

***LSTA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes***  
***Wednesday, November 7, 2012***  
***Comfort Inn & Suites, DeForest***  
***DRAFT***

**Wednesday, November 7, 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Members Present**

Jeff Dawson, Director Lester Public Library; Steve Platteter, Mid-Wisconsin Library System; Teri Iverson, CESA #3 (retired); Robert Stack, Portage County Public Library; Martha Van Pelt, South Central Library System; John Hanson, U.S.S. Liberty Memorial Public Library; Leah Langby, Indianhead Library System; Bruce Gay, Milwaukee Public Library; Malena Koplín, Waukesha High School; Matthew Rosendahl, Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College; Linda Stobbe, Northern Waters Library Service; Mary Driscoll, Dane County Library Service; Gerri Moeller, Outagamie Waupaca Library System; Krista Ross, Southwest Wisconsin Library System; and Cherylín Stewart, Manitowoc Public Library.

**Absent**

None

**Division Staff**

Nancy Anderson, Martha Berninger, Walter Burkhalter, John DeBacher, Terrie Howe, Tessa Michaelson Schmidt, Kurt Kiefer.

**Call to Order and Introductions**

Terrie Howe called the meeting to order at 8:55 am. Committee members introduced themselves.

**Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Kurt Kiefer, Assistant State Superintendent, Division for Libraries and Technology, welcomed the committee adding that the conversation today was important. He encouraged members to think strategically and be proactive about change. He is optimistic about where we are headed and thanked the group for attending.

John DeBacher, Director, Public Library Development, reminded the committee that this was an open meeting and to confine discussion to the meeting proper. This is the first time the November meeting has been held in one day but the spring session may still need to be a day and a half. He again welcomed the group and thanked them for coming.

**Review of the Agenda**

Howe reviewed the agenda including the process to be followed. Iverson moved approval. Platteter seconded. Motion carried.

### **Draft Minutes of April 2012 Meeting**

Dawson moved, seconded by Stack. Approved minutes without amendment.

### **Report on LSTA Plan 2013-17**

Howe reported on the LSTA plan. It basically covers what we plan to do (areas) and how we plan to do it (grants). It has all been accepted by IMLS. We are currently under the plan and grants for this cycle and beyond will need to conform to it. Continuing Education is back in the plan. Prior to this year training had to be incorporated into other areas; it can now be treated on its own.

### **2013 LSTA Application Overview**

Howe reviewed the total amount allocated for grants (\$975,000) and the total amount requested (\$924,897). Sixty-three applications were received in seven categories.

### **Public Hearing**

No members of the public present for the hearing. Two letters received. One from Maggie Waggoner, Director of New Glarus Public Library, in support of the Digital Creation category. The second from Lori Roholt, Indianhead Federated Library System, suggesting the expansion of the Digitization grant to include third party vendors.

### **Procedures: Discussion/Review of Applications & Conflict of Interest Policy**

Howe reviewed the conflict policy with emphasis on page 41 of the *2013 LSTA Information and Guidelines* booklet. New members were encouraged to ask either Howe or DeBacher if there were questions about the policy. Howe reminded the committee that complaint procedures for grant applicants are also in the booklet if needed. Grant applicants on the committee may ask for clarification about why grants were not funded, but cannot advocate. They must also abstain on votes regarding their library's or library system's grant.

### **2013 Budget Issues and Guidelines**

Howe directed the committee to the budget noting each column and what was included under the headings. Two amounts shown for the bottom line. If no cuts are received approximately \$3,162,663 will be available in 2013. The second includes the possibility of an 8.2% reduction leaving \$2,927,925 for the budget. Both figures include an anticipated \$300,000 carry over from 2012. DeBacher added that the \$300,000 is the largest carry over in the recent past due largely to several retirements and cutback in fringe benefits. There is a good deal of uncertainty regarding the 8.2% decrease. The committee will add and subtract recommended amounts and this will also affect the bottom line. The State Superintendent has the final say but will take the committee's recommendations under advisement.

### **Discussion and Review of LSTA Applications 2013 – DLT Projects**

#### **Administration**

Howe reviewed what the category covered. DeBacher added that update of the Tech survey (done several years back) would be included.

### **Communication and Planning**

DeBacher reported. Category reduced to \$20,000.

### **Delivery Projects (SCLS, NWLS)**

Berninger reported there is no change.

### **E-Content Licensing**

DeBacher noted that the amount approved last cycle was \$300,000. This committee approved \$200,000 for 2013 in the spring. It is anticipated that the amount will be reduced further in 2014 to \$100,000.

### **Learning Express**

Berninger emphasized the popularity of the Learning Express service. The \$200,000 is to fund for a full year as part of Badgerlink. She will look into the dates of the contract and let members know.

### **Library Improvement - Technology**

DeBacher reported that this category covers the position formally held by Bob Bocher. He hopes to post and fill the position soon.

### **Statewide Library Improvement**

DeBacher outlined what the funds cover—half of data coordinator position, 80% of director's position, and other position support, electronic forms for annual report, and other functions. The data position would be full time in 2013.

### **Resources for Libraries & Lifelong Learning – Statewide Technology**

Berninger noted the amount requested for 2013 is less than in 2007. There have been several staff changes. ILL staffing is down while Badgerlink staffing has increased. There is a new full time BadgerLink coordinator, part-time backup (50% of metadata position who also works in *Found in Wisconsin*) and Kara Ripley. Another position is for Wisconsin Document depository program and a .5 FTE for support to website and network. Finally, two positions, .8 FTE, part of Martha and Lisa's salary, supported by LSTA.

### **School Library e-Content**

Anderson reported that the first step would be to survey the schools to identify needs. Second step would be to set priorities based on the results (possibly as a summit). Third step would be to possibly set up pilot programs based on the results. Malena Koplin is assisting on this effort.

### **WISCAT**

Berninger noted that the budget request is the lowest since 2003. There is a renegotiated contract with Autographics. The \$200 fee per library will remain in effect. DeBacher stated that reallocation of RL&LL staff has aided PLD. Kiefer commended both for working well together. Rosendahl asked how many fewer licenses than last year. Berninger stated about 25 to 30 fewer; many of which represent school districts purchasing the license as opposed to individual libraries.

### **Youth Services Leadership Development Institute**

Schmidt reported that the funds would be used to conduct a three day conference conducted by DPI staff limited to 25 attendees. DeBacher envisions this conference to alternate every other year with the New Directors Boot Camp. Kiefer noted that the process would include video capture as well.

### **Youth & Special Service Librarian**

DeBacher stated that this position has been broken out into a separate category at the request of IMLS. He went on to describe the various projects Schmidt has been involved with.

### **WebJunction Continuing Education**

Howe noted that this is a new category for 2013. It would provide up to 3000 librarians access to WebJunction. DeBacher noted this helps both school and public librarians.

### **External Grant Categories – Competitive**

DeBacher stated that because of the carry over the budget situation is good. There shouldn't be difficulty funding the categories. This year's grants need to fall under the requirements of the new plan. We need to be sure that grants follow the IMLS guidelines.

### **Accessibility**

Schmidt made general comments about all the competitive grants. There was an emphasis on the structural components, the comments from reviewers, and balance of both plus scores when determining which grants should be funded.

Accessibility had a total of eight grant applications. \$100,000 was available and \$113,000 requested. Based on the criteria above the staff is recommending the five highest scoring grants be funded. Total for those five: \$70,242.

Stack asked if local matching funds were part of the consideration. DeBacher replied that it may have played a factor in that sustainability and ongoing support are necessary for a successful project. Stack responded that he was concerned about the lack of local funding for some of the applications and was curious. Gay asked if Schmidt could describe the rationale behind the recommendation. Schmidt stated that money not being an object, the question was considered which grants could stand alone. Reviewer scores and comments were a more important factor than the amount of funding requested. Howe reiterated that IMLS wants grants that can be modeled based on their own merits.

### **Literacy**

Schmidt reviewed that ten grants had been received. \$125,000 was available and \$116,000 requested. The top four scoring grants are being recommended at a total of \$52,006. Langby noted that there were dramatic differences in reviewers' rankings and opinions. Schmidt agreed that staff had noted this. It was very important in this category to see how the projects fit together (who are the collaborative partners, can the

model be sustained, what can the Division stand behind, etc.). Tessa addressed how to interpret the comments between what is required in grants and what is simply opinion or slant DeBacher noted that the comments by reviewers were mostly diplomatic; we need to concentrate on the requirements rather than the sidebars. Howe stated that the lower rankings came from former LSTA committee members and grant writers.

### **Digital Creations in Public Libraries**

Schmidt reported that this was a new category and only four applications were received. She believes that many potential applicants are waiting to see how the first round goes. \$80,000 was available and \$40,017 requested. Staff is recommending that only one be funded (at \$16,104). It is well written and will be a clear model for grants in the future. DeBacher suggested that in the future libraries and systems will be more aware of the category.

### **Digitization- Local Resources**

Howe stated that four grants were received that met the requirements of the category. One other grant was received but was outside the guidelines. Staff recommends funding the remainder at \$14,762 (out of \$25,000 available).

### **External Grant Categories – Non-Competitive**

#### **Library System Technology**

Howe described some of the areas where library systems utilize these funds. Databases, extra modules for shared integrated library systems, WPLC membership, and combinations.

Howe asked if there were any questions about the categories. Moeller asked if it was “normal” for there to be so many applications that have not been recommended for funding in the past. DeBacher stated that with more restrictions from IMLS and limited staff at DLT to work with grant applicants who have not met requirements there are more than in the past.

Kiefer stated that he has asked staff for suggestions for unallocated funds and those will be reviewed after lunch.

### **Final Recommendations on Applications and 2013 Allocation of Funds**

Motion by Stack, second by Iverson to recommend Delivery Projects at \$90,000. Motion carried. Stobbe and Van Pelt abstain.

Motion by Stack, second by Iverson to recommend Library System Technology Projects at \$350,000. Motion carried. Library system representatives Langby, Stobbe, Platteter, Van Pelt, Moeller, and Ross abstained.

Motion by Stack, second by Iverson to recommend e-Content Licensing at \$200,000. Discussion: Dawson asked if the topic could be revisited later if funding permits. DeBacher replied that it could be. Motion carried. Library system representatives Langby, Stobbe, Platteter, Van Pelt, Moeller, and Ross abstained.

Motion by Platteter, second by Dawson to recommend funding WISCAT at \$458,050. Motion carried.

Motion by Hanson, second by Langby to recommend funding Digitization-Local Resources at \$14,762. Motion carried.

Motion by Ross, second by Driscoll to recommend funding the Youth Services Institute at \$15,000. Motion carried.

Motion by Gay, second by Dawson to recommend funding Library Technology at \$160,000. Motion carried. Motion by Stack, second by Ross to recommend funding Accessibility at \$70,242. Motion carried. Driscoll, Langby, Stobbe, and Moeller abstained.

Motion by Rosendahl, second by Langby to recommend funding Learning Express at \$200,000. Discussion: Stewart would like to bring up adding more later. Motion carried.

Motion by Platteter, second by Stobbe to recommend funding Digital Creation at \$16,104. Motion carried. Stewart abstained.

Motion by Dawson, second by Rosendahl to recommend funding RL&LL Statewide Technology at \$647,100. Motion carried.

Motion by Koplín, second by Iverson to recommend funding School Library e-content at \$35,000. Motion carried.

Motion by Langby, second by Driscoll to recommend funding Youth and Special Services Librarian at \$109,150. Motion carried.

Motion by Langby, second by Stack to recommend funding Literacy Initiatives at \$52,006. Motion carried. Ross, Stobbe, Platteter, Van Pelt, and Stewart abstained.

Motion by Gay, second by Platteter to recommend funding Communications and Planning at \$20,000. Motion carried.

Motion by Stobbe, second by Ross to recommend funding e-Learning CE at \$35,000. Motion carried.

Motion by Dawson, second by Rosendahl to recommend funding LSTA Administration at \$114,500 and Statewide Library Improvement at \$284,000. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:15

Meeting reconvened at 1:00

Staff reviewed possible categories for carryover.

Schmidt suggested a category for digital literacy, "Instruction and Inspiration" Bus Tour to St. Paul or possibly Chicago (\$15,000). This would allow a group to discover first hand projects that are currently being implemented.

Schmidt also suggested an Early Literacy Initiative (\$50,000) that would provide brochures and holders for partner offices. Posters to be customized for libraries. A mobile application for early literacy campaign (Growing Wisconsin Readers).

Berninger presented the possibility of adding statewide access to Learning Express Job and Career Accelerator including Computer Skills Tutorial (\$87,000).

DeBacher added the idea of People Counters for tracking library use (\$50,000). This would allow for \$300 per library to offset costs of up to 150 libraries that do not currently provide year round statistics of door counts.

Howe offered the idea of purchasing Content DM software licenses for libraries to participate in digitization projects in 2014 and beyond (\$5,000). \$300 per library would be available for up to 150 libraries for to obtain content DM software. This software provides compatible metadata in the Wisconsin Heritage Online (WHO) database.

Gerri said digitization training resources or workshop addressing things like copyright and other considerations in addressing digitization of local resources. Terrie talked about digitization as appealing but she doesn't want it to just be a way to buy hardware that perhaps won't be used. Dawson questioned the amount of \$5,000 for DM software. Howe replied that it was a best guess and the amount is paid to OCLC annually. Moeller stated she felt it would be considerably more than the \$5,000 based on her experience. FirstCarta or Omega software packages were suggested by Gerri as alternatives to Content DM. Howe suggested that there might be other options and perhaps a committee should be formed to investigate and recommend standards for an altered digitization category rather than invest in software for a few libraries.

Burkhalter suggested a category for System Merger Planning (\$12,000). Two phases: \$1,000 for planning (budget and process) followed by \$3,000 for meetings and implementation. Process would need to include system boards, county boards, and member libraries. This would allow for three grants of \$4,000. Kurt weighed in on this topic to incentivize the conversation with mergers would be really beneficial. It may be nominal, but it may be enough to help.

Rosendahl asked if it was required for the carryover to be spent. DeBacher responded that it has gotten to the point that it needs to be spent down. Howe added that most of the carryover has accumulated due to staff vacancies and benefit reductions; some unfinished projects added to the amount as well. Can it just be spent

later? She clarified that it is only an issue if IMLS does not cut funds; the funds will otherwise be needed to fund current projects if cuts occur.

Rosendahl wondered how funding extra categories will look to the people who applied for grants that were not recommended. Schmidt reminded the group that those grants were not funded based on merit.

\$291,749 is still “on the table.” If the 8.2% cut is incurred, then that amount will be reduced by \$234,738.

Jeff asked how much Tessa is looking for the bus tour. I said it was \$50,000 and would pay for bus and lodging. Leah--what would it cover? Matt--what would the participants do as their pay-back?

Dawson asked where the figure of \$50,000 for the bus tour came from and who gets to go. Schmidt replied it was a rough estimate based on one or two busloads to the Twin Cities. This would be a learning experience for participants and not just a field trip. This is not a new concept. I said it was \$50,000 and would pay for bus and lodging. Leah--what would it cover? Matt--what would the participants do as their pay-back?

Suggestions on projects to be considered were:

- Bus Trip
- Early Literacy Support
- Door Counters
- Content DM
- System Merging
- Learning Express
- More funds for e-Content

Stack asked if the proposals thus far could be ranked. Some discussion ensued as to how members would rate the various concepts. Rosendahl stated he supported the door counters proposal. More discussion followed. Stewart raised the concern that the grant might be seen as rewarding those that are not currently counting visits accurately.

Stack suggested that the “Mango” resource or some other language software might be of interest. If it is in the \$50,000 range it might be worth considering.

Discussion concerning adding more to e-content (OverDrive). Consensus of the group that if funds are added it should be over and above the \$1 million and that libraries do not need to match with more funds.

After further discussion of the DM software it was agreed that it will not be considered at this time. Since the cost of Mango is unknown at this point it would not be considered further, but Berninger was asked to investigate.

Moeller questioned if \$50,000 was a reasonable amount for Early Literacy. Schmidt stated that it would be for the areas being considered (brochures, website, mobile application, and training).

Group asked Berninger how much just the Computer Skills portion of Learning Express would cost (\$30,000). Consensus of the group to just focus on that portion rather than the full \$87,000.

Stack questioned what the next step would be for these categories. DeBacher suggested various avenues including prioritizing the categories and recommending categories if funds become available.

Discussion returned to e-content. The figure of \$100,000 was suggested to bring the total to \$1.1 Million.

The top four grant possibilities are: Early Literacy Initiative (\$50,000), Learning Express computer skills module (\$30,000), Library System Merger (\$12,000), and e-content (\$100,000).

Motion by Dawson, second by Platteter that these would be the recommended grants should the funds be available. Early Literacy, Learning Express, System Merger, and e-content for a total of \$192,000. Motion carried.

#### **Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2014**

Gay suggested the discussion of digital creation technologies be on the agenda for the spring meeting. DeBacher suggested that alternatives to the current digitization process be explored. Howe would like to form a committee to look at options for a digitization category; what other states and libraries are doing in digitization and report back.

Van Pelt suggested a category for broadband (non competitive). We will continue to develop and hash out the digitization committee. Terrie has MO requirements. Langby suggested a grant category based on the concepts of Eli Neiburger be explored that would be doing local digitization projects. Frame discussion for spring for some of that "alternative" e-book platform model.

Date of next meeting: April 3, 2013

Howe thanked group for participating.

Stack made the motion and Dawson seconded to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 2:40.

Minutes taken by Walter Burkhalter