

*LSTA Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes*

*Tuesday and Wednesday, November 29-30, 2006  
Crowne Plaza, Madison*

**Tuesday, November 29, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

The meeting was called to order by Peg Branson at 10 am.

**Present:** Rebecca Berger, Terrance Burton, Walter Burkhalter, Phyllis Davis, Terry Dawson, Jim Gingery, Paula Kiely, Fred Marini, Paul Onufrak, Jane Pearlmutter, Rhonda Puntney, Elizabeth Richmond

**Absent:** Veronica Thompson, Zora Sampson

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

Branson greeted the group and, after introductions, opened the public hearing.

**Public Hearing**

Melissa Schneider, Assistant Director/Head of Youth Services, New Berlin Public Library, representing Alliance of Public Librarians of the Waukesha Library System. She endorsed the letter from Sheila O'Brien, Elm Grove Public Library Director and President of the Alliance for Public Libraries. She spoke about the need for funding for services to children grades 5-8, especially boys, as well as special needs. Kiely asked if statewide discussion had been conducted. Schneider said that the public library system youth services consultants had discussed it. Huntington agreed and said there also had been discussion on the topic at the system special needs consultants annual meeting. Davis asked what the best way would be to allocate resources in a non-competitive way. Schneider suggested that distribution by the systems may be appropriate, and spoke in favor of multi-year and noncompetitive grant categories.

Pearlmutter asked Branson whether federal policy precludes multi-year grants. Branson said that guarantee of a multi-year time period is not possible since LSTA money is authorized and distributed year-by-year. However, the LSTA guidelines can state an informal intent for a multi-year category or grants. Cross said that the Division would be legally precluded from obligating funds for projects without having the funds on hand. Burkhalter recalled three-year projects from a few years ago. Kiely said that a few years ago multi-year special needs projects, connected to a special needs report, were made available and it was useful for planning purposes to know that the funds for the category would be available for more than one year. Marini asked how going from competitive to non-competitive would be handled. Branson said the LSTA Advisory Committee can make a recommendation for such a category or categories. Branson mentioned that the current Virtual Reference category is another example of a category that is expected to be available for three years, although we don't officially commit the funds beyond a one-year timeframe.

Branson noted two letters that were received and forwarded in an email: the Sheila O'Brien letter (previously discussed) and a letter from Maureen Welch from the Delivery Service Advisory Committee requesting funding for the statewide courier service.

**Review of the Agenda**

Branson summarized the agenda and process.

**Welcome**

Grobschmidt welcomed the committee and expressed his gratitude for their participation, knowing how appreciated the federal funding has been. He noted BadgerLink as an example of a service that had started

as an LSTA project. He said perhaps virtual reference will follow the same model. He provided an update on the DPI budget submitted by the state superintendent.

### **Minutes of September 2006 Meeting**

Davis moved, supported by Berger, to approve the minutes of the September 2006 meeting. Richmond noted a correction required on page four in the fourth paragraph: replace “her said” with “she said.” The minutes were approved unanimously as corrected.

### **LSTA Coordinator’s Report**

Branson reported that the maintenance of effort (MOE) waiver request DPI submitted to IMLS was approved for 2007, meaning that no penalty will be placed on the award for 2007. Without the approval of the waiver, Wisconsin would have suffered a penalty of approximately \$110,000. The Division will request another waiver for 2008. Branson discussed the federal budget. Congress has not passed most of the appropriation bills for FY 2007. The government is running on a continuing resolution, the current one running through December 4, 2006. LSTA is, in effect, accruing funding based on the continuing resolution—approximately 25% by the end of the year. She suspects there may be more of a delay this year unless an omnibus bill passes. We will likely have to award funds contingent upon passage of the FY 2007 federal appropriations bill by Congress. Our estimate is that the amount appropriated for 2007 will be approximately the same as the amount for 2006.

### **2007 LSTA Applications Overview**

Branson referred the committee to the green overview summary of projects and amounts and noted a correction to the amounts budgeted and requested for the 2007 Shared Automated System category. Kiely asked for clarification of the delivery amount which shows an adjustment of +\$17,000 (Branson noted later in the meeting that the +\$17,000 was a request for an additional \$17,000 because of increased fuel costs.) Pearlmutter asked whether funds can be shifted between categories and Branson said yes. Kiely asked whether the budget compiled in the spring assumed the penalty. Branson confirmed that it had because we thought it was better to be conservative than to have to reduce the budget by \$110,000 in the fall. Zimmerman noted that the settlement for four years of state employee contract negotiations was higher than projected. He had calculated the amounts and there was a \$60,000 shortfall that must be addressed if all positions are to be covered.

### **Procedures for Discussion and Review of Applications and Conflict of Interest Policy**

Branson referred to page 13 of the LSTA Information and Guidelines publication for the Policy on conflict of interest. She reviewed the conflict issues for all three bulleted items. Onufrak clarified that, as a system employee, there would not be a conflict with member library applications.

### **2007 Budget Issues and Guidelines**

Branson referred to the two-page yellow Preliminary LSTA Budget 2007. She pointed out that the only difference between the spring estimated amounts and the current estimated amounts, was the MOE penalty amount (no longer a negative). By the end of the day Thursday, the committee is expected to recommend the allocation of \$3,137,000.

### **Discussion and Review of LSTA Applications 2007 Noncompetitive Categories**

#### *Reference and Loan*

Drew noted that there is no change in the overall scope of services. The differences in amount are all related to salaries and attendant costs. She noted that the labor contract had not been settled in two biennia. Marini asked how many staff were affected. Branson noted that the FTE totals are listed on the summary sheets. Kiely asked if there had been changes in staffing levels over the past 10 years. Drew said that she has a number of staff that have considerable seniority. Kiely clarified that she wanted to know if the total number of FTEs has changed. Drew said that in the mid 1990s there were some cuts but it has been stable since then. Richmond asked if there is a way to figure out how much money would go toward subscription database services, including OCLC. Drew said it is about \$25,000. Richmond noted the increased cost of FirstSearch through OCLC. Drew said that use of BadgerLink has resulted in reduced

FirstSearch use. She has not tracked staff time devoted solely to database use. Richmond wondered whether shifting those searches to the academic community could be done in long-range planning. Davis asked how much in the budget goes toward collection development. Drew said there is no funding from LSTA for collection development. Davis asked how many items circulated from Reference and Loan. Sally said between 10,000 and 13,000. Berger asked whether it is common for states to have statewide reference. Drew and Pearlmutt noted that many states actually have a state library building and collection which serves state government and the public. Richmond asked how the state is allowed to distribute the results of databases searches through ILL at such a low cost. Drew said that the contracts were negotiated for ILL to be included.

#### *Public Library Development*

Cross referred to page 7 of the Division projects booklet. In both categories the final amounts are higher due to the union contract settlement and increases in indirect DPI charges. Under the statewide technology category, Bob Bocher's technology consultant position is supported, as well as continuing education and costs for a meeting of the system technology liaisons. Under Library Improvement, the public library development funds include Barb Huntington's position and 80% of Cross's position, as well as costs for the Summer Library Program, an annual meeting for library system directors, and annual meetings of public library system special needs, continuing education, and youth services consultants.

#### *WISCAT*

Clark reported on WISCAT services and the new system. Reference and Loan is three days into implementation and so far it is going well. Auto-Graphics is now the single vendor for the union and virtual catalogs. The servers are in California instead of at UW-Madison and that does not seem to have adversely affected performance. Simultaneous searching of the Z-catalogs is working very well since filtering and availability are now included. Some aspects of the clearinghouse model still need to be adjusted and incorporated. ISO interoperability will be further developed for interaction with OCLC, WiLS and Minitex. Libraries do not seem to be dropping out because of the \$200 cost. Richmond asked about the fee and whether lower participation has affected it. Has the cost-per-library been affected? Richmond wondered if Illiad would work and Clark replied that Kansas and other states have worked integrating Illiad with Auto-Graphics. WiLS is coordinating the implementation.

Drew explained the budget. The WISCAT vendor costs are \$7000 less than last year. Within the WISCAT budget, much of the salary cost increases for 2006 were accommodated, due to adjustments in the fixed-cost charges. In 2008 the \$475,000 contractual amount will be reduced to about \$400,000, although additional functionality such as federated searching could drive costs up. Two more systems shifted to OCLC, so she has adjusted the budget for the lower number of libraries participating. About three-quarters of the libraries previously participating have committed and many have paid. Revenues should work out. There were no further comments or questions.

#### *Public Library System Technology Projects*

Bocher reported on the category and its history. BadgerNet network problems may require purchase of more bandwidth. Richmond asked whether there is cooperative statewide purchasing of databases. Drew noted that it happens most easily when a system can negotiate and purchase from system funds. Onufrak noted the problem of negotiating a price that not all libraries agree to purchase, so re-negotiation is required. Drew pointed out that funding for genealogy databases had been requested for the current state budget but was not ultimately included. Grobschmidt pointed out that vendors do not want to supply auto repair manuals online to all residents of the state. He asked when the next BadgerLink contract must be negotiated and Drew said 2009 will be the contract end. The state superintendent has requested a statewide contract for a bilingual online encyclopedia. Onufrak pointed out the popularity of Heritage Quest, surpassing Chilton's. Davis pointed out that this is one of the most popular databases for systems.

#### *Shared Integrated Library Systems*

Bocher noted that seven grants have been received for \$291,425. This would bring in 14 more public libraries and bring participation of public libraries in shared systems to over 90%. The category request is over budget by about \$16,000 because Arrowhead's application included \$15,000 in system costs that

should not have been included. That brings the requested amount down to \$276,425. Onufrak asked whether Arrowhead was the only one that went beyond the category rules. Bocher confirmed.

#### *Shared Systems Study for Schools*

Bocher said the Division planned to explore the advantages and disadvantages of school libraries participating in shared automated systems. Two pilot projects may be feasible for schools that have expressed interest. Steffan said this would be a targeted study to determine how well the participation works. Davis asked whether contracted staff would work but Bocher reported that we may be able to do it internally. Branson asked what the money would cover; Bocher said he is not sure how it would be applied or whether much, if any, of the funds would be used. Puntney said that Lakeshores is interested in participating. Davis wondered if the outcome could be predicted if only interested parties participate. Bocher said there may be unknown factors that may be discovered. Pearlmutter said she had originally objected to funding actual participation but had hoped that the study might explore how the shared system might affect learning—perhaps a future study could explore that area. Steffan said that there has been research on this issue. Pearlmutter wondered how local collection is defined, since previously the availability may not have explored a broader collection. Richmond said she did not support the use for a broader research study. She hopes a study could look at whether such joint use is more appropriate in rural areas. Marini said he has heard repeatedly that schools only want to borrow—he thinks this is an opportunity to explore more sharing outside of the schools. Also, CESAs often have library collections and the sharing and use may need to change so that use is broader.

#### **12:00 LUNCH**

The meeting broke for lunch and resumed at 1:00 p.m.

#### *Virtual Reference*

Branson referred the group to the revised budget sheet distributed by email. Drew reported on the virtual reference service. Staff has conducted training. Prior to next spring's meeting, WiLS will be asked to put together some funding scenarios. Fifteen of the 17 public systems are now participating and Southwest hopes to join in 2007. There has been good participation by the technical colleges. Davis asked what growth has been noted. Branson suggested that reports should be forthcoming as statistics are available. The additional \$4,100 is for increased OCLC costs. Pearlmutter asked where funding for an evaluation would come from. Drew said either WiLS or DPI would need to conduct a study. Davis said a report of the types and geographic range of questions would be helpful. She wants to know where requests come from and who answers them.

#### *Delivery Projects*

Drew reviewed the history of LSTA funding for delivery. She said South Central Library System and the state delivery committee are working on some long-range projects.

#### *State Institution Coordination*

Huntington discussed the supplemental funding to the Department of Corrections and referred to page 9 of the blue booklet. Kiely asked whether there is research related to childhood library use to later incarceration. Huntington said there is information on high illiteracy rates in prisons.

#### *Communication and Planning*

Grobschmidt reviewed the category. Funds are used for participation in the COSLA (Chief Officers of State Library Agencies), the Council on Library and Network Development, the Library and Information Technology Advisory Committee, and for printing and distribution of Channel. There were no questions or comments.

#### *Economic Impact of Public Libraries*

Zimmerman and DeBacher were charged with looking into the feasibility and process, and potential partners for this project. They discussed the process with DPI purchasing. Madison, Milwaukee, Racine, Appleton and the Wisconsin Library Association Foundation are interested in partnering on the project. On the process side, an RFP would not be permitted. DOA suggests a request for information followed by

a request for bids, which would require lowest bidder. The schedule would require at least two weeks for the bids (plus a period for appeal), following the RFI process. We hope to have the project done by the end of 2007, with perhaps preliminary results in September.

Zimmerman and DeBacher reported on the studies done in other states and noted that the costs were considerably higher--\$150,000 and \$160,000. DeBacher said he was surprised at the costs in the other states, apparently due to the fairly considerable amount of local survey information gathered. Pearlmutter asked if the library school had been contacted. DeBacher said no. Dawson said that additional funding would certainly be advisable or desirable. Cross said that \$50,000 was used because that seemed to be the most reasonable or feasible at the time. Davis said that the committee does not want to have to make the choice between a good study and a cheap study. Kiely said that, while WLA may not find a two-year process desirable, perhaps that may be effective to get adequate results. Dawson suggested that an alternate bid might include other cities or communities. Richmond asked whether the results produced in the other states was accurate in the methodology. She wondered if the study would have any affect on skeptics or would we be "preaching to the choir." Davis said that the prior Wisconsin Public Library Consortium study of library use in the state was worthwhile and this study would also help support local libraries. She feels all outside information is useful. Grobschmidt asked Kiely what Milwaukee Public Library would want to have as a result from this kind of survey. She answered that they would like to be able to show more impartially about what the return was on the local investment is. She wonders if inference can be drawn on better investment leading to greater return. She feels it is an important study. She knows we will be in the black; whether that number is as high as we would expect will remain to be seen.

#### *LSTA Administration*

Branson explained the various elements, including the DPI indirect charge, committee expenses, and DPI fiscal office support. She said it remains essentially the same from year to year. There are very few discretionary options here.

### **Discussion and Review of LSTA Applications 2007 Competitive Categories**

#### *Digitization – Local Resources*

Drew reviewed some of the issues involved in the applications and distributed a summary sheet of recipients. All of the applications would be worth funding. Some may need more assessment of the types of materials that will be submitted for digitization. Pearlmutter wondered if the participants could retain copyright for oral histories taken years before. Davis commented that the projects were very interesting and that even the lowest-ranking project seemed worthy. Comments were made on how previous participants celebrated the culmination of their project. Branson said the projects have been valuable to UW-Madison too.

#### *Sensory and Mobility Disabilities*

Huntington talked about the need for possible support for the Wisconsin Regional Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to extend and promote the transfer to the new format for their materials. She summarized the scope of the projects, all of which could be funded within the budget limit. She said all the proposals are strong. Pearlmutter asked about the digital books grant request from South Central. Huntington said that both Playaway and Overdrive would be included. Pearlmutter said she checked out her first Playaway from the UW-Madison College Library and said it was simple and easy to use. Marini said they also have an adjustable speed which can help with ESL.

#### *Adult, Family, and Early Literacy:*

Huntington reported that there are strong projects in the applications submitted and mentioned the Dane County project which would serve children with mothers in prison. Indianhead would work with five county jails and video record parents reading. Pearlmutter suggested that there is an outlier in the rankings that has influenced that ranking. She thought that some additional recipients could be funded, perhaps up through Wisconsin Valley. Huntington pointed out that only the last two were quite far below the others in the rankings spread. Davis wondered if the number of applicants limited the pool of eligible and

qualified reviewers, and this might support making the category non-competitive. Burton concurred and noted that the reviewers were “all over the map” on the rankings, indicating that personal preferences may be affecting the results. Onufrak noted that as he got more experience in judging, he was better able to spread the points out among the grants. Pearlmutter said the “luck of the draw” may put some “safe” projects above the line but punish some innovative projects that suffered in the rankings. She wondered whether the committee has discretion in the order of the awards.

Branson referred to page three of the LSTA Information and Guidelines indicating that the committee can make recommendations that do not strictly follow rankings. However, there should be a very good reason for doing so. Gingery said that it may be easy to fund though number 14. Dawson pointed out there is less than a 12-point spread between number 7 and number 16. Onufrak said we should avoid the temptation to second-guess the reviewers. Marini asked about the literacy rates in prison and whether there are any results on impact of specific programs on the inmates. Huntington mentioned some current measures including the number of inmates who get GEDs and the number who could not previously read a children’s book but who now can. There is a problem in time-span testing since many sentences are short, so the impact may not be able to be measured. The impact of connections with children while in prison is documented as having a positive affect. Burkhalter said he interprets the passage in the guidelines to suggest that the committee should not be second-guessing the reviewers. Some of the “clumps” the committee noted suggest that all of the “clump” should be funded.

The committee completed its review of the grant categories, so Branson suggested getting a start on the discussion of the long-range plan and evaluation.

#### **LSTA Five-Year Plan and Evaluation**

Branson reviewed the plan and evaluation timetable. The committee had suggested use of an outside group for data collection and that the evaluation should be more than simply a summary of what had been done. Josh Morrill was hired for \$5000 to develop and administer a survey to public library systems. Systems were limited to up to three people to respond—director and two others. There were 45 potential respondents. The same basic survey has been made available to the LSTA Advisory Committee and will be made availability to the broader library community by announcements in the WEMA, WISPUBLIB and WLA email lists, and an article in Channel Weekly. Branson indicated that she had been attending various annual meetings of advisory groups of the Division to gather input on the LSTA program. Gingery asked how the results from groups would be weighed. Kiely noted that the survey respondent’s position can be noted, but not other demographics. Kiely said that, in her library, only certain people are authorized to respond, but by opening it up, input from less qualified respondents is entertained. Marini noted that he had checked out the original survey and wondered if it has changed (no). Also, he hopes that broader sampling from around the state may help balance out the results generally. Branson said the input on the survey had been received from a subcommittee of the LSTA Advisory Committee and the survey has now been distributed. Burton suggested keeping the results separate. Pearlmutter wondered if the committee survey was separate (yes). Marini said that responses may help indicate why there has not been more participation in applicants.

Branson explained a problem with the timing of the survey results. The federal evaluation report is due March 31, 2007, but the committee typically does not meet before then. Should the committee meet by teleconference to review the results? Onufrak and Kiely agreed such a meeting would be effective. Berger asked about the plan component, since she will no longer be on the committee. Branson said that it would be reviewed at the spring committee, with a hearing. Cross said that we would invite input from the broader library community. Burton suggested input could be sought by all committee participants back to 2002. Steffan suggested a two-way video conference with a number of sites around the state. Richmond asked whether input from WAAL on some aspects (such as WISCAT) could be gathered. Burton thought that such input does not need to be split out from general input gathered by the survey.

Grobschmidt said that we frequently see public articles or notifications about projects that were conducted with LSTA funds and that there is frequently no mention that the project is funded with LSTA. BadgerLink sometimes suffers the same fate.

**The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m. until Thursday at 8:30 a.m.**

**Thursday, November 30, 8:30 a.m.**

Branson reconvened the meeting at 8:35. All committee members were present with the exception of Sampson and Thompson.

Branson discussed a possible additional meeting of this committee to review the results of the LSTA surveys, since they were not completed and available for the meeting. She asked current members whose terms are ending if they would attend an extra meeting, possibly a remote or phone conference meeting. Members were willing.

### **Final Recommendations on Applications and Allocation of Funds 2007**

Zimmerman projected the LSTA budget spreadsheet on a screen to allow members to see allocation progress.

#### *Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2007*

Marini asked how the \$110,000 would be distributed. Branson said the amount was included in the total funds available for 2007. Marini suggested that some of the funding for staff salaries and benefits could be shifted to other sources. Drew noted that employees are designated to this funding source so it would not be feasible to shift to other sources. Cross mentioned that indirect costs follow the same principle. Drew said the only way to address it is to cut staff. Marini noted that, had we not regained the MOE cut, we would have had to make cuts elsewhere. This was confirmed.

Burkhalter asked if categories could be combined in one motion. Branson said this was permissible.

Burton moved to approve funding for LSTA Administration at \$90,000, seconded by Onufrak. Motion carried unanimously.

Berger moved to approve funding for the Shared Integrated Library Systems category at \$276,475, seconded by Puntney. Kiely clarified the original amount and the adjusted amount. Bocher explained the amount difference. Carried unanimously, Burkhalter abstained.

Burkhalter moved to approve funding for Reference and Loan at \$670,400, Public Library Development at \$133,800 and \$266,900, and Communication and Planning at \$25,000, seconded by Burton. Passed unanimously.

Berger moved to approve funding for Digitization at \$40,597, second by Davis. Kiely said she could not support it since some other categories have greater need. Davis said this category has great needs in new directions. Pearlmutter discussed some of the projects that are featured on the UW website. Onufrak said he tends to agree with Kiely but we may find funds later. 10 in favor, 2 opposed.

Marini moved to fund the Shared System Study for schools at \$15,000, seconded by Richmond. No discussion. Carried by voice vote, Davis opposed.

Puntney moved to approve the Seniors/Sensory Disabilities category at \$102,648, seconded by Onufrak. No discussion. Unanimous vote.

Dawson moved to approve the System Technology Projects category at \$370,000 seconded by Berger. Pearlmutter asked who cannot vote (five members). Passed unanimously with five abstentions.

Marini moved to approve the Statewide Resource Sharing/WISCAT category at \$641,200 seconded by Burton. Berger asked what percentage of libraries and systems participate this year. Drew said we still have 1200 libraries in the database, including the virtual catalog. She anticipates 590 using the ILL system, but had no breakdown by types of libraries. She said 12 to 13 of the 17 systems will be using WISCAT, excluding South Central, Winnefox, Nicolet, Outagamie-Waupaca, and possibly Kenosha.

Clark said that all except South Central are participating in the virtual catalog even though they do not place requests and those requests can be filtered by availability. Davis said that there was testimony that the five systems that have announced using OCLC represent 32% of the population of the state. Burton pointed out that most of the hospitals, even in those areas, are using WISCAT. Richmond asked how the use breakdown affects evaluation of the project. Even if it works well for those who use it, how can a statewide evaluation be made when so many do not use it. Onufrak said it is difficult to decide how to make funding decisions. Most of the sharing in his system is within their ILS and there are other products that could link them with other shared systems. He acknowledged that those not in a system need some type of product, but it's hard to know how to determine that product. Dawson said that this may be a subject for discussion for the 2008 cycle. Motion carried unanimously with Onufrak abstaining.

Burton moved to approve the Virtual Reference category at \$70,100, seconded by Berger. There was no discussion. Motion carried unanimously with Richmond abstaining.

Onufrak moved to fund the Delivery category at \$75,000, seconded by Marini. There was no discussion. Motion carried unanimously with one abstention (Davis).

Puntney moved to fund the State Institution category funding at \$15,000, seconded by Onufrak. Davis asked what would happen to the position if we did not fund it. Cross said it is hard to determine since it is not in our department. Richmond noted that this is a non-competitive category so there should not be a question for this fall, but it could be cut in the future. Marini said this has come up several times and agreed with Pearlmutter that the Department of Corrections has had great growth yet we are asked to fund this position. Huntington noted that the funding is an incentive to pay for an administrator to help coordinate library services in the Department. 7 in favor, 4 opposed, one abstention.

Onufrak moved to fund the Economic Impact Study at \$50,000. Gingery seconded. Berger noted that she would like to see more funding and would vote against it. Onufrak said that he also supports more funding but wanted to see what is left. Pearlmutter said that she is inclined to look at some of the other categories first. Discussion ensued on how much extra to put toward literacy. Davis may be in favor of drawing the line on the literacy category at \$252,613. Grobschmidt asked what might happen if we received additional federal funds. Zimmerman said they could be used for this purpose. Drew pointed out that an RFI may indicate how much is needed or not available by the March meeting and a higher amount could be considered then.

Dawson moved, seconded by Berger, to amend the motion to \$92,317. Gingery said the category was established as a partnership and we don't know who will partner. Dawson said if we leave it at \$50,000, no amount of partnership will accomplish the study. Branson called for a vote on the amendment, 9 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention. Voting on the motion as amended, 9 in favor, 2 abstentions.

Onufrak moved to fund the Literacy category at \$252,613, seconded by Burkhalter. Burton suggested taking the "figure skating" approach, throwing out the top and bottom votes, which would push the Milwaukee proposal at the number 15 spot, so that a greater number of projects would be funded with the same amount. Pearlmutter said she liked the methodology, but we have so few reviewers it makes the method less effective and fair. Gingery agreed and said any change in methodology should have been discussed previously. Branson said she would be very uncomfortable changing methodology in the middle of the process. Burkhalter said that these outliers have always had an affect, but we just notice it here since it has such a potentially clear impact. Richmond asked about the Milwaukee project and noted that it has been funded in the past with LSTA funds. Huntington noted that the target groups have been changed each time, plus the project design has changed as well. They provide training to day care center staff and model effective programming to day care staff.

Davis noted that we do not have the full grant before us so it is dangerous to second-guess the results of the review process.

Onufrak emphasized that the job is to fund as much as we can, and noted that the \$252,613 is still over \$22,000 more than the original budgeted amount. Pearlmutter wondered if perhaps it is the committee's

job to weigh other considerations, but the decision should be made for future decisions. Richmond suggested the issue should be discussed only when there is no vested interest. Burkhalter said he did not have a problem with changing the process in the future, but it should be done so that both the applicants and the reviewers know the change will be made. Burton noted that he would not have considered the process if it were not for the fact that five grants could not be funded. Richmond asked whether the public librarians might want to split this into two categories in the future. Branson said that discussion could be held later when we talk about the future. Branson asked for a vote. All in favor with 3 abstentions.

The committee broke for a few minutes and resumed at 10:05.

Puntney moved that, if additional money is received, consideration be given to other literacy projects except the lowest two proposals. Marini seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Branson noted that after the superintendent reviews the recommendations, provisional letters of approval will be sent out with a note the awards are contingent upon receipt of the federal funds from Washington.

### **LSTA Five-Year Plan and Evaluation**

Branson directed the committee to the Comments on LSTA from Annual Meetings, dated 11/7/2006 and discussed some of the input and issues discussed. The committee discussed whether to bring schools into shared systems, to fund upgrades to existing systems, digitization, distance learning equipment, and innovative and pilot projects.

Davis said that while no new innovative ideas were expressed, there was a desire for innovation. Some discussion followed on whether to consider projects to encourage participation in the E-rate program. Marini suggested the grant form should more clearly require disclosure of previous grants in order to get more libraries who have not received grants previously. Huntington replied that page 3 of the application requires that disclosure though Branson said it is not a clear-cut as it might be to get new applicants. Pearlmutter said she would like to see a way to get more grants out to individual libraries. Burkhalter said some of the small libraries simply do not have the resources to carry out, much less write, a grant proposal.

Huntington, discussing the special needs category, saying she gets feedback from the special needs consultants at the public library systems. All but three systems have submitted grants on behalf of their member libraries.

Burkhalter noted that two libraries in his system had applied for digitization grants and pointed out that even Slinger, one of the libraries, has considerably more resources than nine of the other even smaller libraries. Burton said that studies provide considerable information but not enough is spent in digesting or interpreting the data to see how it can benefit the smaller libraries.

Drew noted that the system technology grants list databases that are being purchased and she wondered whether some tracking could be done to see whether some group purchasing could be done for statewide projects, for instance genealogy resources. She asked whether she should do some research on the range of products to report at the spring meeting. Burkhalter commented that three counties have contracts for Heritage Quest, and that they hope to extend it to the system, but it would be helpful to have it coordinated by the state. Davis suggested that a statewide contract for WorldCat / BadgerCat would level the field for statewide resource sharing. Berger would like to see GED preparation materials in all libraries.

Drew reported that a number of states have a supporting infrastructure for the use of those products. They may have toolkits to support what families or educators do to interpret and train those in the field to use BadgerLink and the tools available. She pointed to the efforts the State Historical Society has put toward public awareness of the digitization resources.

Richmond suggested that instead of funding the full purchases perhaps consortia purchasing may be more appropriate. Burton supported the idea of education and awareness tools that schools and libraries can use.

Drew asked if there would be consideration for digitization projects to be hosted by the Wisconsin Historical Society, which may provide other means for projects to be conducted outside of the UW process. She wondered what types of information or resources might be required to proceed.

Marini noted that Wisconsin History Online discusses digitization coordination. The state has done a nice job. He likes the idea of the toolkit in order to support the use of the project.

Gingery asked for clarification on the database proposal idea. He has assumed that we have negotiated prices and then they are purchased for statewide use. He prefers that whatever goes toward BadgerLink be free rather than fee based.

Drew asked if the group was interested in databases related to history such as a cemetery index, working perhaps with the Wisconsin Historical Society to create an index that libraries could access.

Branson directed the group back to the comments received in the summary sheet from statewide meetings.

Pearlmutter said the University of Wisconsin has changed the formula for support of graduate students, so that grants for those seeking a masters degree would certainly help. She also sees the need for assistance to get the training necessary for certification. IMLS has put money into this area, but they generally require a partner library to establish that a library will have a job available once they complete their evaluation. Burton said he too has seen less discretionary support for graduate students.

Marini noted that the groups who were consulted for input were weighted to the public library community and that there is need for more input from schools and special libraries. Branson said the upcoming survey would be open to school, special and other types of libraries.

Grobschmidt talked about the increasing interest in workforce preparedness. How can better preparation in school increase the economic benefit once students reach the workforce? This could include those who had dropped out and those who require additional or second career training. He noted that the local library is more friendly and available for those preparing for jobs. He noted Berger's request for GED preparation as a good step to take. Virtual education may be another area of opportunity. The online job application alone can be a hurdle for some people that the library can address.

Kiely reviewed the first page of the LSTA Information and Guidelines booklet which indicates that the LSTA categories are fairly broad, with emphasis on electronics and technology, but also general services. She observed that both the special needs for children and those who have a parent incarcerated are needed and perhaps should be separately considered. She gets somewhat nervous about preparing librarians since there are programs through IMLS. Pearlmutter said that there needs to be partnerships. Kiely said that her library works with the library school to prepare internship programs.

Burton suggested health literacy and health information awareness, since he is very aware of the need. He mentioned the "go local" program to direct people searching on a national level to local resources.

Dawson said he is interested in seeing some incentives for libraries to move toward joint library efforts. He is interested in incentives for degree programs because he is aware anecdotally that there are few opportunities for scholarships for library school students. He said that many states fund their equivalent of BadgerLink with LSTA funds rather than state funds as we do in Wisconsin.

Richmond noted that many health libraries are becoming more patient information centers rather than research centers.

Davis noted that the original discussion focused on whether grants for little libraries were necessary. She said that if staff could be paid, it would help. Her members have noted that the state can cover personnel costs but other applicants can't. Perhaps that should be considered in the long-range plan.

Burkhalter agreed that there should be more variety in what is done with the funding. It would free up much money if the legislature would fund systems at the level required. There is a mandate to cooperate in multi-type situations and they could do more of that if they had funding. In essence, we use federal money to fund systems through the block grants. He wonders whether we explore enough about options for libraries, such as where branches could work instead of autonomous boards. Another possibility is for a community to contract for library service with an existing library.

Kiely commented on process. She said some think the LSTA program is laborious or complicated. She noted that her first grant was in 2000 for Books to Go. At that time there were workshops conducted for writing and, more importantly, how to plan the execution as well as think through the objectives and impact of the project. She thinks that all those steps need to be seriously considered. She also wondered whether the number of reviewers should be increased, but it may be difficult to increase the pool of reviewers. Branson mentioned that training is done for reviewers and potential applicants. Pearlmuter commented that there are benefits to having discussion among the reviewers that can benefit the process and eliminate some of the odd outliers.

Burton commented on Kiely's suggestion about getting and using project development help. He said that the amount of time put into preparing the grant is never recovered so the project should be considered and evaluated before submitting an application.

Puntney suggested a component where the committee might look at the written comments. Huntington said she did not think it would be beneficial because there usually are very few comments. She also said that applicants should attend the training sessions.

Richmond said there is only so much you can do for training, perhaps the systems can help pick up the support. She would not like more money devoted to training. She also thinks Jane's ideas are good but would require too many extra resources to administer.

Gingery thinks that the focus should be on training to make sure reviewers know their role, while considering balancing geographic area and role among the reviewers.

Grobschmidt said that, overall, everyone should know what the rules are that are established and then can feel that they are being considered fairly. He noted that other DPI grant programs are considered differently in a much more complicated process.

Davis wondered whether the Division could establish a "pass-fail" process for some categories.

Kiely commented on the outlier issue. She said that when she sent her responses, the Division staff reviewed them

Huntington noted that typically the average score reflects the distribution of the quality of the grants. She went back and looked at all the scores of all the reviewers and saw very few situations where the outliers being removed would affect the outcome.

Gingery does not support the idea of the reviewers gathering to discuss the outcome of their grant. He also does not like to weight the amount of the grant.

### **Consideration of Other Preliminary Categories for 2008**

Branson asked for additional ideas for the categories for 2008. Gingery said he liked the grant category that Sheila O'Brien suggested, although he thought it should start at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade (rather than 4<sup>th</sup>) and that the category could remain competitive.

Puntney said she strongly feels that a non-competitive category for special needs for systems should be established.

Onufrak said that all the categories for technology should be maintained, noting that virtual reference will be in its third year.

Kiely likes the idea of the non-competitive categories. She advocates not eliminating the early literacy category because without it the work with 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and beyond will be wasted.

Marini mentioned the double standard by funding certain activities at the state, but not for participants. He believes that should be looked at in the future. Berger said she has concern for non-competitive system funding and supports the “pass-fail” concept mentioned by Davis.

Burkhalter said that the shared integrated library systems should be the final cycle and those funds will be available for other purposes.

Onufrak wondered if there should be a follow-up for the schools in shared system study. Marini wonders whether we may be premature in the discussion and that some other ideas may come from the survey results.

Steffan suggested looking at the process the schools use to review grant applications.

Davis asked Grobschmidt about the funding deficiencies and wondered whether the change in the legislature might realize better funding for state agency programs division staffing. He said there are two pressures—less than half of the positions at DPI are funded by GPR funds. The other is position authority to use the money to replace GPR with federal money. With the state seeing a deficit it is difficult to imagine a change in the next biennium.

#### **Next Meeting of Advisory Committee**

Branson is considering the spring meeting in April, possibly the week of April 9. She'll check on staff schedules and hotel rooms and get back with the committee.

Grobschmidt thanked the group and said he appreciated their input. He encouraged suggestions for new members.

The meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m. with lunch following.