

LSTA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Crowne Plaze, Madison, November 14-15, 2007

Wednesday, November 14

Present: Jan Adams, Roxane Bartelt, Terrance Burton, Terry Dawson, Bea Lebal, Mildred McDowell, , Elizabeth Richmond, Phyllis Davis, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Jim Gingery, Jane Pearlmutter, and Zora Sampson.

Absent: Paula Kiely, Paul Onufrak (both joined the meeting Wednesday mid-afternoon)

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

Also present: Larry Nix

Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions

Cross welcomed committee members and had them go around and introduce themselves. He announced that Paula Kiely will not be able to attend until late afternoon and that Paul Onufrak would attend as soon as he fixes a technical issue at Eastern Shores Library System.

Public Hearing

Larry Nix, describing himself as a retired librarian, noted that his comments are his own and not on behalf of any other group or organization. Libraries and archives are digitally converting materials for preservation with limited budget. He proposes a digitization project toward preserving Wisconsin's library heritage. Wisconsin Library Bulletin, published from 1905 through 1984 is an excellent resource with information on all types of libraries. He described some of the articles in the first issue. He suggests the digitization be conducted using LSTA funds as a new item in the 2009 grant cycle. He suggests that the cost could be about \$21,000 which could be done at once or phased in over a course of years. Cross asked if it could be done as part of the Google digitization project. Nix said that while there is a Wisconsin Heritage project, the Wisconsin library heritage is largely invisible. He believes it is appropriate to make library heritage a priority.

There were no others attending for public comment. Cross distributed an email from Maureen Welch, chair of the Delivery Services Advisory Committee. While the advertised purpose is to gather preliminary ideas for the 2009 cycle, this message asked for an increase to the 2008 Delivery category due to higher costs and volume. Burton asked what change in volume has occurred. Drew said that the costs for delivery typically go over budget but the costs are absorbed by the systems. She noted that the committee is aware that changes or adjustments have previously been made to the awarded amount. Davis noted that the committee is pointing out that the amount of the subsidy has been flat in previous years. Pearlmutter asked how it is typically covered. She wondered how much of a deficit there was that was absorbed by the systems. Davis said there are various pieces incorporated in the budget to accommodate the 5% increase this year. Drew said the LSTA component is to address cross system delivery, not to individual libraries. Gingery added that the item has been recommended for the state budget each cycle but it does not get included. Grobschmidt noted that the Superintendent has included it in her budget requests but it has not proceeded through the budget process.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Grobschmidt expressed thanks to the committee and noted the absence of Peg Branson, and expressing gratitude that she had completed the five-year plan for submission to IMLS. The Division is in the process of filling the position, and expressed thanks to the PLD team for absorbing her duties in the interim. He noted that LSTA budgets have been fairly flat for the past three years; increases are proposed but it is not known whether the bill will proceed. On the state level we are pleased with the level of funding that was approved in the budget for state library programs.

Cross noted that this meeting will be the last for four members of the committee: Terry Burton, Paula Kiely, Paul Onufrak, and Betsy Richmond, and thanked them for their service to the committee.

Review of the Agenda

Cross asked if there were changes to the agenda; there were none.

Cross entertained a motion for the approval of the minutes of April 2007 Meeting. Sampson moved, seconded by Lebal to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

Interim LSTA Coordinator's Report

Cross hopes to be able to soon announce the replacement for the LSTA coordination and certification consultant, who should be starting in early January. He distributed a letter of approval for the five-year plan of service. IMLS staff did require minor revisions of the plan prior to approval. Pearlmutter thanked Branson and the staff and noted that she met George Smith from IMLS who told her of the fine job accomplished by Wisconsin. Cross noted the requirement that the grant categories explicitly address the priorities of the LSTA program. He noted that other states had to do much more extensive adjustments. He noted that both the U.S. House and Senate improved the LSTA portion of the education health and labor appropriation bill, which passed both houses but was vetoed on November 13. It is unknown whether another bill will address LSTA and provide an increase to the budgeted amount.

Shared ILS Study for Schools

Bocher reviewed the first portion of the report that was distributed, and gave an overview of the issues considered. He reviewed the examples submitted of public schools in public library system consortia, noting that the school library at Kohler is a combined school/public library. He added that there has not been a groundswell of other schools in the system regions asking to join the shared systems.

Steffan presented the second part of the report. She noted that the data that has been collected through the year on interest in joining a public system, or of establishing a shared system at the CESA or school region level. 1817 schools responded to the survey and over 78% of the respondents reported they needed to upgrade or change their library automation system in the next two to three years. 25% indicated that they would like to explore a regional shared integrated library automation system; another 53% indicated that they are not sure about or are not aware of the concept of a shared system. CESA 10 and 12 were interested in pursuing shared systems. About a third of the districts in CESA 10 are interested and are ready to move forward to establish two shared systems—one supported by CESA 10; another project demonstration project plans to use a new Follett system to join their member libraries into a shared system over a regional LAN on the TEACH network. She awaits reports from other CESAs as 4, 6 and 11 are still surveying their districts. The survey questions append the report.

Dawson noted that two separate tracks seem to be addressed. It does not appear that any CESAs have expressed interest in areas served by public library shared systems that already include schools—have CESA 10 or 12 had contact or expressed interest in the regional systems because the borders are not the same? Jan Adams said that she had a conversation with her system years ago and there may be opportunity for cooperation. Steffan noted the different boundaries and interests. Bocher noted that CESA 12 is in the NWLS area, which already has a school participating. Gingery asked for clarification on the

two questions in Appendix A: what was the interest in the school districts establishing a shared system themselves versus a public library shared system? Were the two questions differentiated? He wonders how the schools feel about a public system. He feels the information is crucial and that the examples of participation in the shared systems all showed issues of different use. Steffan said that the demonstration project may indicate more examples for comparison. Gingery wonders if there are statistics that show the differences: that is were the schools asked the two questions? Cross noted that the full results are not in yet and are currently being collected. Steffan said that in the next statewide survey those questions would be further clarified. Cross asked the deadline. Steffan said the deadline had recently passed but that only one of the four surveys has been returned. Davis asked whether the other schools (in other CESAs) would be included in the statewide survey which Steffan confirmed. Davis was concerned that CESA 5 be surveyed. Adams asked whether the instructional media surveys have been distributed and clarified that the current survey is just to the selected CESAs. Steffan noted areas to be addressed in the statewide survey.

Pearlmuter wondered whether there has been research on whether local school services have suffered when there are materials not in the local media center because of sharing with other libraries. She wasn't sure how to interpret the NWLS information. Was the information on sharing only what was available since they loaned so much more than they received? She is curious about the nature of the items loaned. Steffan is not sure of the details. She noted that many of the districts are now coordinating their curriculums and that the sharing might be to other schools within the district as curricular units rotate. Richmond said that studies 20 years ago showed more unique titles in small libraries. She noted that the fears of being in a large shared system would deplete local resources may not have been realized. Adams added that districts cannot use common school funds to build rotating curricular bundles, but alternately they could focus on certain specific areas for cooperation. Sampson noted that the CESAs have specialized materials and resources that have been useful, such as assistive technologies. Adams wondered whether the survey questions on page five are new. Richmond asked who answers the survey. Pearlmuter wondered whether what the media specialist wants might differ from what the district administrator responds on the survey. Steffan said that often the responses are reviewed by the district administrator. Dawson asked about the interlibrary loan data, since we have only the data from NWLS. The rest of the state may have ILL that is distributed differently. He would like to see information from Kohler and Waterford as well. Bugher said that Burlington in Lakeshores had a longer history and better data. Sampson said that the delivery systems, funded separately, are a source of frustration since the materials cannot be easily exchanged. Davis noted that a private vendor does delivery within Indianhead. Adams wondered if the counts include intra versus inter-district. Sampson said she would like to know what the systems like in the schools who have participated for awhile. Adams mentioned a 30-district Follett shared system in northern Minnesota.

2008 LSTA Applications

Cross reviewed the two packets of materials that were distributed.

He then reviewed elements of the conflict of interest policy that relate specifically to this meeting—members may not discuss, make motions, or vote on categories in which they have a conflict. Gilderson-Duwe asked whether the restriction refers to the entire grant category. Cross said that the member should not vote on a motion concerning the entire category.

2008 Budget Issues and Guidelines

Cross reviewed budget summaries distributed via email and handed out at the meeting. He noted that there were some changes in the LSTA administration and R&LL categories as a result of changes in DPI policy and state budget cuts. Grobschmidt noted that, while libraries in general fared quite well in the state budget, there was a \$200 million dollar cut to state agencies that will have an undetermined affect on DPI operations. In addition to budgeted increases in salaries and benefits, there are also projected increases to the maximum in allowable administration costs to 4%, from \$90,000 to \$120,000. Zimmerman reviewed the changes in administrative costs.

Cross reported the tentative LSTA budget amount is based on the actual amount received this year, but could change even with a continuing resolution. If we receive an increase, it would show up as an unallocated carryover for 2009. The total amount budgeted for 2008 allocations is \$3,047,000. He noted that requests exceed the budget by \$115,560.

Discussion and Review of 2008 LSTA Applications

Internal Operations and Statewide Projects

Public Library Development

Cross reported that there are no changes in the requested use or amounts from the amounts submitted last spring. These amounts are based on projections.

Reference and Loan

Drew reported also that any changes are related to the budget issues already noted. Also, one of the staff had been paid partly with indirect costs and part as LSTA and DPI has asked to take back the indirect portion. Grobschmidt added that several other DPI federal programs have been eliminated creating greater pressure for funds. Richmond asked about the negative number in reimbursements. Drew said she would report under the WISCAT budget. Davis asked if staffing has been level for the past few years. Drew replied that staffing has been the same for a number of years.

At 11:45 a break in the meeting was taken for lunch. The group resumed at 12:40 p.m.

WISCAT

Drew asked the committee to look at the budget amounts on the summary budget sheet rather than on the earlier narrative report. She reported on the continued implementation of the product and the vendor's response, which has been very good. They are testing ISO ILL standards with WiLS for Iliad to facilitate requests flowing directly between two automated systems. Currently they are working on ISO interchange with OCLC but the feature is not implemented. Also testing NISO for direct information exchange to automated systems and will test with the SIRSI SHARE system with Lakeshores and MWFLS.

Communication and Planning

Grobschmidt reported on the uses in this category, which will not increase from previous levels. Mailing cost reductions for Channel has resulted in some savings.

LSTA Administration

Cross noted that the category has increased due to higher indirect charges from DPI as well as 10% of the funding for the LSTA/Certification Consultant's position. Gingery has asked if the 10% could ever be recouped. Drew pointed out that it would have to come out of the LSTA overhead.

Delivery Projects (SCLS, NWLS)

Drew reported that nothing has changed, and that the funding was discussed this morning. The systems pay more than \$200,000 toward statewide delivery.

Shared Integrated Library System for Schools

Steffan reported on the proposed shared automation system for schools. Davis asked for clarification of the cataloging component in the narrative. Pearlmutter asked if she knows whether the same vendor for acquisitions is used.

Virtual Reference

Drew and Berninger reported on how long the category would be continued with LSTA funds. She introduced Martha who coordinates the project within R&LL. Burton suggested that the reference for the Ebling Library be changed to the UW Health Sciences Library.

Adolescent Literacy Initiative

Huntington reported that the funding is for the first year of a four-year initiative. It will dovetail with the Superintendent's adolescent initiative. Funding would be for trainers for regional workshops and funds for resources at the system level. The initiative will raise awareness, provide training, and help assure that public libraries have the tools they need to best serve adolescents with special needs. Richmond asked what LSTA goals would relate to this project. Burton and Pearlmutter both asked whether resources for speakers are needed for regional workshops.

Statewide Visioning Summit

Grobschmidt said that plans are proceeding and a date has been set in early May. The summit is co-hosted by COLAND and the Superintendent. Another planning meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 16. Nominations are sought to select 100 participants. Funds would pay for travel, lodging, meals, speakers and facilitator. He requested that the budget be increased to \$30,000. Davis asked about the focus sessions at individual systems. Grobschmidt confirmed that the budget is for the central function, not for the additional focus groups. He hopes that the summit can be videocast for greater involvement. He hopes that outcomes could be incorporated into the budget process. Drew said the website will be further developed and include space for issue papers. Richmond asked if the economic impact study results will be incorporated. DeBacher reported that the economic impact study will be less than budgeted and that the results should be ready in time for the conference. Cross reported and Drew confirmed that nominations can be entered at the COLAND site. There is also a questionnaire available. The information is available from the COLAND page.

External Grant Categories – competitive and noncompetitive*System Technology Projects*

Bocher reviewed typical uses of the grant funds and examples of new applications.

Merging Shared Automation Systems

Bocher reported that Brown County would not be participating next year. The grant is for BCLiC to join IFLS's MORE system. Adams said she is on the Indianhead advisory committee and had heard that BCLiC decided that it would not dissolve. Bocher said that he would check, but that if the money is not used, it would be re-allocated next year.

Wireless Internet Access

Bocher said that \$500 per library was allocated. The total in the category came in at \$56,335 which would bring the total of wireless libraries up closer to 60% of libraries with the addition of 80 libraries.

Innovative Use of Technology

Bocher reported that this is the first year we have had a category called "Innovative." The amount requested was well above the amount budgeted. Many requests fall into two general categories, one of which was for interactive gaming that might attract children and young adults to the library. The other is to promote or broadcast information via audio or video broadcasting. Other requests aimed to offer a broader range of resources. Sampson wondered if the Oshkosh grant should have gone under the digitization category. Pearlmutter said that the formal digitization category is more structured and would not accommodate that grant. Richmond said that, while many of the grants are innovative, she did not think that some of them are particularly library-related. Davis noted the Idaho study on digital natives stressed the importance of investing in innovations to attract the populations.

The committee took a break at 1:50 p.m. Paul Onufrak joined the meeting. The meeting reconvened at 2:03 p.m.

Library Development Training

DeBacher delivered eloquent testimony summarizing the category. Pearlmutter was surprised that one of the grants requested only \$660.

Digitization

Drew noted this is the first year when the total amount for requests was less than the funding category budget. She reviewed the new applicants and the issues addressed. She noted that one grant asked for more than was requested and, while there are funds available, the precedent has been to limit awards to the grant limit. Sampson asked if requestors could apply again. Drew reviewed the category limit for repeat grants. She noted that some of the previous applicants have continued projects with local funding.

Disabilities

Huntington noted that the last two grant applications went counter to the requirement that grant funds not be used solely to install handicap doors. Sampson wondered why a library would want to install a door instead of retrofitting. Onufrak commented that it is good to abide by the reviewers rankings.

Literacy

Huntington explained problems with the lowest ranking grants. She concluded that she wanted to put in a plug for gaming in libraries and the benefit for adolescent and youth.

Cross noted that the day's agenda is accomplished and asked whether the committee wanted to start on tomorrow's agenda or continue. Some consensus indicated that the committee should be adjourned for the day.

Paula Kiely joined the meeting.

Pearlmutter talked further about gaming in the libraries. After some discussion she suggested that the category more explicitly require the grant to establish the purpose and outcome for those grants. Dawson suggested that any grants with gaming have to submit a letter confirming the educational versus entertainment elements of the grants. Gingery asked if it is necessary if it is true that gaming has educational and literacy value for teens. Davis wondered if it might be better to simply assume that "entertainment" is performers.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 2:45 p.m.

Thursday, November 15

Cross convened the committee at 8:37 and explained the process for the day.

Grobschmidt welcomed the committee back and welcomed those who had to arrive late Wednesday.

As a follow-up from Wednesday, Cross explained the OMB circular A-87 information on the limitation for entertainment costs. "Amusement, diversion and social activities and any costs directly associated with such costs." Gilderson-Duwe asked how the rule applies to gaming. Cross asked the committee how they wanted to address the issue. Burton suggested that the grants do have the necessary relation to LSTA purposes. Adams suggested strengthening the instructions to better clarify the requirement. Grobschmidt had some concern about how purchases might be construed by the media. Kiely reported that some gaming had been applied at the library last summer but she used no local money. Onufrak stated that it may not be too different from related programs to establish bridge groups or board game groups in the library, and that this may be a way to retain more of the children over fifth-grade. Lebal suggested providing information on the effectiveness of gaming for distribution to the media. Huntington said there likely will be information available through the adolescent literacy project. Richmond suggested having the LSTA applicant provide that information, perhaps as part of their evaluation. Grobschmidt expressed caution that, while the games may get people into the library, the grant needs to show what happens next. DeBacher suggested that, if the grants all emphasize how the LSTA purposes are met, the defense is

incorporated. Burton suggested that the grants must be for purposes, not just for “things”—the grant needs to address how those things serve the LSTA purposes.

Final Recommendations on Applications and Allocation of 2008 Funds

Cross stated the conflict of interest policy and how it applies. Anyone with a conflict of interest should consider staying out of the discussion and certainly abstain from the vote. Onufrak asked for clarification on grants from individual libraries within a system. Lebal asked about a system grant when her library is not included. Cross suggested that there may occasionally be issues of conflict, but the policy does not absolutely require abstention. He then asked Zimmerman to explain how the spreadsheet is utilized and how the budget amounts are arrived upon.

Davis asked about the shared system category; Bocher reported on what he had learned from IFLS and BCLiC—that, while Rusk County is no longer interested, the other libraries are meeting next week and have interest in the proposal.

Gingery moved to approve the Special Needs Sensory and Mobility Disabilities category at \$58,265; Dawson seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Burton moved to approve the DLTC R&LL category at \$710,400; DLTC Library Development at \$137,500; the first two under library improvement at the recommended amounts (DLTC Library Development at \$273,700 and Communication and Planning at \$25,000); and LSTA Administration at \$120,300. Kiely seconded the motion. Kiely asked about the increase in LSTA administration. Grobschmidt reviewed the increase. Cross explained the change to the LSTA Administrator position. Richmond suggested it might be easier for the committee to look at the state programs if the individual programs were broken out more for the committee to consider so that they could make recommendations for prioritizing. Davis added that it is difficult to vote on elements if they are bundled when the committee may need to look at reductions. Grobschmidt asked if it meant more detailed explanation of what positions and programs are funded with LSTA and how they relate. He reminded the committee about the result of cuts in the late 1980s and even four years ago when a budget deficit was addressed and there were reductions in staff, often by attrition. Pearlmutter agreed in principal with the idea of more detailed reporting but noted that she is paid from four different sources and there comes a point where the reporting and tracking of work exceeds the benefit of the details. She noted that there is already a level of detail in the category descriptions and budgets. Burton said he did not think that Richmond is requesting that much detail, but that some greater detail of how the projects are funded and handled might be helpful. Davis asked about the SALPC database services in the spreadsheet section “Materials Supplies & Support.” Kiely asked for information on how many FTE positions are involved in answering reference questions. She also wondered whether AskAway questions are included in the total for the number of reference questions. Drew indicated they were. After discussion the motion carried.

Davis moved to approve the Digitization category at \$33,890, supported by Burton, which would fund all projects submitted. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Onufrak moved to fund the Library Development and Training category under Library Improvement at an amount of \$18,560, which would fund the top 8-rated projects. Sampson seconded the motion. Kiely asked for his rationale. The motion carried. There were four abstentions: Dawson, Gilderson-Duwe, Bartelt, and Davis.

Richmond moved to fund Delivery at \$75,000. Onufrak seconded the motion. Sampson asked if additional money could be appropriated later. Cross affirmed. The motion carried with Davis abstaining.

Onufrak asked about the statewide visioning conference and why the amount is \$30,000 instead of the original \$20,000. Grobschmidt reviewed the reasoning from Wednesday.

Burton moved to fund Library System Technology at \$400,000, seconded by Kiely. There was no discussion. The motion carried with Onufrak, Gilderson-Duwe, Gingery, and Davis abstaining.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund the Wireless category at \$56,335, Adams seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried with abstentions of Onufrak, Davis abstaining.

Pearlmutt asked, in the competitive categories, how it is addressed when a grant requests more than is allowed in the grant category. Cross said that the division would require the applicant to submit an amended budget at the amount allowed. She noted that some applicants might not carry the grant out sufficiently rather than decline the award. Cross noted that the particular application included more than one system so that the committee might consider permitting over the budget amount. Bocher commented (since it was the case in the innovative technology category) that if the applicant were asked, they would move the additional amount required to local resources.

Pearlmutt moved to fund the Innovative Technology category at \$55,603 to fund the first eight grants, with the eighth limited to \$20,000. Sampson seconded the motion. Richmond suggested some concern at the way the wording of the proposal suggesting that librarians are best equipped to teach gaming. Kiely also expressed some discomfort on her part on that particular grant and the amount of funding requested. Burton noted that he might be more inclined to appropriate more to the category rather than less, and noted that the next two projects look like good projects. Pearlmutt noted that some of the individual grants did not look particularly innovative and also thought it is tempting to pick-and-choose. Burton suggested that the third-ranked grant is tempting to exclude, but that he agreed that the job of the committee is simply to establish the amount budgeted and accept the ranking of the reviewers. Kiely said she agreed but nonetheless it is the job of the committee to debate the merits of the grants. Cross noted that conditions can be attached to the awards. Dawson said that retroactively attaching criteria is not fair to either the applicants or the reviewers. DeBacher noted that unfunded grants can be further developed and submitted in subsequent years. Richmond wondered whether the language on entertainment limitations was pointed out to the reviewers. Cross said not explicitly. Pearlmutt wondered about the content and rating system for games, which DeBacher tried to explain and how the levels might be interpreted. Groschmidt asked about the term “innovative” and how that might have been presented to the reviewers. Bocher said that the category is difficult because of how “innovative” can be interpreted—what is innovative in one area may not be new in another setting, so that “innovative” did not necessarily imply “unique.” Drew noted that the conversation is predictable since “innovative” comes up as a recurrent request for new categories. This time, since the topic had not been available for awhile, the category was left pretty much open. After some time, the “innovation” might wear thin and then the category may not be necessary any longer. She said that, unless a set of parameters is defined, the applicants will range broadly. Davis said she had testified previously to include the notion of innovation, one that is not tightly set or defined, to allow some new ideas in categories. Sampson said it may not be so important that the committee’s recommendations result only in projects that will be successful; it may be okay to allow something to be tried and fail. Groschmidt said one of the reasons for a broad category such as innovative is to see if there is interest for specific categories.

Kiely asked whether some additional information or criteria could be required or if she should propose a friendly amendment. Cross said that the state has an obligation to ensure that the money is used legally and that the projects address the stated purposes and guidelines. If there is a need for clarification, perhaps the applicant could be asked how the project would advance one or more of the LSTA purposes listed on page 1 of the LSTA guidelines. That might serve as a means for them to prepare for questions that might arise in their grant execution. McDowell asked if that is not already required of the applicants. Cross said it should be but might not be explicit in the application. Gingery commented that he would oppose further requirement of justification, but he might support that the discussion was held and that there are concerns that they be equipped to be able to support the gaming application in the library if it is brought into question, so as not to appear to be second guessing. Sampson thought it would be better to require all applicants to support the purpose in subsequent years. Richmond noted that the Division is probably likely to require that level of support and to exclude grants that use the funds inappropriately. Pearlmutt noted that one of the applicants that included the cheaper dance pads might want to purchase better equipment. The motion carried, with Bartelt, Gilderson-Duwe and Onufrak abstaining.

After a break, the meeting reconvened at 10:20.

Davis moved to fund the Virtual Reference category at \$69,300 as requested, seconded by Onufrak. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

McDowell moved to fund Shared Integrated Systems for Schools at the amount of \$25,300, seconded by Dawson. Davis expressed her support for such a demonstration project and supports shared systems. She noted that there is not enough to support all the school shared systems. Pearlmutter noted that, as a demonstration project, a strong evaluation will be necessary. She hopes there is enough funding to support the follow-up. Gingery said he is supportive of the category based on the success of projects in Minnesota in bringing together school libraries, bringing libraries of common purpose together. The motion carried, with Adams abstaining.

Burton moved funding the WISCAT category at \$597,700, seconded by Adams. Davis said she cannot vote against it now but that she feels the committee must look closely at how much has been spent on the project over the years and it may be a topic for the visioning summit. The motion carried.

Dawson moved to fund Merging Shared Systems at \$75,000. Burton seconded. Onufrak asked if there is another possible project. Cross and Bocher confirmed that Brown County might be considered but not this year. The motion carried.

Sampson moved to fund the Adult & Family Literacy category at \$244,267 (through grant application number 10), seconded by Dawson. Burton expressed concern that some of the evaluations are based on percentages, and that a percentage participation-rate should be an objective, not an evaluation. Davis asked Huntington whether the SWLS grant was not subject to consideration. Onufrak questioned whether Davis should be participating in discussion. Huntington said she could support the grant but it needed some work. She felt criteria for the materials should be added so they address the target audience. Richmond noted that she has a concern about one of the grants (Kenosha). She thought it probably qualifies and should not be a problem. The motion carried. Kiely, Bartelt, Onufrak, Gilderson-Duwe, and Davis abstained.

Bartelt moved to fund the Adolescent Literacy initiative at 20,000, seconded by Onufrak. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

Kiely moved to fund the Statewide Visioning Summit at \$30,000, seconded by ????. The motion carried.

Zimmerman stated that there is \$20,880 unaccounted for.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to add \$15,000 to the Delivery category, seconded by Adams. Cross confirmed that the new total would be \$90,000. The motion carried, with Davis abstaining.

Richmond moved that the remaining \$5,880 be applied to the Shared Integrated Systems for Schools category. Gingery seconded the motion. Pearlmutter asked how the extra funding would be used. Steffan said other school districts in the test site could be used. Pearlmutter wondered if more could be added for evaluation. Richmond thought the applicant could decide how it could be used. Kiely made a motion for amendment to require that the additional funding be appropriated to evaluation. Gingery seconded the amendment. Dawson supports the notion to require a strong evaluation but questioned whether an evaluation could be done for that amount. Kiely noted that her library had hired an outside consultant to do an outside evaluation. Steffan said that the federal grants for Enhancing Technology all required evaluation components. She felt that the additional amount should be enough to pay for outside evaluation. Pearlmutter thought the amount and requirement is justified. The amendment to the motion carried. The motion was approved as amended with Adams abstaining.

Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2009

Onufrak asked whether the wireless category might be considered again. Bocher said he had not considered it. He asked Drew whether digitization could be expanded. Drew said it could be expanded

beyond the number of new projects. She wondered whether the limit of continued participation may have inhibited some additional applicants. She would investigate whether new projects could be added.

Pearlmuter suggested allowing digitization under WHO. (Wisconsin Heritage Online) Gingery asked whether the fees would actually be waived. Drew said it might have to be considered. Adams suggested that Nix's proposal might be supported by WLAFL. Drew also discussed the WHO project and noted a proposal has been compiled for other funding to allow community historical materials to be preserved. Another consideration is that the SHS's (State Historical Society's) server might need support and LSTA funding might be appropriate for that support. DeBacher asked for clarification. Drew said it might be opening up the projects to different types of applicants, or to a different means of digitizing than what has been done in the past. Davis asked how this meshes with WHO. Drew said the projects would be preparing materials for hosting on WHO. Davis asked how this would move digitization forward. Drew said she is not advocating. Grobschmidt gave some examples of calls he had received from local historical societies. Lebal discussed digitization projects her library had conducted. After the LSTA project, they felt that WHO allowed them more flexibility. Davis said there are considerable materials in libraries that deserve preserving but the other funding needs to be identified as LSTA may not be enough to support it. Pearlmuter discussed a recent pre-conference for archivists. Some of the outcome questioned whether libraries are prepared to make the decision on what should be preserved and should be maintained for the future. Richmond asked what the site search model on page 7 of the LSTA booklet refers to. Drew responded that is the name of the software that is used by the UW in their process. Richmond wondered whether the searching that is maintained on the collection is sufficient to access the materials prior to entering the website. Drew said that some of the aspect of the searching has improved and that Google recognizes the collections but cannot recognize them at item level. Richmond maintained that databases in other states have better access through search engines. Davis wondered how to consider Nix's proposal.

Burton suggested "Healthy Information and Awareness" as a topic for grant applications in the future. Cross encouraged him to submit a more developed proposal. Adams asked whether the innovative technology projects had a sufficiently high maximum dollar amount. Onufrak noted that he had thought about putting more money into the total category, and suggested increasing the grant cap for next year. Sampson stated she would like to see more teen participation in the development of the proposals and gave an example at LCO Library. Pearlmuter wondered if the subsidy for Delivery should be maintained at \$90,000. Onufrak asked what to consider for the Shared Integrated Systems for Schools category. Bocher said that we would have a stellar evaluation that would give us direction on how to proceed in the future.

Gilderson-Duwe suggested consideration of a category for digitization for statewide resources might address such requests as Nix proposed.

Drew asked for direction for the Virtual Reference project. At the last meeting the committee asked for proposals on how to proceed in the future. Davis said she acknowledged that the project might take longer to establish and felt there is progress being made with the schools. She added that there is potential to market the service. Drew asked if there was consensus to maintain the 24/7 service on LSTA longer than the initial 3 years. No one objected.

Adams asked whether the guidelines, in the future, would address the priorities. Cross suggested that the application may include a new component.

Gilderson-Duwe suggested that the Innovative Technology category have some limits for certain areas of the category to focus on the very best projects. Burton said that his suspicion is that the order in which the reviews are read might influence the rankings. DeBacher and Cross noted that the order of the grant applications sent to reviewers is randomized. Huntington said that the adolescent category will include gaming and that it may be justified.

Davis asked whether the overall amount in the innovative category could be increased next year. Onufrak noted that nothing was particularly new in the applications but that may have been driven by the tight

budgets at the libraries. Gingery stressed the importance of raising the amount for individual libraries in the innovative category.

Davis asked about the possibility of additional resources being added to BadgerLink. She suggested that the current core offerings be reviewed as well as considering additional databases. Drew noted that additional money likely will not be available but that bidding might permit a different combination. Gingery talked about the mixed role his system has served for the libraries. In reality the libraries are no longer willing to put funding toward the individual databases. Grobschmidt noted that the law has been changed where an individual library can purchase a database and offer it for external access only by its own patrons, which has caused some issues in itself.

Adams asked whether some multimedia databases might be considered.

There being no further discussion, Cross discussed possible dates for the next meeting of Advisory Committee, and would look at the week of April 7, 2008.

Cross adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.