FY 2008 funds. She appreciated the patience of all the grant recipients in coping with the delay in the project start date.

Pearlmutter asked whether the RFP for the Economic Impact Study had been released. DeBacher said it was about ready to be released.

LSTA Five Year Evaluation

The final version of the LSTA evaluation for 2003-2007 that was submitted to IMLS was distributed. Branson said the document, dated March 31, 2007, is more complete than the draft document that had been distributed with the meeting packet. She said the final version of the evaluation will be posted on the LSTA Website.

Draft Five-Year Plan for Wisconsin

Branson reviewed the process of development of the LSTA plan for 2008-2012 and invited input and suggestions for further development. She noted that the information from the LSTA evaluation surveys was incorporated as much as possible and said the draft plan still had gaps in coverage (it's not due until June 30, 2007). She reviewed individual sections, starting with page six.

Goal 1, Technology. Branson suggested that the committee focus on the specific activities. She noted that the draft plan for 2008-2012 includes fewer activities than the 2003-2007 plan (76 versus 26 in this draft), which should make it easier to evaluate and measure progress.

Objective 1A. Support improved telecommunications access in public libraries and public library systems.

Davis asked whether the group would have the opportunity to go over the goals. In particular, she asked whether the goal at the bottom of page 6 should be removed. She had thought that the idea of a single shared system for the state should not be pursued. Gingery added that he thought the results of the Morrill study emphasized that statewide resource sharing ranked near the bottom. Branson commented that the plan covers five years and that the McClure/Bertot study revealed that about half of the respondents expressed an interest in a statewide shared system in the four-to-eight-year range. Bocher recalled about 45% of the respondents were either indifferent to or interested in a state-wide system. Bocher said that the study revealed, without indication of a funding source, that a larger system was desirable for some, but that LSTA funds may not be the way to go to achieve that. Davis thought that the Morrill study put the question to rest. Richmond wondered whether, if the statement were removed, would that preclude an open source solution. Gilderson-Duwe said he had the impression from a report that a single-vendor system was a dead issue. Bocher noted that the state would not be able to impose such a statewide solution. Onufrak noted that because of what has happened in the market in the last few months, he would be more comfortable leaving the language in, particularly since the open source solution may make a single-vendor more of a reality.

Cross noted that the statements on page six are needs statements, not goals statements, and they are included as something that may be considered for LSTA over the next five year, not as goals to be accomplished. Branson said the plan should be broad enough to allow us to look at a variety of options without committing us to anything. She'll modify the language so it is clear that these are needs statements not goal statements.

Branson moved back to Objective 1A. Gilderson-Duwe asked why greater participation in the E-Rate program should be included as an objective. Bocher noted that other states have been more aggressive and have achieved much greater participation by using state or federal funds to encourage participation. Gilderson-Duwe asked whether other systems used the Nicolet model of helping member libraries complete the forms. Bocher said that Northern Waters has helped to coordinate grant submissions for its libraries. Onufrak asked how it would be done. Bocher commented on a possible process.

Davis said she was not clear why LSTA funds would be used for this purpose. She said that her system had tried and the libraries had decided it was not cost effective and that they do it instead at the consortium level. She suggested the LSTA money in the System Technology category be used for this purpose rather than creating a separate category. She did not think it was a high priority.

Pearlmutter said it seemed odd that federal money would be used to get other federal money. Bocher said he wished that more systems could be convinced to use their technology block grant funds for such projects, but they have not.

Adams wondered if it might be possible for public libraries to partner with the schools in their areas to coordinate the E-rate grant program. She added that, speaking from a CESA perspective, someone could be contracted to conduct the training for those libraries. Bocher said that, while he had mixed responses to his query to the public library systems asking about interest, there were positive responses, as well. Branson noted that there would be more opportunity to comment on this particular issue as we discussed the proposed category for 2008.

Objective 1B. Support the availability of electronic content and information for all Wisconsin residents.

Davis suggested that the format changes coming have not been addressed. Cross pointed to Objective 1.5 and said it may cover that concern. Drew was curious how LSTA would be used to address that concern, since it is probably not reasonable to suggest that LSTA be used for local libraries to acquire materials. Pearlmutter suggested that the activity not be too proscriptive. Davis thought that if the plan simply clarified that the information in brackets is illustrative instead of exclusive, that would address her concerns. Branson noted that she did not intend to include the bracketed information in the final plan. It was there for information for the committee at this time.

Richmond said that 1.10 should be more futuristic and less specific.

Objective 1C. Facilitate the development and improvement of shared integrated library systems at the regional level.

Gingery suggested the addition of language for advancing and improving existing systems. He wondered whether text for innovative uses of technology should be added. Branson said that previously there was reluctance to use LSTA for continued funding for expanding shared systems. Gingery suggested some more options that might be explored. Bocher said that the block grant category is already available to use to achieve that end. Gingery said perhaps the block grant category is under-funded.

Davis referred to 1.11 as a new category for shared systems for school participation and wondered whether that belongs in this category if those systems are not truly for the sharing of materials. Richmond wondered whether the current school shared system study is a \$15,000 study limited to a specific area and would not reflect the situation in the entire state. Gingery said it is a new category for \$75,000. Pearlmutter said that the new category seems presumptuous since this year's study is not yet completed. Adams wondered whether the bracketed "new category" language should be removed. Pearlmutter said that the language should not include assumptions about the results of the current study. Gilderson-Duwe suggested "if deemed feasible and appropriate" be added to the statement to make it more palatable.

Onufrak asked that the group return to the discussion of new shared systems and suggested the open source option. He said that he is probably not alone in his cynicism about the current vendor.

Cross said there could be two additions - one would be to do what Paul suggested, a new category for systems who do not like their current product, and another would be to add new developments that would enhance current systems. Branson suggested that the "new technology" item be added elsewhere to broaden the intent and allow for innovation in general.

Objective 1D. Facilitate the sharing of library materials and information resources throughout the state and beyond.

Richmond stated that she hopes the examples here were illustrative so that perhaps multitype options would be available in the future.

Objective 1E. Support state-level leadership, planning, and coordination of technology services throughout the state.

No discussion.

Goal 2: Library Improvement and Special Needs.

Richmond asked about outreach to prisons and Branson noted 2C (literacy for special needs). Drew suggested mentioning institutions in the needs statements.

2B. Support training.

Gilderson-Duwe asked whether “library system trustees” could be added.

Bartelt asked about Objective 2A, 2.2, and whether this would follow the pattern of the early learning initiative. Branson said it would follow that pattern and we would discuss the specific details when we discussed the 2008 categories.

Davis wondered whether the intent of 2B could be put under 2D, since the consultants and Reference and Loan staff do statewide training already.

Pearlmutter asked about the first needs statement, inadequate library services. She wondered which of the actual activities address that particular needs statement.

Richmond suggested an activity under 2B to study improvements for local libraries. Branson pointed to 2.9. Cross suggested that 2A would permit a category for achieving state standards. The activity would be for all Wisconsin libraries to meet minimal state standards. Concern was expressed that, unless requirements for ongoing support were added, the library would revert to an inadequate status over some time. Bugher pointed that 2.1 could be flipped to be the objective, with the objective being the activity in 2A.

Lebal said she agreed that some libraries may be marginal, but wondered if this group had the power to say that some libraries are not viable. The group discussed what might be possible or how service could be achieved. Gilderson-Duwe wondered if the needs statement itself may not belong in the LSTA plan.

Branson said the committee would have another opportunity later in the meeting to comment on the draft plan and she would send them a revised draft after the meeting.

Break at 2:45; resumed at 2:55 p.m.

Procedures for Discussion of LSTA Grant Categories and Conflict of Interest Policy

Branson noted a couple of items in the conflict of interest policy the committee operates under that relate specifically to this meeting - members may not discuss, make motions, or vote on categories in which they have a conflict. She said the committee would go through all of the proposed/potential grant categories first to get all information on the table and then go back and make recommendations for funding amounts and language.

Preliminary LSTA Budget 2008 Overview

Branson reviewed the yellow budget sheet. She noted that the final carry-over amounts for 2008 will be established prior to the fall meeting and we may have a better idea of the FY 2008 appropriation at that time.

Consideration of Preliminary Grant Categories for 2008

Reference and Loan

Drew referred to page two of the Preliminary LSTA Ideas 2008 handout and stated that there were no changes in the level of personnel for Reference and Loan from existing levels. She noted that a lot of time this year has been devoted to BadgerLink - promoting it and making librarians and users aware of it. She stated that a BadgerLink toolkit will be paid for with Gates grant funds. The toolkit will develop activities for parents to conduct with children.

Drew said the documents depository project has gone very well. She noted an adjustment she could make in fixed costs that would reduce the total requested by \$5000. Gilderson-Duwe asked about the survey results that ranked BadgerLink high. Drew stated that only staff costs are funded under LSTA. She said that additional funds for promotions would be desirable, particularly when the Gates grant expires this year. She noted that she had requested \$15,000 in state funding for this purpose, but did not think it would be forthcoming.

Public Library Development

Cross referred to page five of the handout. Funds are used to support the technology consultant position (Bocher) and related work. The part of the budget under the Library Improvement category includes 80% of Cross's position and all of Huntington's position, as well as support for the Summer Library Program and annual meetings of system coordinators on various topics. The budget also supports some continuing education for Public Library Development consultants. The slight increase is due to estimated salary increases and increases in DPI overhead charges.

Statewide Resource Sharing access / WISCAT

Clark referred to page six of the handout. She pointed out that implementation of the new WISCAT is underway. Most of the customization and enhancements requested have been undertaken and achieved by the vendor. More catalogs for libraries not updating the union catalog have been added through Z39.50. More shelf status of items is now displayed in the system. 559 libraries purchased licenses for WISCAT, somewhat short of expectations, but adequate for the level of reimbursement required. Currently, there are 258 public libraries and systems and 254 schools participating in WISCAT. Five public library systems are not participating. More schools are using WISCAT and requesting resources. More requests are being sent directly to Minitex and WiLS because shelf status is displayed, relieving some backlog in Reference and Loan. WISCAT staff have been testing ISO connection with OCLC libraries. One hurdle is the lack of OCLC codes for some libraries in WISCAT. There are also many OCLC codes not recognized in WISCAT. She discussed training that has been done.

Davis asked about the last part of the next-to-last paragraph, referring to a backlog of requests. Drew reported that the new system has allowed more requests to go through without as much staff intervention. She noted that email requests need to be accommodated for those libraries that have not purchased the software but who have materials in the union catalog. Drew clarified that they have brought down the backlog to only a week. Davis said that she still has an issue with the low fee charged to individual libraries for WISCAT use. Grobschmidt asked about the backlog and whether requests might expire. Drew then reviewed the costs as reflected in the spreadsheet on page one.

Public Library System Technology Projects

Bocher reviewed this category (page eight). He highlighted some uses of the funds in the category. He noted that wide latitude is generally permitted in this category. The items listed in the category description are examples of the different uses.

Gilderson-Duwe wondered if it would be legitimate to combine a project that might fit in the Innovative Uses of Technology category and also be part of a block grant. Bocher said it probably would not be a problem. Richmond asked how it would read to the reviewer. Bocher said the block grant would need to be referenced in the budget for the competitive grant.

Merging Shared Integrated Library Systems

Bocher explained that the previous shared systems category had been available for about the past five years. He said that, after this calendar year, almost 90% of public libraries would be part of shared systems. This category would focus on merging some smaller shared systems into larger existing shared systems.

Davis had thought that Marshfield could not join under this category. Bocher said that the category would have to be interpreted. In the case of Brown County, while it is an individual library in governance, there are a number of branches in individual communities. Davis suggested that, under that criteria, then Portage County could join under this category, but not Marshfield. Onufrak asked whether this category would be available after the 2008 year. Bocher could not think of other situations where this could apply.

Gingery asked how the funding would apply under the guidelines. Bocher said the range was established to give the advisory committee some latitude, but also because the Division was not sure whether or which of two possible systems would be ready to apply. Gilderson-Duwe asked whether the hearing letter from Indianhead inferred some uncertainty as to timing. Gilderson-Duwe suggested funding one such project this year and one next year as a possibility, thus funding it only at \$75,000 for 2008. Onufrak talked about the sunset of the former category and the concern that if the broad shared system category had been continued, libraries would have put off joining shared systems.

Wireless Internet Access

Bocher discussed the increase in wireless access in public libraries over the past year, but noted that Wisconsin is still behind the national average for such access. Gingery asked how the amount per library and the total available was determined and whether a survey had been conducted to ascertain interest. Bocher reported the results from the annual report technology survey indicated there are libraries interested in doing it this year and others who are not interested. It is not known whether funding is the sole deterrent. Davis wondered whether branches could be considered as eligible. Bocher thought that would not be a problem. Davis also said that a very simple application would be desirable. Bocher said he hoped funding would be available to any library that applied. Richmond wondered why IT costs need to be addressed. Onufrak said that in many cases there is outside expertise required to establish security on a WAN circuit. Bocher added that he did not expect the \$500 to cover all costs but instead would serve as an incentive. Adams wondered whether filtering is required. Bocher said that laptops are exempt from the filtering requirement and that only two public libraries apply for e-rate funding for Internet access. Onufrak said he likes this category as a short-term category and noted an example of an installation in his system in a combined school-public library.

E-rate Incentive Program

Bocher discussed the concept and why greater participation in the E-rate by public libraries is desirable. He hoped to include a couple of systems which already have expressed interest and use that to leverage further interest by member libraries. Gilderson-Duwe wondered if an individual technology plan is required for a library applying for POTS service only. Bocher confirmed that it is not.

Wednesday, April 5: 8:30 – 2:30 pm

Present: Paula Kiely, Paul Onufrak, Elizabeth Richmond, Phyllis Davis, Jim Gingery, Jane Pearlmutter, Jan Adams, Roxane Bartelt, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, and Bea Lebal

Absent: Terrance Burton, Terry Dawson, Mildred McDowell, Zora Sampson

Division Staff: Peg Branson, Bob Bocher, Kate Bugher, Mike Cross, John DeBacher, Sally Drew, Rick Grobschmidt, Barb Huntington, Donna Steffan, Al Zimmerman.

Branson called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m. on Wednesday, April 5, 2007

Innovative Use of Technology

Bocher introduced the new category and its use. DLTCL staff propose \$40,000-60,000 for the category funding, with a maximum of \$5000 per participating library.

Davis, Onufrak, and Gilderson-Duwe all expressed appreciation for the new category. Pearlmutter asked the system directors if they thought the amount was appropriate or adequate. Davis said it is a high priority for their system and they would appreciate any additional funding. Gingery asked whether multitype associations or other types of libraries that are in a system area might wish to participate and he wondered whether a public library system could involve other types of libraries within a grant. Bocher said that, as written, a grant would have to target public libraries and that staff had not considered whether other types of libraries could be involved. Branson said she did not have a problem with other types of libraries participating. Onufrak suggested trying out the category with the existing amount and language. Kiely suggested another way to increase the funding would be to require a cash match to the project by the local library. Bocher suggested another threshold amount for systems. He expressed some concern that requiring matching funds can be difficult to validate and confirm. DeBacher asked whether a system could apply and obtain \$5,000 per library. Bocher said that had not been the intent but perhaps a maximum system amount could be proposed. Lebal and Adams both expressed hesitancy about setting limits by size of libraries since many of the sparsely populated areas have at least as much need as libraries with larger populations. Pearlmutter suggested a cap per system as a remedy.

Shared System Study for Schools

Steffan presented the category and said that the LSTA-funded study approved for 2007 is in place, but no new data have yet been obtained through that study. The Division has other information that might impact the study, such as information from existing public library shared systems that have bylaws allowing participation by school libraries. She also shared information from a recent survey of school district technology, showing 75% of schools expressing interest in participation in a shared system or interested in learning more about them. She pointed to the last sentence of the preliminary grant category description, saying that this category might be used to support a pilot or demonstration project. She suggested we might use similar guidelines to those used for the public library shared systems projects for a pilot project, using census population as a factor for the dollar amount for schools. Since CESAs have collections as well, there would need to be a factor for including them (two CESAs, 10 and 12, and also CESA 9, have expressed interest). She suggested that the recommended \$85,000 might cover one project with five school districts.

Gingery asked what would happen if more systems were interested. She said that priority might be given to districts serving the largest population, or rural service could be considered. Gilderson-Duwe wondered how the delivery component might be considered. Steffan said that the proposals would need to demonstrate how that would be carried out.

Pearlmutter said that the shortage of money for schools might backfire with administrators see this as an opportunity to further cut budgets to school libraries. She thought the need for immediate local collections may be greater than the ability to obtain materials from another agency. She suggested that the results of the study are really required. Pearlmutter also wondered whether a district with one media specialist could

provide the necessary services to obtain and distribute materials. Steffan thought it could be done. Adams noted that she has a public library background as well a school background and can see how participation in shared systems can serve small rural districts as a resource. She noted that schools might be able to specialize in certain areas of resources. Richmond thought that being able to pool resources would be helpful for schools to broaden resources. Pearlmutter said she hoped the study may be able to determine that. Richmond said that in the minutes of the last meeting this category was held to higher standards than other categories. She thought that the category should go ahead. Steffan noted that categories need to be designated in the spring for funding to be considered in the fall and encouraged this as a placeholder to make this category available. Branson pointed out the timing issue and suggested that having a competitive category in 2008 would be a problem. Kiely agreed that Pearlmutter raised a valid concern with the timing, and also questioned the technical component. She wondered how students work best and whether this would serve students appropriately. Steffan commented on how new technologies are shared and suggested that the project might encourage more collaboration of teachers and professionals. Gingery said he is torn but also thinks the description is diffuse. Talking about collaboration and sharing resources, he can support it. But he can also see some of the intrinsic challenges and hurdles that might create problems later. Adams said that the school library automation vendors have had some of the consolidation problems that the public library vendors have seen. Sagebrush has been bought out by Follett which limits the range of choices to the schools. She said that the open source option presents some interest for schools, too. Lebal wondered how, since this is a non-competitive category, the applicant(s) will be determined. Steffan said the Division would review the results of the study and present a plan for how to proceed in 2008 at the fall meeting of the LSTA Advisory Committee.

Digitization – Local Resources

Drew summarized the history of the program and how libraries, working with UW-Madison, digitize materials and develop metadata to make the materials available on the UW server. While the materials are part of the larger UW collection, they can be electronically grouped to be searched and browsed as individual collections. The digitization can also help to protect and preserve fragile materials and make rare materials more broadly available. She said that, at the local level, there has been some success in collaboration with local historical societies. She said that the Wisconsin Historical Society is hosting a server that can carry and make available digitized materials. However, local libraries would have to convert the materials to load on that server so she recommends a similar amount of money and continuing to require libraries to work through the UW system. Branson noted the proposed limit in the number of times (two) libraries are able to receive LSTA funds for this purpose. Onufrak agreed with the limit on the number of recurrent applications. Lebal said her library had been able to conduct a project with limited additional funds and the project was both exciting and successful in being able to be part of a larger digitization project. She said they are now working on another project through the historical society through WHO (Wisconsin Heritage Online). She said, though, that the fees required for WHO are daunting for small libraries. Drew confirmed that the membership fee is a hurdle. Grobschmidt asked what the fee was for Merrill. Lebal said their consortium would be two libraries and several historical societies and the fee would be \$4000 per year. Lebal wonders whether it is good to get libraries started if they cannot carry out the projects themselves in the future, although she notes that she very much appreciates the grant they received and the experience gained. Drew noted that she still wonders whether the Division should be taking a role in the development of WHO, but it is not clear what that role would be now. Pearlmutter wondered if the dollar amount for the category is appropriate based on the amount per grant proposed. Drew said she would like to see approximately the same amount for this purpose in 2008 as used during the current year, 2007.

Virtual Reference

Drew noted that while the project was initially intended as a three-year project, that may be difficult since the initial year wasn't a full year and the libraries have not yet experienced the new service long enough to determine their long-term interest. She proposed instead a more gradual phase-out of the support from

LSTA funding that might yield nearly the same cost. She said WiLS also proposed a “freeze plan” with continued LSTA support rather than the “phase-out” plan. She has not yet talked to the participating libraries to get their reactions to the proposals. She hoped that some of the committee members could give their own input. She expressed concern that we not discourage participation by increasing costs precipitously.

Gingery said that costs passed back need to be considered as percentage increases. Initially, everyone was paying the same amount. He did not support the phase out. Drew asked whether the amount should be carried out for a longer period of time. Kiely said they see it as great service and that Milwaukee Public Library would probably spend more money to continue. She said that young library users have been able to adapt to the software and service very well and that the service is in high demand. She acknowledged that at some point the project probably should not be funded with LSTA, but that she also could see continued support. Richmond wondered whether it is the virtual reference they like or the consortium portion. Her staff had difficulty with remote users expecting that the respondent was a local librarian. Onufrak said that, while three years was originally intended, he also knows that his system would lose participants if the cost increased. He said that it is true that the younger audience may be a good target and justification to continue the service. Bartelt said also that at Kenosha it has been a very positive experience. Kiely noted that there are questions that the librarians cannot address and must be forwarded to the local library, but that the 24 hour service is a boon. Drew said they have tried to coordinate local databases to make them available to librarians who may be fielding questions remotely. Davis suggested that we not be too eager to phase out the project, that it is a boon to small libraries who may not have a reference librarian. She feels that coordination by the state is helpful to limit the amount of commitment at the local library. She has concern that more PR is necessary. Grobschmidt said that the service is received well by parents groups and CESA administrators when they hear about it. He wonders if the Ask?Away publicity could be folded in with the BadgerLink PR. While funding could continue with LSTA, perhaps the virtual reference could be included in the next state superintendent’s budget request, and subsequently included in the governor’s budget.

Centralized Searching/Authentication

Drew reviewed the advantages of centralized user validation as well as how searches might be federated through the BadgerLink page. She hopes to find a vendor that can do both and free up much of the time spent on authenticating IP address ranges for internet providers. She noted also that there are vendors that can aggregate IP addresses for Internet vendors but she has not included that in the proposal. She noted that costs range from \$25,000 for federated searching or authentication, to over \$135,000.

Onufrak said he does not necessarily support using additional LSTA funding to support BadgerLink, though he acknowledges that it may be a worthy project. He also has concerns about vendor access to patron databases, though Drew replied that NCIP or SIP would not give direct access. Davis said that, while not a bad idea, it should be through state funding and she pointed out that authentication is also required at the system and regional level, not just at the state level. She noted that some will be starting at a local circ system, not necessarily at the BadgerLink page. Drew said that in the Newspaper Archive, a small amount was appropriated through LSTA then it was continued with state funding. She hoped that a one-time-grant could purchase and establish the service, and it could then be put in the biennial budget. She also reported that one vendor had included local federated access in the cost for WISCAT, which might be an option. Davis said that a needs assessment may be required rather than funding a project that may or may not work. She said that we must be sure of our shopping list before shopping. Gingery wondered if federated searching, as defined here, may have limited value if it only includes the BadgerLink resources. Drew said that the library catalog could also be added in, but that she was trying to keep it to a small project. He asked whether the authentication will require library cards and eliminate IP-only authentication. She said it would allow one IP file for authentication, rather than five separate ones for individual database vendors.

Richmond agreed with Onufrak that, while this is important, it would be going backwards to use LSTA funds to achieve it. She also has reservations about federating searching in general in that, by eliminating the native interface, much of the value of the database may be lost. Pearlmutter noted that two different things are being addressed, but that the validation in particular should be accomplished through the BadgerLink funding, not through a new, separate category. She asked for more information on the separate services for IP address aggregation and Drew said that one of them charges \$20,000 as a startup cost and \$20,000 in ongoing fees to maintain an IP database. Kiely asked about the downside of not doing it now and Drew said she is worried about continued maintenance of the IP database. Trying to do it in the state budget would have to wait until 2009. She noted that the systems are using the same products for federated searching and are interested but she also knows that the academic community has not been satisfied. She noted that other states have been doing this type of project, including the federated searching.

Delivery Service Projects

Drew said the proposal is status quo, subsidizing the public library delivery through South Central, and the Northern Waters access to the backbone delivery service. The Delivery Service Advisory Committee as well as individual systems think that the subsidy is justified and necessary.

Adolescent Literacy Initiative

Huntington reviewed the previous early learning initiative and its success. She showed the early learning publication. According to the 2006 public library annual report, 198 public libraries offered programs for infants and toddlers, a 77% increase between 2001 and 2006 in the number of libraries offering such programs. In 2006, 65% offered toddler programs. She noted how popular the online version of the publication has been, with over 5,000 downloads in January alone.

The preliminary request is for \$20,000 to promote the role of the public library in improving adolescent literacy in 2008. She noted the state superintendent's adolescent literacy initiative and how this project would allow our division to actively participate in a department-wide initiative.

Kiely expressed her support and noted that it is a relatively modest amount of money that may yield very valuable results. Bartelt added that this is a natural extension of the early learning initiative that can benefit all library staff in being able to better serve this age group. Lebal noted that fourth grade has been identified as an age where we begin to lose readers and wondered if the target should be lowered. Huntington said she defines the target audience as fifth grade and up, not just teens.

Literacy

Huntington commented that she wants to keep the category broad to address all literacy needs, both ESL and other special needs. Bartelt expressed her support.

Disabilities

Huntington noted that this category is broad enough to support the new adolescent literacy initiative, as well as the types of projects we have addressed in the past. Lebal noted how useful this category has been in her community. Davis asked about ZoomText and said that it is obsolete and wondered if a separate reader can be identified. Huntington noted that the language can be adapted and updated through recommendations from Regional Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. Davis said that many of the capabilities may be included in new software. Huntington noted that the new publication, *Youth with Special Needs: A Resource and Planning Guide for Wisconsin's Public Libraries*, has an updated list of resources and software.

Onufrak wondered whether the accessible website component may be used to work with vendors to help make their products accessible. Huntington thought it could be. Richmond asked about the mini-grants for outreach and wondered how this related to the category.

State Institution Library Coordination

Huntington reported that the library consultant in the Department of Corrections will be retiring. If the position is eliminated, this funding could be eliminated, but while the position exists, the subsidy is valid and justified. Onufrak suggested that the category be kept. Pearlmutter noted that the funding had been reduced and that the position remains, but that there have been other cuts that have affected educational services and wonders if the funding is having any effect. Huntington noted that the existing consultant at least has experience to provide support to libraries. Davis said she was surprised to see the category, since she thought it was being eliminated, and she reminded committee members that the survey ranked this item last in priority. While she is sympathetic to the prisoners, she wonders if we are enabling corrections to provide inadequate service. She feels perhaps this should be eliminated once the consultant retires. Drew noted that the consultant had been given additional responsibilities, but she has also done a considerable amount to coordinate services among the libraries with very limited resources. Richmond thought we were going to give another \$15,000 for this year but not provide any further funding. Kiely thought that an appropriate amount of funding has been requested and it might serve as a carrot to continue services.

Communications and Planning

Grobschmidt reported that the funds support Library and Information Technology Advisory Committee meetings, the meetings of the Council on Library and Network Development, and participation in national associations, as well as the printing and mailing of Channel. Pearlmutter wondered if travel has been able to be conducted to the same extent as in past years. Branson said the amount varies depending on the location of participants. Grobschmidt noted that COLAND held a videoconference session as an experiment in 2006 and it worked fine and saved money.

Library Development Training Projects

Branson introduced the category, which is a new category based on the interest expressed in the LSTA evaluation survey and in the meetings held with library groups during the LSTA evaluation process. This category would provide a fairly general training category at a modest amount with a broad range of options for libraries and systems. The proposed grant amount per applicant is \$500 to \$3000 and the category description provides some examples for uses of the funds. Kiely agreed it is a good category idea and that not a lot of money is required to bring in someone who can have an impact on the staff. She supported the category. Richmond asked whether this is for individuals doing programs at individual libraries or whether it could be used to develop modules that could be used more broadly. Staff said it was not what they were thinking of, but that development of programs might be included. Pearlmutter noted that they had in the past developed scripts for local libraries to use in training. Branson said it also could be used for collaboration to hire a more expensive speaker.

Statewide Visioning/Strategic Planning Conference

Cross reviewed the discussion at COLAND for a long-range or strategic statewide planning process or conference. Lebal stated her support, believing in strategic planning. Grobschmidt said it could be an exciting project. While a statewide planning conference ten years ago focused on technology, this would not need to, but could consider library services in the state more broadly.

LSTA Administration

Branson noted that, while not on the agenda, this item is in the handout on page 31. LSTA pays for advisory committee expenses, training of reviewers, and the DPI indirect charge of \$70,000.

Additional Grant Categories for Consideration (from committee and public hearings)

None proposed from the floor.

Cross noted that Lisa Strand had recommended follow-up workshops to disseminate the results of the economic study. DeBacher reviewed the minutes and said she had suggested training for libraries in using the results of the study. Drew recalled that Strand had suggested making the Division an eligible applicant for a grant in the training category.

Recommendations on Grant Categories and Budget for 2008

Zimmerman reviewed the spreadsheet and how the totals accumulate, as well as the total available funds.

Branson invited motions for grant categories and budgets.

Onufrak moved to approve the Delivery Services category for \$75,000, seconded by Richmond. Onufrak asked about the conflict of interest policy. It was noted that he did not have a conflict with this category. Davis noted that she will not vote on this category. The motion carried unanimously with Davis abstaining.

Pearlmutter moved to approve the Digitization category for \$42,000, seconded by Kiely. Onufrak spoke in support of the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Gingery moved to approve the Library System Technology category at \$400,000, seconded by Onufrak. Gingery noted the high level of support for this category in the LSTA evaluation survey and recalled that in 2004 the category was funded at \$472,000 with even less total funding available. He noted that a higher amount may be needed to help with the shared systems. Davis pointed out that while LSTA goes to the South Central System, the fund serves many multi-type and school customers as well as public libraries in training and databases. Kiely noted that the funding for the category is at the high end of the range which means it will affect the other areas. The motion carried unanimously.

Davis moved the Virtual Reference category at the 2007 level of \$69,300 (instead of the \$50,000 proposed). Gilderson-Duwe seconded the motion, and added that this is a program that reaches out to important populations and will take longer than three years to find legs to stand on independent of LSTA. Onufrak noted that he would support it at \$50,000 but not at a higher amount. Richmond concurred. The motion carried with six in favor and four opposed.

Gilderson-Duwe moved for Merging Shared Systems at \$75,000, seconded by Lebal. Gingery noted that we have to take a step, but should fund it at a lower level. The motion carried unanimously by hand vote.

Onufrak moved to fund the Wireless Connections category at \$60,000, seconded by Richmond. Onufrak said his rationale was that he likes the concept and that perhaps it may be able to be carried over a second year. This would allow a fairly large number of libraries to participate. Pearlmutter said the responses in the public library annual report supported the need. The motion carried unanimously by hand vote.

Kiely moved to approve the Literacy category at \$250,000, seconded by Davis. The motion carried unanimously.

Davis moved the Adolescent Literacy Initiative category at \$20,000, seconded by Bartelt. The motion carried unanimously.

Kiely moved funding for the Disabilities category at \$125,000, seconded by Onufrak. Gingery suggested that it be funded at a lower amount. Lebal concurred. Kiely felt that the special needs category is

important and wanted to start at the higher level with this category. Onufrak noted that this category had lower than budgeted participation. Kiely said the category is more inclusive this year. The motion carried with six in favor and four opposed.

Davis moved to not support the proposed E-rate category (i.e., \$0), Gingery seconded the motion. Davis noted that the rebate should be enough of an incentive and that federal money should not be used. Pearlmutter noted that normally federal money cannot be used as a match for obtaining grants. Davis noted there are other problems with the E-Rate program. The motion carried nine in favor and one opposed.

Onufrak moved to fund the Reference and Loan request at \$689,500, seconded by Lebal. The motion carried unanimously.

Gingery moved to fund the Library Development Technology category at \$137,500. The motion carried unanimously.

Adams moved to fund WISCAT at \$600,200, seconded by Lebal. The motion carried unanimously by hand vote with Davis abstaining.

Onufrak moved to fund State Institution Library Coordination at \$15,000, seconded by Kiely. The motion failed, four in favor, six opposed.

Davis moved to fund the Statewide Library Planning category at \$20,000, acknowledging that more may be necessary. Richmond seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Kiely moved to fund the Library Training category at \$20,000, seconded by Gilderson-Duwe, who noted that this is a good new category meeting a great need. The motion carried unanimously.

Onufrak moved to fund the Library Development Library Improvement category at \$273,000, seconded by Lebal. The motion carried unanimously.

Davis moved to fund the Innovative Use of Technology category at \$60,000, seconded by Pearlmutter. The motion carried unanimously.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund the Communication and Planning category at \$25,000, seconded by Adams. The motion carried unanimously.

Gingery moved to fund LSTA Administration at \$90,500, seconded by Richmond. The motion carried unanimously.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund the State Institution Library Coordination category at \$0, seconded by Gingery. Kiely asked if it had been voted on already—it had but it had failed at \$15,000. The motion carried, six votes to four.

Richmond moved to fund the Shared Integrated Library Systems for Schools category at \$70,000, Adams seconded the motion. Onufrak said he might be willing to fund it at the amount remaining, \$25,300. Gingery said he has not heard enough evidence to warrant a greater amount. Davis asked whether there may be money in the fall that is not known now. Branson described the various situations that may affect changes in the fall (e.g., higher appropriation, more carryover, fewer applications in categories than anticipated). The motion failed two votes to seven, with one abstention.

Adams moved to fund the Shared Integrated Library Systems for Schools category at \$25,300, seconded by Lebal. Pearlmutter asked whether this is really feasible. The motion carried unanimously.

Onufrak moved to fund Centralized Searching/Authentication at \$0, seconded by Gingery. Lebal asked if the Division could apply for funds in the Innovative use of Technology category. Richmond noted that it was a system that could apply, not the Division. Gingery noted that there was pretty good consensus that it is a valid project, but not with LSTA funding, so it is not a rejection of the concept. Onufrak agreed. The motion carried unanimously.

After lunch, the meeting resumed at 12:55 p.m. Richmond had departed.

Bartelt moved to increase the Literacy category to \$275,000 and decrease the System Technology Projects category to \$390,000 and decrease the Disabilities category to \$110,000, seconded by Kiely. Gingery recommended against taking funds from system technology. He noted that, with shared systems decreasing, he would not recommend going lower. Onufrak concurred with Gingery. Kiely noted that there was validity in reducing Disabilities and that the System Technology category would not be decreased substantially. Pearlmutter noted that we adjusted in the fall last year based on demand in the applications. The motion failed two to seven.

Review LSTA Plan

Branson asked if there were any additional adjustments to be made based in the draft LSTA plan based on the discussion over the past two days.

On page seven, 1.2, she questioned eliminating the E-Rate participation item. Davis suggested it could be left in without funding. Gingery asked whether changes would be made in the wording of Goal 1. Branson said that changes would be made to the current draft and she would distribute a revised draft to the committee. If desired, a conference call will be scheduled so the committee has another opportunity to discuss the plan before it is submitted to the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Pearlmutter asked if a change should be made to allow the Division to apply for the training category in response to Strand's request.

Gilderson-Duwe moved that the Division be added to the list of eligible applicants for training and dissemination of results of the economic impact study, seconded by Lebal. Davis suggested that the two be connected so that others would not apply for that. Kiely wondered whether there was precedence for a category to include the Division in a competitive category. Gilderson-Duwe withdrew his motion. Lebal stressed that it is important to disseminate the information. Kiely gave an example of the recent Urban Studies report on the impact of urban public libraries on their community and it has been effective. It was suggested that money could be included in the fall in the Public Library Development category or the Communication and Planning category to allow the Division to disseminate the results of the economic impact study.

Gilderson-Duwe mentioned that there was considerable discussion of inadequate public library services in the needs statement on page 9 of the draft plan. Cross suggested adding a 2.4 statement about standards for libraries. Steffan asked whether the language of Objective 2A and 2.1 would be substituted or flipped. Branson said the language would be adjusted and submitted for review by the committee.

Review of LSTA Process for 2008

LSTA Timetable, Review Process, Application Form, Rating Criteria

Branson referred the committee to the application and rating forms she had included in the meeting packet. She suggested that the comments on the evaluation surveys did not seem to warrant major changes to the process but that some simplification of the forms might be made. Branson noted that applicants whose proposals are rejected can appeal the decision and this has rarely happened. She acknowledged requests to simplify the application form. She wondered, in particular, if Section IV could be simplified to require less narrative. Gilderson-Duwe said that outcome-based evaluation is very grueling and did not support or focus on that. Branson said we would not require any particular type of evaluation method, including outcome based evaluation. Davis said she likes the idea including specific goals/objectives for projects.

Drew suggested that some categories might be worthy of simpler applications. Kiely suggested that, for more substantial grants, section IV is useful and necessary, but the form could be simplified for smaller grants.

Onufrak said he did not think the application form was too onerous and thought it might be difficult to manage multiple versions of the form. Davis noted that in some categories there may be applications from multiple libraries or systems, so she would not like to see the space available limited on the form, but she wondered if some of the sections could be noted as “not necessary” for some of the simpler categories.

Pearlmuter asked why LSTA funds cannot be used for salary and wages. Branson said there is not a national prohibition on the use of the funds for that purpose; we made a decision on that sort of thing on a category by category basis. Huntington noted that some libraries were using LSTA to fund existing staff positions through grants. Pearlmuter suggested that personnel time might be a major consideration, especially since some libraries may not be applying not knowing who will carry out their projects. Kiely noted the university model where staff time can be devoted to grant projects as funds are available. She said they had in the past used contracted services as an alternate means to add personnel for projects. Cross suggested that the committee could vote to recommend allowing staff costs in the grants. Lebal spoke against establishing requirements to address one or two libraries that abuse the process. Pearlmuter suggested a justification line in the budget requiring explanation of how the funds would be used and justified. Gilderson-Duwe concurred with Lebal’s opinion suggesting that policy is being made to address the few that punishes the many. Kiely gave examples from Milwaukee grants that required extra time worked to accomplish the grants. She wonders if the time involved to accomplish the grants might be underestimated because it is daunting to see how much the actual cost of the grant really is. She wonders if there is a way for systems to work with the smaller libraries to help carry out the projects. Pearlmuter noted that librarians in many small libraries work many extra uncompensated hours. Onufrak said that care must be taken to avoid employment issues. Lebal wondered if there is a way to enforce the rules more stringently on libraries taking advantage of the system. Bugher suggested using language that LSTA funds can supplement but cannot supplant existing personnel. Grobschmidt reiterated a point made by Gilderson-Duwe that, once you put someone on the payroll, you are faced with a subsequent layoff costs.

Kiely suggested shortening the area for the abstract since the abstract is published and doesn’t need to be so long. Zimmerman said space on the form is an optical illusion since there is a 4000 character limit. Onufrak wondered if it is possible to have support for browsers other than Internet Explorer. Branson responded that we are not sure whether that can be achieved but Zimmerman would check.

Final Comments

Branson said the committee recommendations would be submitted to the state superintendent for her consideration and she would notify committee members of the results.

The next meeting likely would be the week of November 12, 2007. Branson will notify committee members of the dates.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.