

**LSTA Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015**  
**Comfort Inn & Suites, DeForest**

***DRAFT***

**Members Present**

Rachel Arndt (Milwaukee Public Library), Erin Foley (Adams County Public Library), Nyama Marsh (Whitefish Bay Public Library, Glendale), Eric Norton (McMillan Memorial Library, Wisconsin Rapids), Omar Poler (UW-Madison SLIS), Cherie Sanderson (Boulder Junction Public Library), Marla Sepnafski (WVLS), and Kristin Stoeger (Brown County Library).

**Members Excused**

Jennifer Einwalter (Jack Russell Memorial Library, Hartford), Gus Falkenberg (IFLS), Stacy Fisher (Waunakee High School), and Amanda Hegge (Whitehall Public Library).

**Division Staff Present**

Nancy Anderson, Martha Berninger, Ryan Claringbole, John DeBacher, Terrie Howe, Kurt Kiefer, Jamie McCanless, Ben Miller, and Tessa Michaelson Schmidt.

**Call to Order and Introduction**

Howe called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. Committee members and DLT staff introduced themselves.

**DLT Administrator's Remarks**

Kiefer thanked everyone for being part of this process and stressed the important task of this Committee. Noted that the projects exemplified the importance of the work the state library agency does. Mentioned DLT's strategic discussions internally and involvement in the system redesign process and our interest in the Aspen Report. Stressed that the librarians present are the most important asset to libraries across the state of Wisconsin. DeBacher welcomed those present. Talked about the system redesign as a "re-visioning" process. Noted that change needs to come through the library community. Talked about the strides already made in Continuing Education delivery through contracting services.

**Review of the Agenda**

Howe reviewed the agenda for today's meeting and confirmed a quorum of the committee was present. DeBacher explained the difference between the Fall and Spring meetings.

**Minutes of April 2015 Meeting**

Norton made a correction to the incorrect correction from the November 2014 meeting included on the April 2015 minutes: spelling of the McMillan Memorial Library is incorrect.

Sepnafski motioned to approve the minutes with the noted change / Norton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Coordinator Report and LSTA Updates**

Howe and DeBacher went to Washington, D.C. to get updates from IMLS on the new reporting requirements. More detail is now requested to find similarities in project outcomes across the country. Moving toward a more universal Federal Grant reporting model. Need to have DUNS numbers and new grant recipient information. Administration costs for DPI cannot exceed 4% of total funds. Risk assessments will be done by DPI for districts, CESAs, public libraries. Kiefer mentioned that the COSLA group has had discussions about the new reporting system and the response from that group has been very positive. The changes will allow for better data and stories to report the outcomes of grant projects.

Howe reviewed all of the forms and reports distributed to LSTA Committee members in advance of the meeting.

DeBacher explained the conflict of interest policy. Committee members that are actively involved in a grant application should not advocate for or vote on those grant categories. Those members can answer clarifying questions but will not be asked to leave the room.

DeBacher discussed the Department of Administration change to State Transforming Agency Resources (STAR), a new fiscal management and reporting tool. This change will eventually provide better fiscal reporting functionality.

McCanless reviewed the current grant year budget and noted spending that happened since the previous LSTA committee meeting.

Marsh asked a question about the Federal budget process. DeBacher clarified that the Federal budget for 2016 has not been approved. We are shifting our grant cycle from an April – March timeframe to better reflect the reality of funding cycles from Washington, D.C.

Sepnafski asked about the Federal maintenance of effort penalty. Howe mentioned that we are ending our first penalized year. Our appropriation wasn't itemized, but Howe will look into getting the exact penalty amount for future planning. DLT is not aware of the penalty amount in the second and third years. Analysis led DLT to budget for a 5% penalty in 2016. This is a worst case scenario, which might improve.

Kiefer explained that COSLA = Chief Officers of State Library Agencies. He is the secretary of this professional organization and sits on the Data committee. This group is trying to take a more proactive role in driving the direction of library related legislation.

Howe clarified that IMLS receives almost 228 million dollars and the Grants to States Program is the largest portion of this budget. The budget in 2016 is 230 million; funding will up for reauthorization at the Federal level in 2017. Wisconsin distributes 1/3 of funds received through a grant program. This varies by state, but Wisconsin is fairly typical in this regard.

### **DPI Managed Projects and Resources**

Claringbole and Schmidt explained the **Wisconsin Public Library Coding Project**, a planned 3 year project. \$20,000 is requested for 2016. Year 1 looks to provide awareness and gather resources to distribute to libraries about coding. Aimed at both librarians and the community they serve. One of last year's ILEAD teams, WisCode Literati, are already doing things related to coding and libraries and discussions are under way to collaborate and expand their project. Marsh asked a question about being non-technical and shutting down when she hears the term "coding." This is exactly what the project aims to address. Looking more at coding literacy instead of proficiency. Kiefer reiterated how this project exemplifies an alignment with the Aspen Report and libraries engaging with their communities. Stoeger clarified that this project will begin in 2016. She also wanted to know what the scope of the coding will be. Schmidt affirmed it would begin in 2016 and that Year 1 would be spent discussing and fact finding to determine the scope and see what is needed. Stoeger asked what the library participation would be. This is also something that will be determined during the Year 1 phase. DeBacher noted that this type of project is happening at the national level and will let Wisconsin begin participation at the state level. Stoeger asked if there is a plan for the end of the 3rd year of the project. Claringbole noted that the proposal was just for Year 1. Each year would need to be approved. After Year 3 the project will be assessed and a new roadmap will be included.

### **Public Hearing**

Howe conveyed a message from Angela Myers from Waukesha County Federated Library System. She asked that the committee continue funding the accessibility category. Waukesha has been very successful in implementing hearing loops in six member libraries and Memory Cafes that were established and that it has been beneficial to the communities served in their county.

### **Break (10:10 - 10:24)**

### **DPI Managed Projects and Resources (continued)**

Schmidt discussed the **Youth and Special Services Continuing Education Projects**. \$25,000 is requested for 2016. 2015 was a pilot year working with systems to offer collaborative events that are two-pronged and offer an event as well as something to extend the learning opportunity and provide resources. The pilot has been a success on both the DPI front as well as for systems and their member libraries. The hope for 2016 is to take this project and expand it to a larger audience. Some of the individual projects will be expanded or relocated so as not to duplicate efforts. Growing Wisconsin Readers is in its 3rd year and has been a resounding success. Moving forward a smaller amount is requested to continue offering

support and funding to keep the project active. DeBacher noted that this project began as an extension of the LEAN system study as this was identified as a way to extend collaboration and reduce duplicate efforts. Kiefer reiterated that this effort helps professional development for librarians throughout the state.

DeBacher described the **Library System Re-visioning Project: Project Management and Support to the Steering Committee**. \$150,000 is requested for 2016. The project steering committee met face to face for the first time and appointed WiLS as the project manager for this project. Negotiations are underway to review contract terms. Initial contract will be for \$35,000 for work to be completed by April 2016. WiLS will subcontract some of the data work to get a clear picture of the library landscape. Other consultants will be brought in throughout the process to allow outside thinking and experts in various subject fields. This project is requesting an increase from the spring meeting. Indianhead Federated Library System has agreed to act as the fiscal agent for this project. Looking at library software and delivery as pilot projects for increased efficiencies.

DeBacher discussed the **New Library Director Orientation Project**. \$20,000 is requested for 2016. Denise Anton Wright did much of the pre-work for this project, but is retiring at the end of the year. Looking forward, this could be a collaborative effort that could be taken on by a group of systems. Because this is only offered every other year, there are perceived gaps in providing this service to directors coming in on off years. DLT would work on building a curriculum and the event could travel throughout the state and be facilitated by individual systems. The initial request is for \$16,000, but if we move it to an annual offering it would end up costing closer to \$10,000 with a library system acting as the fiscal agent. Norton noted that his version was different, the live version of the document had been edited before this presentation. Norton also asked about meals if the event was a day and a half. Meals could potentially be provided, but on-site and not as a per diem.

Berninger and Anderson discussed the **School Library eBook project**. \$15,000 is requested for 2016. Anderson has been working on this project for several years. DLT contracted with WiLS to investigate a way to work with vendors and the school library community to access the kind of consortial pricing available to public libraries through the WPLC model. 2016 funding will be used to investigate a method to allow school libraries a way to collaboratively build a collection. Foley asked how it differs with WPLC since school libraries have access. Berninger stated that the Overdrive pricing models are not compelling to school districts in terms of vendor. Anderson noted that access is different since WPLC requires a public library card and another layer of access would be necessary. DeBacher also noted that Overdrive won't allow different types of libraries to be involved in the buying pool. Also the materials would not be available on a 1:1 basis, which is something school libraries would require if the materials are required for curricular learning.

Berninger explained the **Learning Express Library License**. \$100,000 is requested for 2016. This resource allows access to tests and skill building modules to fund this through June of 2016. This category will be included in the BadgerLink RFP and should be available through that funding source moving forward.

Despite peaks and valleys of use the activity is increasing. Kiefer noted that through the procurement process this tool might be replaced by another comparable product.

Berninger explained the **RLL -- WISCAT program**. \$496,950 is requested for 2016. Changes were made in the document to better break out salary, benefit, and travel costs. Miller is working on a white paper that is looking at Discovery Layers, Interlibrary Loan Software, and Integrated Library System software. If DLT moves forward with providing statewide ILL an RFP for software will be published in 2017. DLT has now updated its ILL interface. Fill rate has increased by 2%, requiring less human work in referring requests.

Berninger explained **RLL -- Statewide Technology** and its associated programs. \$589,035 is requested for 2016. BadgerLink is seen as being a key offering. Usage is increasing at a rapid pace and DLT is identifying new populations to provide outreach of this service. This is a complement to the ILL service to meet informational needs immediately. Interlibrary Loan service funds the OCLC software to allow libraries in Wisconsin to borrow from OCLC libraries if items are unavailable in WISCAT. Staff and software is involved in this budget. This staff trains ILL staff across the state. The Wisconsin Digital Archives and Document Depository project is statutorily mandated to make governmental information available in libraries throughout the state. Usage in this project is increasing. More and more documents are being made available electronically. Digital Projects and Outreach is seen as a support for BadgerLearn Pro service used by systems across the state of Wisconsin to make digital learning artifacts available through a collaborative model. It supports professional development for librarians throughout the state. The librarian working on this service will also work to facilitate Wisconsin's involvement in DPLA. Management of Technical and Library Service Contracts and Supervision and Staff provides administrative support to all of the programs underneath the Statewide Technology. Sepnafski noted she would like to see BadgerLearn Pro and WISELearn resources available through the same portal. Berninger and Kiefer reported that this discussion has been happening internally and DLT is working toward this goal. Marsh asked about the "extra" funds mentioned in other projects. Kiefer clarified that these funds are available through other sources and not actually "extra" funds. Norton asked if the Wisconsin Digital Archive could be included in the BadgerLink resource so it could be findable. Kiefer noted that there could be two "skinned" WISELearn systems: one for K12, one for public libraries. Kiefer also noted that DLT is interested in bringing in many library voices to discuss the content and resources they want to see included.

DeBacher discussed the **Communications and Planning** category. \$15,000 is requested for 2016. This funds COLAND meetings, which are increasingly becoming virtual as a way to save funds. DLT is waiting for a legal opinion on whether COLAND meeting costs constitutes an Administrative activity to IMLS. Kiefer's attendance at the COSLA meetings is also funded in this category. Special projects such as eBook projects, scholarships for attendance at national conferences, with money that isn't used in other ways. Norton asked why this categories funding is shrinking. DeBacher explained that the initial COLAND LEAN summit increased this line previously and efficiencies have been increased.

Howe explained that the **LSTA Administration** category is the category limited to 4% of the total LSTA grant funds. An estimated \$106,530 is requested for 2016. DLT is waiting to hear about whether COLAND meeting funds need to be moved here, so this amount is still an estimation. DeBacher noted that this category is essential for any other category to be funded since someone must administer the dispersal of funds in all categories and this is where that funding happens.

DeBacher explained the **Statewide Library Improvement** category. \$266,700 is requested for 2016. This provides consultants and leadership to libraries throughout the state. DeBacher, McCanless, and Howe are funded by this category.

### **Competitive and Noncompetitive Subaward Applications**

Schmidt discussed the **Accessibility Project** category. \$89,127 is requested for 2016. This and the Literacy category fall under the "Serving Special Populations" umbrella. Applicants were able to apply for a planning grant to help look out to communities and plan projects. Project level grants are for larger projects. In the future, planning grants might come back as a project grant. In the Accessibility category the Bridges Library System grant title contains an error and is not funding a position. More applications funds were applied for than budgeted. DLT staff have decided to recommend funding for 8 of the 10 applications. Marsh asked why certain grants were scored higher than others. This is not based on the activity of the grant, but the qualities of the grant applications in the eyes of the grant reviewers. Poler asked for ways that DLT can better explain or display what the activities might be funded by these grants. Schmidt explained that the quality of grant applications have increased dramatically. The introduction of the planning grant portion creates a better structure for making these applications better. More thought has also been given to some of the less visible accessibility issues (low income, cultural background, etc.) The name accessibility might mislead applicants and internal discussion is underway to decide if renaming is worthwhile or better explaining and messaging would work best. Howe added that each system is adding workshops about the grant categories and helping member libraries work through the applications. Poler pointed out that the profession does have a diversity problem and we need to keep that in mind as we move forward in these grant projects.

Schmidt explained the **Literacy Project** category. \$40,998 is requested for 2016. One Accessibility project was applied for in the Literacy category. This category is expressly provided to increase literacy skills. The amount requested came in a bit below the amount DLT budgeted for this category. DLT staff have decided to recommend funding for 6 of the 8 applications. Sanderson asked about the reviewer notes asking for CIPA compliance. Michelson Schmidt noted that the CIPA compliance requirement for purchased devices was included in the grant applications. DLT can't verify and investigate the level of CIPA compliance, but if discovered it would become an issue for both the library granted funds and DLT. DLT staff will verify and work with applicants to honor grants while still awarding the grant. DeBacher noted that libraries would be required to certify that they are CIPA compliant. Marsh clarified that CIPA was the Child Internet Protection Act. DeBacher noted that libraries are required to report whether or not they filter the Internet on the Annual Report to DPI each year. E-rate also provides a category 2 funding level that would require CIPA compliance and DLT is investigating best practices around filtering

since more funding might be available. Claringbole clarified that the only funds that require CIPA compliance are those that go towards hardware that accesses the Internet or the cost of Internet Access. DeBacher noted that grant applicants could use local funds to purchase these items with IMLS funds going toward other parts of the project.

Berninger explained the **Delivery Project** category. \$90,000 is requested for 2016. This provides funding to Northern Waters and SCLS to provide delivery. These amounts have been unchanged since 2012 and potentially further back. Howe noted that this category is being discussed as part of the system re-visioning project.

Claringbole explained the **Digital Creation** category. \$95,281 is requested for 2016. This category hopes to move libraries from a place of consumption to creation. DLT staff are recommending the funding of 9 out of 11 projects. The funding levels are lower than the amount budgeted. Norton asked what happens to the unused funds in individual categories. DeBacher explained that these funds go into a carryover account. This can be used to bridge gaps between funding years if they come up. The grant amounts from IMLS are for a two-year cycle. The DPI business office staff spends down the funds that expire soonest first.

Claringbole explained the **Digitization of Library Historical Materials** category. \$9,280 is requested for 2016. Only 2 applications were received. DLT staff is recommending one of the two projects be funded. Norton asked why only one was funded when their reviewer rank was the same. Claringbole explained that discussions with the DLT staff made it clear that the quality of the unfunded application was much lower than the funded application.

### **Lunch (11:59 - 12:48)**

Claringbole explained the **Digital Public Library of America project**. \$50,000 is requested for 2016. The DPLA is a platform that aggregates information and digital documents. Wisconsin has applied and has been accepted as a service hub for this project and Emily Pfotenhauer will help to facilitate DLT's involvement in 2016. DeBacher explained that this might be one of the reasons that so few applications were made for Digitization grants.

Claringbole explained **Library System Technology Projects**. \$350,000 is requested for 2016. These funds go to systems to fund direct Internet connections. One system had to be corrected in their CIPA compliance as they plan to purchase hardware or provide Internet access using Federal funds. An open discussion with the systems will happen in the next year to revisit the funding of this category and how funds will be used in the future. DeBacher reiterated that this category was raised to offset the 10% system aid reduction in 2011.

DeBacher explained the **Merging Integrated Library Systems** project. \$12,000 is requested for 2016. One application has been accepted. The systems (SHARE and Kenosha) are no longer planning to merge

whole system operations, but will be consolidating to one ILS. Eventually, funds in this category could be used to pay for ILS mergers.

## **Final Recommendations on Applications and 2016 Allocation of Funds**

McCanless explained the spreadsheet he developed to help the committee allocate funds.

Marsh had a question about whether the recommendations could be funded in full. McCanless replied that we would have to use carryover. Norton asked what the carryover amount is. DeBacher answered that the carryover is already allocated in this budget and we would have to wait for unspent budget funds.

The category motions below were made for the staff proposed amounts in two documents:

- **2016 LSTA Sub-Award Application Categories**
- **DPI Managed Projects and Resources**

### **Delivery Project**

Marsh motioned / Arndt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **RLLL--Statewide Technology & RLLL--WISCAT**

Sepnafski motioned / Stoeger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Library System Technology**

Sepnafski motioned / Arndt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Youth and Special Services Librarian**

Marsh motioned / Stoeger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Learning Express Library License**

Stoeger motioned / Poler seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Digital Public Library of America**

Arndt motioned / Norton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **WI Public Library Coding Initiative**

Stoeger motioned / Poler seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **New Library Director Orientation**

Funding level: \$15,000. Norton motioned / Sanderson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Statewide Library Improvement**

Sepnafski motioned / Stoeger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **School eBook Project**

Arndt motioned / Norton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Communications and Planning**

Marsh motioned / Stoeger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Public Library System Re-visioning Project**

Marsh motioned / Norton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Accessibility Projects**

Poler motioned / Marsh seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Abstaining: Sanderson.

### **Literacy Projects**

Norton motioned / Poler seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Abstaining: Arndt.

### **Youth and Special Services Continuing Education**

Stoeger motioned / Poler seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Library System Technology**

Norton motioned / Arndt seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Abstaining: Sepnafski.

### **Digital Creation Projects**

Sanderson motioned / Stoeger seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Abstaining: Marsh, Norton.

### **Digitization of Library Historical Material**

Marsh motioned / Norton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Merging Integrated Library Systems**

Marsh motioned / Sanderson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2017**

Howe indicated that focus groups and discussions will begin, but DLT is looking for guidance in categories for LSTA funding next year. Norton wants to see more of a focus on getting librarians out into the community and increasing accessibility. Schmidt wanted clarification on whether this should be a category or a DLT initiative. Arndt supported an education piece on getting accurate grant applications for the Accessibility category that would be related. DeBacher suggested a virtual symposium on issues of accessibility with a grant category to follow. Poler supports that idea. Marsh mentioned something should be done for libraries with staff shortages to provide outreach. Schmidt mentioned that the same type of situation came about in Early Literacy category. Sepnafski would like to do a mini-ILEAD project throughout the state to bring more leaders into the forefront. Norton would like to see the Accessibility

category move away from disability and not be constrained to just that. Howe thanked the committee for their suggestions and invited them to contact DLT staff if they have any further ideas.

Howe thanked Sepnafski and Norton for three years of service to the committee.

### **Schedule next meeting of Committee**

June 2nd for “spring” meeting.

The second meeting during the year will be December 1st.

### **Final Comments**

DeBacher reminded the committee that they can always propose more categories before the spring meeting. A platform for authors is something he is thinking about. Kiefer reiterated the importance of having this committee. It is public money and the oversight is essential. DLT will be actively engaged in working with the library community to work on a new 5 year plan for moving forward with libraries in Wisconsin. He thanked the committee for taking the time to attend the meetings and thanked the DLT team for pulling all the information together.

Norton motioned to adjourn, Stoeger seconded.

### **Meeting adjourned at 1:37 pm.**

*Recorded by Ben Miller with assistance from Ryan Claringbole.*