

W I S C O N S I N



PLSR

PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM
REDESIGN PROJECT

Resource Libraries Workgroup Report

April 2, 2018

This report is part of a larger report presented to the
PLSR Steering Committee:

<http://www.plsr.info/april2018report>

Resource Libraries Workgroup

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT MANAGER INTRODUCTION.....	2
RECOMMENDATIONS OVERVIEW.....	5
WORKGROUP MEMBERS	5
CHARGE OF WORKGROUP	6
BACKGROUND.....	6
PROCESS TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDATIONS	8
WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS	16
COSTS	22
IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS	23
GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS	24
APPENDIX A: CURRENT LIST OF RESOURCE LIBRARIES.....	25
APPENDIX B: CHAPTER 43 RESOURCE LIBRARY LANGUAGE.....	26
APPENDIX C: COMPILED 2014 RESOURCE LIBRARY CONTRACT INFORMATION	29
APPENDIX D: 2017 RESOURCE LIBRARIES SURVEY OF WI PUBLIC LIBRARIES.....	32
APPENDIX E: RESOURCE LIBRARIES SCENARIOS	41

PROJECT MANAGER INTRODUCTION

The report of the Resource Libraries Workgroup is part of a culmination of a larger process to consider how to best provide public library system services in Wisconsin. Building on the work of many, its goal is to develop a plan for implementation of new models of service. The process, led by a Steering Committee, will result in recommendations from the Steering Committee to the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). The workgroup reports are provided to the Steering Committee as an input to their recommendation process.

In order to develop new models of service, the project manager formed workgroups of community members. The PLSR Steering Committee, with the guidance of the project manager, selected workgroup leads and facilitators from a pool of applicants for each service area and assigned liaisons from DPI and the Steering Committee to each group. In March 2016, the facilitators, leads and liaisons to each workgroup reviewed the applications from potential participants to determine the composition of the workgroups.

The following report is the result of the workgroup's consideration of their topic area over the past two years.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The PLSR process asked each workgroup to answer the following question in the course of their model development: what is the best way to maximize resources, improve services and provide increased equitable access to services? They were not asked to recommend an overall structure for collaborative public library services (i.e. determining if there should be library systems), who might provide the services described or how the services would be funded.

To answer the question posed to them, the workgroup created recommendations, which is included in the following report.

In addition to the recommendations, the report includes suggestions or recommendations in the following areas. The intent of these recommendations is to provide the Steering Committee with information as they consider overall governance and structure.

COSTS

Information about what cost impact there may be from the recommendations. Exact cost impacts, however, are not possible to determine until implementation.

IMPLEMENTATION

The workgroup has provided general recommendations related to implementation.

Implementation recommendations are limited; any implementation of the recommendations depends heavily on the structure and legislative recommendation from the Steering Committee and the subsequent work of DPI.

SOME POINTS TO KEEP IN MIND WHILE READING THE REPORT

THE REPORTS ARE LIMITED TO THE SCOPE OF THE WORKGROUP'S CHARGE

The workgroup was instructed to focus on how best to deliver services and how to deliver the best services. The Steering Committee is responsible for making recommendations related to funding, structure and administration. Therefore, the report does not include answers to questions such as:

- Will there be systems and, if so, how many?
- Who will provide services?
- How will services be funded?
- When will it be implemented?
- What exactly will governance look like?

GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE GENERAL AND LIMITED TO ASSESSMENT WITHIN THE MODEL

Without a clear understanding of structures supporting the service models, the workgroup was unable to offer governance and accountability recommendations beyond the scope of the services. For example, the workgroup could not recommend appointing authorities, though they could recommend oversight bodies for the service.

THE MODELS ARE FUTURE FACING BUT NOT FUTURISTIC

The workgroup was given a service area to consider and was asked to redesign the current service while keeping in mind the future. As they each developed their model, they considered how it would support change and growth in the future, but they were not designing models that focused on (or predicted) future services.

THE REPORTS ARE NOT THE END OF THE PROCESS

While these reports are an important step in the process, they are far from the end. The Steering Committee will work with Core Recommendation Collaborators, Model Development Summit Participants and a facilitator to build their recommendations for DPI. In addition to the

workgroup recommendations, many other sources of information will be considered during the Steering Committee's recommendation development process. After the Steering Committee submits their recommendations to DPI, there are a number of steps and processes that DPI may undertake to further vet the recommendations with the library community and others.

For more information about the process and reports, please see the complete Project Manager's Report, linked from <http://www.plsr.info/workgroups/workgroupreport/>

RECOMMENDATIONS OVERVIEW

Since the statute legislating Resource Libraries was adopted, times have changed. Many non-resource libraries have developed the means for addressing some of the specific services currently delineated in statute as resource library functions. However, an indirect result of the resource library statute was that over time systems and resource libraries leveraged their unique relationships to provide services that satisfied local needs within the system beyond statutory requirements. The workgroup offers three recommendations:

- Eliminate statutorily mandated regional resource libraries. However, regional and statewide coordinated services to libraries should continue to be contracted with libraries, current resource libraries or other, when determined to be most effective and/or efficient at improving equitable access to services and resources for all libraries and leading library service innovation into the future.
- Establish, in statute, a single state resource library to be responsible for the coordinated development of and access to specialized collections at public libraries throughout the state.
- Cultivate and connect the expertise, leadership and capacities that currently exist in libraries throughout the state to leverage the experience, knowledge and talents of those that directly serve patrons in developing and providing innovative services to communities of all sizes.

WORKGROUP MEMBERS

Jeff Dawson, Lester Public Library (Two Rivers) (Lead)

Cindy Fesemyer, Columbus Public Library (Facilitator)

Sue Heskin, Superior Public Library

Bret Jaeger, Waupun Public Library

Susan Lee, Madison Public Library

Angela Meyers, Bridges Library System

Colleen Rortvedt, Appleton Public Library

Kirsten Thompson, Milwaukee Public Library

Past Workgroup Member

Stephanie Weber, Florence County Library

Steering Committee Liaison

Bryan McCormick, Hedberg Public Library (Janesville)

CHARGE OF WORKGROUP

The Resource library workgroup was charged with studying and making recommendations related to how System resource libraries can best serve the needs of Wisconsin library systems, public libraries and the patrons they serve.

BACKGROUND

RESOURCE LIBRARIES IN CHAPTER 43

Written in the early 1970s, Chapter 43, the Wisconsin State law that provides funding for coordinated regional library services, codified the idea of resource libraries to ensure that a baseline of resources and services would be available to all libraries and residents in the state. Today, there are different perceptions in the library community regarding the current definition of a resource library and even the need for resource libraries. The needs of libraries have changed, as have access to resources (i.e. development of ILS consortia, internet reference research, electronic databases), but the law and its definition of resource libraries have remained unchanged. Additionally, the law, as written, is at times very proscriptive, and yet vague, making it very difficult for the library community to clearly define the current role of resource libraries.

See Appendix A: Current List of Resource Libraries for a current list of Wisconsin resource libraries and Appendix B: Chapter 43 Resource Library Language for actual Ch. 43 statutes related to resource libraries.

STATUTORY DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCE LIBRARIES

In 1971, Wisconsin Act 152 introduced the formation of public library systems. At that time, Wisconsin Statute section 43.15(1)(a) stipulated that a public library system must “contain at least one public library established under 43.52 in a city which, at the time of the system’s establishment, has a population of more than 30,000.” This municipal population requirement was intended to guarantee at least one population concentration of sufficient size to encourage and justify the development of a diversified library collection and varied service programs staffed by trained personnel. In addition, the legislation believed that a city of this size would have pre-existing public library strength, upon which a system could build, as to create such strength without it was thought to be prohibitively expensive.

Paragraph (a) further details the requirement of a system plan for access by contract to the resources and services of a public library having a population of 30,000 or more which is participating in the system. The system population minimum of 85,000 set forth in paragraph (b) was intended to further ensure that each system would have a large enough total population to support and utilize comprehensive library services. Sub-section (4) of that same section stated that the public library “system shall have a designated headquarters library...” The mention of the precursor to the later formalized “resource library” concluded in section 43.24(2)(c), when the statute specified that “each system shall provide... interloan of library materials among all participating libraries, reference and reference referral services from the headquarters library, and...complete library service as provided at the headquarters library or at the resource library if different from the headquarters library to any resident of the system on the same terms as the service is available to residents of the headquarters community.”

In 1989, Act 286 made several changes to Chapter 43, some of which denoted resource libraries. Section 43.15 was amended to make way for the addition of 43.16, which specifically addressed and defined resource libraries in current day terms. Section 43.24 changed language from the terms “interloan” and “referral” to “interlibrary loan” and “reference” to “backup reference.” Others changes included terminology update of “headquarters library” to “resource library.”

CURRENT STATE STATUTE REFERENCES TO RESOURCE LIBRARIES

Currently, Chapter 43.16 states that each public library system shall have at least one system resource library. Per statute, the public library system board must negotiate terms of an annual agreement with the member library with the largest annual operating budget of all member libraries to serve as the system resource library for the following year. If this agreement is unacceptable to the proposed system resource library, then the public library system board must negotiate a contract with the member public library with the next largest annual operating budget of all member libraries, and this process is repeated with member public libraries in decreasing order of the size of the annual operating budget until an agreement is reached. No system resource library agreement can last beyond one year.

A system resource library must:

- Have a collection of at least 100,000 volumes
- Be open to the public at least 50 hours each week
- Employ at least one full-time, permanent reference librarian with a master's degree in library science.

If these requirements are not met, either the system board must enter into a supplementary contract with the academic library with the largest operating budget of all academic libraries in the system area or with a resource library in an adjacent system that meets the above requirements. For example, at this time, no member library in the Southwest Library System meets each of these requirements; therefore, SWLS contracts with Madison Public Library as its resource library.

In order for a system to receive state aid (Wis. Stat. sec. 43.24(2)(b)), the agreement to serve as a system resource library must include the provision of backup reference, information and interlibrary loan services and the development of and access to specialized collections from the system resource library to the other member libraries.

ADDITIONAL CONTRACTS WITH RESOURCE LIBRARIES

In addition to contracting with resource libraries to fulfill the requirements of state statute, public library systems also contract-- often with resource libraries-- for other services. Examples of such services include cataloging, technical services and various consultant services. Contract terms and costs for these services vary greatly across the state.

DESIRED OUTCOMES OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In June 2016, the workgroup identified the following desired outcomes:

- Patrons receive the resources they need today and the innovations they need for the future
- Regardless of size, libraries can provide services to pilot projects for the state or obtain projects that have been vetted by those with expertise or more resources
- Knowledge held by library staff and collection strengths of libraries is known statewide – that knowledge should not be contained by system or regional borders
- Understand/share innovation (better communication of individual library's innovation) other libraries have successfully created
- Wisconsin libraries maintain and improve on the level of partnership and collaboration that allows us to provide services efficiently

PROCESS TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDATIONS

WORKGROUP MEETINGS

Between June 2016 and March 2018, the workgroup met as follows:

- 12 times via web-based meeting
- Two all-day, in-person meetings
- Two all-day, in-person meetings with members from all the workgroups along with the Steering Committee and DPI Liaisons

In addition, the workgroup lead and facilitator attended three all-day, in-person meetings with the leadership from the other workgroups, the Steering Committee and DPI Liaisons.

INFORMATION GATHERING

STATUTORY REVIEW

The workgroup reviewed Chapter 43 in the summer of 2016 and then examined every Wisconsin system resource library agreement. It was determined that each resource library is compliant with the existing statutes related to Resource libraries. The workgroup identified that many agreements between the public library system and the resource library included contracts for services beyond Chapter 43 mandates (See Appendix C: Compiled 2014 Resource Library Contract Information). The level of detail varied within these agreements, making it difficult to compare system to system. Some agreements did not always make clear how funding is applied for services rendered by the resource library.

Resource libraries are not required to list contracted services beyond those mandated in Chapter 43. However, during the workgroup's research of those mandated agreements, the contracts revealed that in 2014, resource libraries were contracted for the following additional services:

- 12 for support of collection development
- Seven for support of cataloging
- Six for support of internet
- Six for support of delivery (one contract for delivery for the system, five provide sorting space)
- Five for support of continuing education
- Four for support of ILS
- Two for support of consulting

In addition, per the Department of Public Instruction Resources for Libraries and Lifelong Learning, two resource libraries act as their system's interlibrary loan clearinghouse.

MONITORED PROGRESS OF OTHER PLSR WORKGROUPS.

From July 2016 through November 2017, workgroup members monitored progress on model

development within each of the other PLSR workgroups. This was primarily to understand where resource libraries might fit in the other workgroup's service model development. Service workgroups presented their models at the 2017 Wisconsin Library Association Conference and based on the status of those models, the Resource Libraries workgroup determined monitoring the progress of the other workgroups was no longer necessary.

RESOURCE LIBRARY DIRECTORS FOCUS GROUP MEETING

On December 9, 2016, thirteen resource library directors met for a conversation on the PLSR process concerning resource libraries. The open discussion included:

- Current roles of resource libraries in their system
- Past, current and potential future changes to systems and resource libraries
- Roles resource libraries see continuing into the future and new roles that could be added
- Gaps where there is a need for coordinated or shared resources, services or expertise that could be fulfilled or provided by resource libraries

LIBRARY COMMUNITY SURVEY

In July 2017, the Resource Library workgroup shared a survey with every public library in Wisconsin that was open for any public library staff member to fill out. The survey asked library staff about their use and perception of resource libraries and the statutorily defined services that resource libraries are to make available to all libraries and patrons within a system. The survey also asked for input regarding other types of services a library needs or may want from another library or organization. (See Appendix D: 2017 Resource Libraries Survey of WI Public Libraries)

Other information from the survey:

- 282 people completed the survey
 - 23% work in resource libraries
 - 65% don't work in a resource library
 - 12% don't know if they work in a resource library
- By municipal population
 - 44% serving <1,000-9,999
 - 25% serving 10-49,999
 - 30% serving 50,000+
 - 46% work in public library administration

Highlights of the survey results include:

- Respondents saw a need to modernize the concept of resource libraries.
 - 57% agree or strongly agree that resource libraries, as defined in Chapter 43, should remain part of State Library Law
 - 81% of respondents agree or strongly agree that resource libraries need a new definition if they are to remain part of State Library Law
- Library staff are generally able to meet the reference and ILL needs of their patrons without resource library assistance, but see value and need for institutional housing of special collections and access to special collections
- For each of the following services, between 15-23% of respondents indicate their library receives the service from their system's resource library
 - Cataloging/bibliographic control
 - ILS management
 - Technology support services
 - OverDrive and/or database support
 - Continuing education/professional development
 - Website design and management
 - Marketing/public relations
 - Library policy and/or procedure knowledge, resources and/or expertise

INTERVIEWS WITH OTHER STATES

In September 2017, the workgroup initiated calls with library leaders from New York and Massachusetts. The formal concept of a resource library is statutorily rare in the United States. While larger libraries often fill needed roles in a statewide or regional manner, it is often done either contractually or informally. The workgroup identified two states for further study: one with a statutorily defined resource library model and one that previously had a statutorily defined resource library model, but eliminated it as part of their state's library system redesign process.

New York

The Coordinator of Statewide Services at the New York State Library shared that currently each system has a Central Library, very similar to resource libraries in Wisconsin.

- There are 23 library systems and 756 public libraries. Systems range in size from one to five counties. There is a wide range of library and community sizes in the state.
- Central libraries in New York have very little written into statute other than a funding formula. Few state statutes mandating central library services allows for flexibility in the provision of central library services to member libraries.

- Throughout the call, the Coordinator stressed the importance of maintaining flexibility in model design.
- Stagnate state funding has resulted in funding that is 7% below statutory funding levels. This translates into state funding supporting basic library services in the central library rather than toward innovation and additional services.
- The statutory funding model creates conflict between local boards and system boards on how the funds are used.
- Without statutorily defined accountability, central library directors provide varying degrees of leadership to member libraries.
- New York's central libraries remain relevant for member libraries and patrons. According to the Coordinator, 80% of libraries in the state support central libraries and 20% do not.

Massachusetts

Members of the workgroup spoke with the Executive Director of the Massachusetts Library System, a retired system director and a public library director. Each discussed Massachusetts' experience of reducing systems from seven to one and the dissolution of system reference centers (similar to resource libraries in Wisconsin).

- Tensions gradually grew between regions and reference centers concerning funding of and services rendered by the reference centers.
- With changes in reference services and collections, reference centers were providing fewer reference services to member libraries. They were disbanded in 2010 with the merging of the seven systems.
- After the merger, there was no noticeable change in collaboration among Massachusetts libraries. Collaboration has strengthened around the nine regional shared ILS systems.
- No longer being a reference center did not impact local funding for these libraries.
- Boston Public Library became the state's "Reference Center" as a result of the merger process.
 - Boston Public Library was called "Library of Last Recourse" immediately after the merger but was ultimately named "Library for the Commonwealth," moving away from the past title of Reference Center.
 - Boston Public Library has performed admirably in:
 - Supporting e-content creation in libraries
 - Supporting the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA)
 - Digitization
 - Depository services

- This call demonstrated that the merging of regions and dissolution of reference centers, though painful as it was, was the right decision for Massachusetts libraries.
- What was lost in local and personnel support (loyalty based on proximity) was gained in overall efficiencies in funding, ILL and delivery. For example, the cost of ILL in the state decreased by 25% and state spending on shared databases doubled. This was achieved by reallocating personnel and facility costs.

FEEDBACK POINTS AND RECOMMENDATION DEVELOPMENT

SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT

From August through November 2017, the workgroup developed and evaluated ten scenarios that focused on state and local funding, validity and value, potential complications, positive impact and future opportunities. Many of these scenarios were dependent upon decisions that would be made elsewhere in the PLSR process and could not be further developed; however, the workgroup classified the scenarios into four ‘buckets’ presented at WLA 2017. (See Appendix E: Resource Libraries Scenarios)

These scenario buckets are:

1. Resource libraries remain in statute with no changes
2. Resource libraries remain in statutes but are modified in various ways with the following possibilities:
 - a. Only change statutory definition of what determines a resource library
 - b. Only change statutorily mandated roles of resource libraries
 - c. Change both statutory definitions of what determines a resource library and mandated roles of resource libraries
 - d. Modify resource library statute and create categories of essential services where systems must have a contractual relationship with a member library or libraries
 - e. Have fewer resource libraries for different regions in the state
 - f. Have one resource library for the entire state
 - g. Designate any library that meets certain standards to be a resource library without specific connection to systems or regions
3. Resource libraries are no longer relevant and eliminated in statute
4. Resource libraries move to a non-statutory role

In November 2017, the workgroup convened an in-person meeting to prepare resource library model recommendations for presentation to our review panel. Through discussion of the scenarios on how independently written contracts might be regulated, overseen or otherwise normalized, the workgroup determined a need to keep contractual relationships nimble so they could change with changing times. The workgroup was reluctant to add parameters on

contracts into state statute for fear those parameters would become outdated or proscriptive. Instead, the work group chose to leave the power to determine need and enter into contractual relationships at the local and/or regional level.

This determination best fits in the fourth bucket, removing resource libraries in statute, but still having what are currently resource libraries, along with other libraries, provide regional or statewide coordinated services to other libraries.

The workgroup also discussed the survey results and other input it received at various feedback points during the process. In relation to this, the workgroup discussed the existing mandated services for resource libraries and determined that the roles of interlibrary loan and backup reference are no longer relevant. However, it is clear to the workgroup that access to special collections is important to libraries of all sizes. From this determination, the workgroup identified the need for a single state resource library to address this need for access to special collections around the state. How this role will be filled, either by the resource library on its own or through coordinated partnerships with other libraries and institutions, is to be determined as part the implementation plan.

REVIEW PANEL FEEDBACK

Based on its determinations, the workgroup provided the review panel with a two-part recommendation:

1. Eliminate statutorily mandated regional resource libraries. Instead, regional services, such as ILL, Continuing Education, ILS, Technology, etc. should be contracted with libraries, either current resource libraries or other libraries, as needed.
2. Establish, through statute, one state resource library that will be responsible for the coordinated development of and access to (not relocation of) specialized collections throughout the state.

The recommendation was shared with the Resource Libraries Review Panel that was made up of library system directors, resource library directors and seven other current and retired library professionals from across Wisconsin. Reviewers had two weeks to respond. The workgroup received nineteen responses that were then shared with resource library directors for discussion at a January 30, 2018, conference call, attended by fifteen of the sixteen current resource library directors.

Several ideas and suggestions came from the review panel results and discussion with the resource library directors for the workgroup to consider:

- Create a clear path from outcome development to final model recommendations.
- Look at current contracts resource libraries carry outside of mandated Chapter 43 services.
- Review resource library data from the annual reports.
- Explore potential partnerships with the Wisconsin Historical Society and other agencies for the special collections (heritage) aspect of the model.
- Illustrate impact of the models from the New York and Massachusetts calls.
- Consider how to foster an environment for innovation in library services.

The workgroup review panel consisted of the following people:

- Members of the System and Resource Library Administrators' Association of Wisconsin (SRLAAW)
- Becca Berger, Door County Public Library (retired)
- Nick Dimassis, Beloit Public Library
- Michelle Harrell, Milwaukee Area Technical College
- Hollis Helmecki, Ladysmith Public Library
- Joyce Latham, University of Milwaukee School of Information Studies
- Jennifer Thiele, Marinette County Public Library
- Emily Truman, City of Baraboo

FEEDBACK CONSIDERATIONS

The workgroup met via conference call on February 16, 2018, and in-person on February 27, 2018, to discuss feedback from the resource library director meeting and the review panel. The workgroup wants to make clear the path from our desired outcomes from June 2016 to our model recommendation in January 2018.

With the desired outcomes at the forefront of the discussion, the workgroup decided not to focus on the name “resource libraries” or the *who*, in order to focus on the *what* regarding innovating library services across Wisconsin. After removing the name “resource libraries” from the discussion, the group brainstormed possible contracted services and innovative deliverables for all Wisconsin libraries. Library systems and resource libraries were created in the 1970s as a way to ensure equitable delivery of library services and access to collections, regardless of community size or location.

In the spirit of shared resources, it was discussed that, in addition to the value of our Wisconsin heritage that exists in collections at libraries throughout the state, the number one resource in Wisconsin is the people working in libraries. Taking into account this valuable resource, there was recognition that continuously building strong leadership within our library community is vital to maintaining existing services and developing new ones. Experience at the largest library is not exclusive to that library but has shared attributes with the smallest, and vice versa. Innovation is not based on library size or population served but based on the individuals and groups of individuals designing and implementing innovation at the local level.

WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the statute was adopted, times have changed. Many non-resource libraries have developed the means for addressing some of the specific services currently delineated in statute as resource library functions. However, an indirect result of the resource library statute was that over time systems and resource libraries leveraged their unique relationships to provide services that satisfied local needs within the system beyond statutory requirements. The following are the recommendations of the workgroup regarding resource libraries moving forward.

RECOMMENDATION #1

Eliminate statutorily mandated regional resource libraries. However, regional and statewide coordinated services to libraries should continue to contract with libraries, whether current resource libraries or other libraries, when this approach is determined to be most effective and/or efficient at improving equitable access to services and resources for all libraries and leading library service innovation into the future.

RECOMMENDATION RATIONALE

Contracting for services with libraries, as determined locally, regionally or statewide, does not require statute that can be bogged down with procedure. Rather, it ensures that libraries have fair and equitable compensation for serving in these roles and that the deliverable of the service is clearly understood to those receiving the service.

This recommendation does not prescribe that existing system contracts with resource libraries be terminated, but rather they can be carried forward as determined locally. Chapter 43 simply requires that a library system has an agreement for the three mandated services with a resource library. It does not require compensation for these roles nor does it limit contracting with the resource library or another library for coordinated services, as is current practice.

The recommendation proposes that these and other library contracts continue to be a part of collaborative library services (continuing education, consulting, delivery, electronic resources, ILL, ILS and technology) regardless of the library contracted to provide any given service or resource.

This recommendation reaches the following desired outcomes the workgroup identified at the beginning of its work:

1. Regardless of size, libraries can provide services to pilot projects for the state or obtain projects that have been vetted by those with expertise or more resources.
2. Knowledge held by library staff and collection strengths of libraries is known statewide – that knowledge should not be contained by system or regional borders.
3. Understand/share innovation (better communication of individual library's innovation) other libraries have successfully created.
4. Wisconsin libraries maintain and improve on the level of partnership and collaboration that allows us to provide services efficiently.

RECOMMENDATION CONCERNS

Among the workgroup, there has been discussion of three concerns with the elimination of regional resource libraries:

- The current resource library model requires a system to form agreements with resource libraries. This negotiation process between systems and resource libraries ensures that capacities or expertise in libraries is best utilized and efforts are not duplicated.
- The resource library fills a leadership role in the system that contributes to ensuring system services best meet the needs of libraries and moves library services forward.
- The resource library designation provides leverage for the library with its municipality in two ways:
 - It defines a regional role that helps these libraries, which serve approximately 46% of the state's municipal population, maintain their local funding levels.
 - It provides a statutory reason for the library to advocate to its municipality its obligation to participate in regional collaborations and system services.

RECOMMENDATION #2

Establish, in statute, a single state resource library to be responsible for the coordinated development of and access to specialized collections at public libraries throughout the state.

RECOMMENDATION RATIONALE

The Heritage Model, as the workgroup thinks of it, recommends a single library be statutorily recognized as the conduit for identifying, preserving and cultivating special collections and archives at libraries across the state. It would serve as a representative and advocate at the table for public libraries as special collections and archives are addressed by historical societies, academic and special libraries.

The term “special collection” has come to mean a great many things. A brief definition of special collections and archives is they are documents and artifacts of cultural significance – historical, genealogical, ethnographic and corporate/economic. They can be rare, valuable and very unique materials that are held in environmentally controlled locations and require special handling.

They can be a collection curated around a single subject that is of value to researchers and scholars without restrictions of use or a need to be held in environmentally controlled locations. For example, if related to a local person of historical significance, a collection may contain biographies, histories, photographs, autographs, newspaper clippings, etc. in various quantities and formats, including digital or electronic materials. Special collections built around local history and genealogy are commonly found in many public libraries.

In the initial implementation of this model, it is very important that special collections be clearly defined, along with the scope of the collection in relation to location. With the ranges of very small to very large libraries in Wisconsin, collections can range from the local containing items of historical value to a village to collections that are of interest on a county, state, national and, even, international level.

While nearly all public libraries have special collections of some sort, most do not have the expertise, equipment or staffing to effectively manage, preserve and provide access to these materials. This recommendation encompasses the management of physical collections as well as digitization work. The workgroup recognizes and is excited by the intersection with this model and the Collections Workgroup’s digitization model.

The Heritage Model recognizes:

- All libraries, small and large, hold special collections that contribute to a statewide collective history, in addition to some libraries having collections of interest beyond our state.

- These collections should stay in the communities where they have been created and curated.
- These collections should be accessible to any interested researcher, local or not.

The state resource library would:

- Be accountable to the State of Wisconsin and Wisconsin public library community.
- Develop specialized physical and digitized collections with a statewide focus.
- Coordinate access and awareness of special collections available in the state to be used through a variety of platforms by all. After identifying collections at public libraries across the state, a goal would be the development of a database to increase awareness and facilitate discovery of these resources.
- Provide leadership in the promotion of these collections throughout the state.
- Ensure the existence and maintenance of an underlying infrastructure that supports the discovery of and access to new and existing special collections in Wisconsin.
- Be a partner in curating, arranging, describing and digitizing, where appropriate, these collections.
- Be a leader in preserving these collections at all libraries through the development and sharing of best practices.

The following attributes could be considered to establish a state resource library:

- Extent of unique special collections held by the library
- Expertise, or capacity to gain expertise, in preserving and promoting these types of collections
- Ability to digitize resources to increase access to collections
- Willingness and ability to support other libraries in these endeavors
- Commitment that these collections will remain accessible, regardless of format

This recommendation reaches the following desired outcomes the workgroup identified at the beginning of its work:

1. Patrons receive the resources they need today and the innovations they need for the future
2. Knowledge held by library staff and collection strengths of libraries is known statewide – that knowledge should not be contained by system or regional borders
3. Wisconsin libraries maintain and improve on the level of partnership and collaboration that allows us to provide services efficiently.

RECOMMENDATION CONCERNS

The workgroup recognizes that other institutions, such as Wisconsin Historical Society, Recollection Wisconsin, Wisconsin Historical Records and Archives Board (WHRAB), ARC network (Archives and Area Research Centers), academic libraries and others already have a role in the collection, digitization and preservation of special collections and archives. Though this recommendation is to establish a state resource library as a leader in this area for public libraries, the workgroup understands there must be a clear understanding of the current landscape and potential partnerships before this recommendation could move forward. This is addressed in the implementation recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION #3

The other service workgroups were not charged with identifying specific service providers, and that includes not identifying specific libraries. However, it is clear from the agreements between systems and libraries, along with the survey results, that resource libraries, to different degrees in different systems, already either partially or entirely fulfill what is typically provided as a system service.

Recognizing that innovation spans all workgroups, the Resource Libraries workgroup asks that the Steering Committee considers in their recommendations the role of libraries as follows:

- How they can fulfill staffing and service provider roles
- How they can contribute to the planning or oversight of coordinated services
- How they can share expertise, leadership and innovations through coordinated statewide connections among libraries to increase the equity of excellent library services being available for all residents of our state

RECOMMENDATION

Cultivate and connect the expertise, leadership and capacities that currently exist in libraries throughout the state to leverage the experience, knowledge and talents of those that directly serve patrons in developing and providing innovative services to communities of all sizes.

RECOMMENDATION RATIONALE

As stated in feedback considerations, Wisconsin libraries' number one resource is the people that work in libraries. In addition, libraries are the laboratories where innovative services are developed and then shared with other libraries throughout the state. With this, the workgroup recommends the following to the Steering Committee:

- The state should invest in growing the knowledge base and expertise of librarians across the state by subsidizing staff development and workshop and conference attendance.
 - The execution of a connected statewide approach, as recommended in the Consulting and Continuing education workgroup report, to coordinated continuing education, training and consulting can be enhanced by leveraging the resources currently provided throughout the state in libraries that have capacity and expertise to share beyond their municipalities.
 - Not only does this increase expertise that can be shared, it addresses the reality of the inequity that exists. Many librarians around the state are unable to take advantage of collaborative learning and sharing opportunities, including state library conferences.
- Identify investment in innovation as a priority.
 - This can be achieved by cultivating expertise and leadership through an investment in staff development and by funding seed projects to develop innovative services, which are vital to building a future-focused library community.
 - Invest in pilot projects at libraries on different scales, allowing ideas to be fostered in a manner that allows the entire library community to learn from the pilot and the process.
 - As part of this, facilitate collaborative efforts across the state for national grant opportunities, which will allow Wisconsin public libraries to dream bigger and simplify processes for all libraries to apply for funding and grant opportunities. This will improve the ability for all libraries to compete for opportunities to innovate and improve library services in communities of all sizes.

This recommendation reaches the following desired outcomes the workgroup identified at the beginning of its work:

1. Patrons receive the resources they need today and the innovations they need for the future
2. Regardless of size, libraries can provide services to pilot projects for the state or obtain projects that have been vetted by those with expertise or more resources
3. Understand/share innovation (better communication of individual library's innovation) other libraries have successfully created
4. Wisconsin libraries maintain and improve on the level of partnership and collaboration that allows us to provide services efficiently

RECOMMENDATION CONCERNS

The workgroup discussed that implementation of this recommendation falls partially in the realm of the other PLSR workgroups and partially in the Steering Committee's administrative, funding, governance and legislative recommendations. The workgroup also recognizes that the role of funding innovative initiatives overlaps with IMLS and other funding initiatives the state already coordinates. The workgroup does not have a specific role for implementing this recommendation in resource libraries or other libraries, but it did not want this important element of investing in librarians and libraries as well as leadership and innovation to be missed as the Steering Committee develops its recommendations.

COSTS

RECOMMENDATION #1

The impact of eliminating regional resource libraries depends on the current contracts between library systems and resource libraries, and will impact each resource library differently. This recommendation cannot be realized without a statutory change. Thus, systems and resource libraries, depending on the recommendations regarding this that the Steering Committee submits to DPI, will continue to evolve their contractual relationships until the necessary change occurs. Many resource library agreements and the compensation within them have changed significantly over the last few years. Because of this, it is not possible to put an exact dollar figure on what the impact will be to resource libraries or any public library system aid currently funding any part of resource library agreements.

A large portion of funding to current resource libraries is for services outside the scope of statute and this recommendation states that contracting with libraries should continue. Therefore, there is not a dollar amount related to this recommendation beyond what would be accounted for in the other service areas. For example, contracting with a library to have their youth librarian serve as a youth services consultant to the system is a consulting expense and contracting with a library to do cataloging is an ILS expense.

RECOMMENDATION #2

The potential costs for a state resource library to be responsible for the coordinated development of and access to special collections throughout the state cannot be calculated at this time. As stated in the concern for this recommendation, there are existing institutional roles and collaborative efforts already taking place in this area. These need to be thoroughly explored to understand the need and role for a state resource library; this investigation is part of the implementation section. Digitization is part of the Heritage Model and the Collections workgroup report covers this activity in their budget estimations.

That said, the workgroup recognizes that whatever role and capacities expected of a state resource library (or libraries, should a network of libraries performing these duties be the outcome) would require compensation to the library for staff time, space and other expenses.

RECOMMENDATION #3

The cost for this recommendation will be determined by the Steering Committee's decisions about funding the other service models related to library staff development and conference and other learning opportunity subsidies. The future use of IMLS funds and any other statewide funding of initiatives for innovation projects and pilots will determine costs as well.

IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The workgroup recommendations for implementation are limited because the workgroup is leveraging what they have identified as outstanding needs with resources and systems that are being developed in other workgroups.

RECOMMENDATION #1

The elimination of regional resource libraries can only be implemented by statutory change. Any statutory change for this recommendation should be flexible in order to allow for contracting with libraries to provide coordinated services and resources on a regional or statewide level.

RECOMMENDATION #2

The workgroup recommends a Year One study, instituted through DPI, to better understand the need and role for a state resource library. This study would include:

- Exploration of a need for a single state resource public library:
 - Identification of existing efforts, institutions and collaborations that focus on special collections and archives in the state.
 - Resource and service gap mapping.
 - Determine the scope of collections around the state that may be included in this Heritage Model. This includes defining what a special collection is in relation to the role the resource library would be filling.
- Based on the information gathered during the identification phase, begin to determine the details of the public state resource library.
 - Is there buy-in for funding this?
 - Is this a single library service model with a dedicated staff?

- Is this joining an existing collaboration?
- Based on the determinations made during the detail phase, move into governance and funding.
 - Establish a budget.
 - Determine an oversight and governance model. This will be dependent on whether the role of a state resource library is independent or part of a collaboration with other institutions.
 - Develop a proposal, if determined to be necessary, for how the establishment of this may need to exist in statute.

RECOMMENDATION #3

Any implementation of the components of this recommendation will be done as part of the continuing education and consulting service model's implementation related to library staff development and determinations of regional and statewide investment of grant funding and other resources to foster innovation.

GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

There are no specific governance recommendations for any of the recommendations.

For Recommendation #1, protocols and oversight for contracting with libraries and accountability of those contracts will need to be established in the structure, however, this is dependent upon the overall administrative, funding and governance structure that is put in place by the Steering Committee.

The implementation plan for Recommendation #2 already addresses this.

APPENDIX A: CURRENT LIST OF RESOURCE LIBRARIES

- Appleton Public Library – Outagamie-Waupaca Library System
- Brown County Library – Nicolet Federated Library System
- Hedberg Public Library (Janesville) – Arrowhead Library System
- Kenosha Public Library – Kenosha County Library System
- L. E. Phillips Memorial Public Library (Eau Claire) – Indianhead Federated Library System
- La Crosse Public Library – Winding Rivers Library System
- Madison Public Library – South Central Library System
- Manitowoc Public Library – Manitowoc-Calumet Library System
- Marathon County Public Library – Wisconsin Valley Library Service
- Mead Public Library (Sheboygan) – Monarch Library System
- Milwaukee Public Library – Milwaukee County Federated Library System
- Oshkosh Public Library – Winnefox Library System
- Platteville Public Library – Southwest Wisconsin Library System
- Racine Public Library – Lakeshores Library System
- Superior Public Library – Northern Waters Library Service
- Waukesha Public Library – Bridges Library System

APPENDIX B: CHAPTER 43 RESOURCE LIBRARY LANGUAGE

43.16(1)

(1)

43.16(1)(a)(a) Each public library system shall have at least one system resource library. Annually, prior to the expiration of its agreement with its existing system resource library, the public library system board shall negotiate with the member public library with the largest annual operating budget of all member libraries to serve as a system resource library in the following year. If the board and the proposed resource library are unable to reach an agreement for the following year before the expiration date of any existing agreements with resource libraries, the existing agreements shall be extended for one year or until an agreement is reached with that proposed resource library, whichever occurs earlier. The division shall notify the public library system board, the existing resource libraries and the proposed resource library of the extension and, during the period of extension, shall attempt to mediate an agreement between the public library system board and the proposed resource library. If the division determines that the public library system board and the proposed system resource library are unable to reach an agreement before the end of the one-year period, the division shall propose an alternative agreement, which shall be binding if it is acceptable to the proposed system resource library. If the alternative agreement is unacceptable to the proposed system resource library, the board shall negotiate with the member public library with the next largest annual operating budget of all member public libraries to serve as a system resource library in the following year.

43.16(1)(am) (am) An existing contract may be extended under par. (a) only if it was entered into on or after May 8, 1990.

43.16(1)(b) (b) The procedure under par. (a) shall be repeated with member public libraries in decreasing order of the size of their annual operating budgets until an agreement is reached with a member public library to serve as a system resource library. Except as provided in par. (a), no agreement may extend beyond December 31 of any year.

43.16(2) (2) If the member public library selected to serve as a system resource library under sub. (1) fails to meet all of the following requirements, the system board shall enter into a supplementary contract with the academic library with the largest operating budget of all academic libraries in the system area, or with a resource library in an adjacent system, that meets all of the following requirements:

43.16(2)(a) (a) The library has a collection of at least 100,000 volumes.

43.16(2)(b) **(b)** The library is open to the public at least 50 hours each week.

43.16(2)(c) **(c)** The library employs at least one full-time, permanent reference librarian with a master's degree in library science.

43.24(2)

(2) For a public library system to qualify for and maintain its eligibility for state aid under this section it shall ensure that all of the following are provided:

43.24(2)(a) **(a)** Written agreements that comply with s. 43.15 (4) (c) 4. with all member libraries.

43.24(2)(b) **(b)** Backup reference, information and interlibrary loan services from the system resource library, including the development of and access to specialized collections, as evidenced by a written agreement with that library.

43.24(2)(d) **(d)** Referral or routing of reference and interlibrary loan requests from libraries within the system to libraries within and outside the system.

43.24(2)(e) **(e)** In-service training for participating public library personnel and trustees.

43.24(2)(fm) **(fm)** Electronic delivery of information and physical delivery of library materials to participating libraries.

43.24(2)(g) **(g)** Service agreements with all adjacent library systems.

43.24(2)(h) **(h)** Professional consultant services to participating public libraries.

43.24(2)(i) **(i)** Any other service programs designed to meet the needs of participating public libraries and the residents of the system area, as determined by the public library system board after consultation with participating public libraries.

43.24(2)(k) **(k)** Promotion and facilitation of library service to users with special needs.

43.24(2)(L) **(L)** Cooperation and continuous planning with other types of libraries in the system area, which results in agreements with those libraries for the appropriate sharing of library resources to benefit the clientele of all libraries in the system area.

43.24(2)(m) **(m)** Planning with the division and with participating public libraries and other

types of libraries in the area in regard to library technology and the sharing of resources. By January 1, 2000, and by every 5th January 1 thereafter, the public library system shall submit to the division a written plan for library technology and the sharing of resources.

43.24(2)(n) (n) That, if the system reimburses a participating public library for the costs of providing interlibrary borrowing services to an individual who holds a valid borrower's card of another participating public library, the reimbursement shall not exceed the actual costs incurred by the public library in providing such services. The department shall promulgate rules for determining actual costs for the purposes of this paragraph.

APPENDIX C: COMPILED 2014 RESOURCE LIBRARY CONTRACT INFORMATION

	Statutorily Required Services			Other Services Contracted with the Resource Library							
	Backup Reference	Development and Access to Specialized Collections	Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	Cataloging	Collection Development	Consulting	Continuing Education	Delivery	Integrated Library System (ILS)	WAN/Internet	
Appleton Public Library – Outagamie-Waupaca Library System	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Brown County Library – Nicolet Federated Library System	X	X	X		X		X	X			
Hedberg Public Library (Janesville) – Arrowhead Library System	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	
Kenosha Public Library – Kenosha County Library System	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
L. E. Phillips Memorial Public Library (Eau Claire) – Indianhead Federated Library System	X	X	X		X						
La Crosse Public Library – Winding Rivers Library System	X	X	X		X				X	X	

Statutorily Required

Services

Other Services Contracted with the Resource Library

Resource Library / Public Library System	Backup Reference	Development and Access to Specialized Collections	Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	Cataloging	Collection Development	Consulting	Continuing Education	Delivery	Integrated Library System (ILS)	WAN/Internet
Madison Public Library – South Central Library System	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Manitowoc Public Library – Manitowoc-Calumet Library System	X	X	X	X	X					X
Marathon County Public Library – Wisconsin Valley Library Service	X	X	X							
Mead Public Library (Sheboygan) – Eastern Shores Library System	X	X	X		X		X			
Milwaukee Public Library – Milwaukee County Federated Library System	X	X	X	X	X				X	
Oshkosh Public Library - Winnefox Library System	X	X	X							
Platteville Public Library – Southwest Library System	X	X	X							
Racine Public Library – Lakeshores Library System	X	X	X	X						

Statutorily Required

Services

Other Services Contracted with the Resource Library

Resource Library / Public Library System	Backup Reference	Development and Access to Specialized Collections	Interlibrary Loan (ILL)	Cataloging	Collection Development	Consulting	Continuing Education	Delivery	Integrated Library System (ILS)	WAN/Internet
Superior Public Library – Northern Waters Library Service	X	X	X		X					
Waukesha Public Library – Bridges Library System	X	X	X		X					
West Bend Public Library – Mid-Wisconsin Federated Library System	X	X	X	X						

APPENDIX D: 2017 RESOURCE LIBRARIES SURVEY OF WI PUBLIC LIBRARIES

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey to help the Public Library System Redesign (PLSR) Resource Libraries Workgroup.

The Resource Libraries workgroup is reviewing the role of resource libraries, both as defined in statute and in practice, in the landscape of coordinated and collaborative services to public libraries within public library systems in Wisconsin. To help gain a better understanding of this, the workgroup developed this survey for *public libraries only*.

The workgroup will connect as needed with public library system staff after it reviews the results of this survey to follow up on the relationship between systems and resource libraries. *Library system staff and non-public libraries should not respond to this survey.*

The goals of this survey are:

1. Gain an understanding of how resource libraries, or other libraries, are fulfilling the current role of resource libraries as defined in Chapter 43 of Wisconsin State Statutes.
2. Identify other types resources and services that libraries currently need and receive, outside of those Resource Libraries provide as defined in Chapter 43.
3. Learn what libraries think about the current role of resource libraries as defined by statute and if there are potentially new definitions needed for resource libraries for the role they fill in practice or may fill in the future landscape of coordinated and collaborative services to public libraries.

State Statute Section 43.16 1(a) states "each public library system shall have at least one system resource library." This is typically the largest library in a public library system.

State Statute Section 43.24 2(b) requires Wisconsin public libraries systems to provide "*backup reference, information and interlibrary loan services* from the system resource library, including the *development of and access to specialized collections*, as evidenced by a written agreement with that library."

For purposes of this survey, interlibrary loan is defined as the process by which a library requests material from, or supplies material to, another library. It is not restricted to within a system. This survey is one part of the information gathering process and the results will only be used by

this workgroup for the purposes of developing recommendations to the PLSR Steering Committee.

You may skip any of the questions that you do not feel qualified or able to answer.

This survey should take you 10-15 minutes to complete.

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

Select your library system:

My public library serves the following (municipal) population size:

What position area best describes your role at your library?

- Administration
- Reference
- Circulation
- Interlibrary Loan
- Collection management
- Children's/YA
- Other (please specify)

Do you work in a Resource Library?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

Do you know which library is the Resource Library in your system?

- Yes
- No

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

The following is information so you can see who the Resource Library is for your system for you to answer the questions that follow. If you do not know which library system your library is a member, please see [this system map](#). You may just select NEXT after you have seen which library is your system's Resource Library.

Arrowhead - Hedberg Public Library (Janesville)
Bridges - Waukesha Public Library
Indianhead - L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library (Eau Claire)
Kenosha - Kenosha Public Library
Lakeshores - Racine Public Library
Manitowoc-Calumet - Manitowoc Public Library
Milwaukee County - Milwaukee Public Library
Monarch - Mead Public Library (Sheboygan)
Nicolet - Brown County Public Library (Green Bay)
Northern Waters - Superior Public Library
Outagamie-Waupaca - Appleton Public Library
South Central - Madison Public
Library Southwest - Platteville
Public Library
Winding Rivers - La Crosse Public Library
Winnefox - Oshkosh Public Library
Wisconsin Valley - Marathon County Public Library (Wausau)

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

In this section, we will ask you to think about your use of your resource library for services as defined in Chapter 43.

State Statute Section 43.16 1(a) states "each public library system shall have at least one system resource library." This is typically the largest library in a public library system.

State Statute Section 43.24 2(b) requires Wisconsin public libraries systems to provide "*backup reference, information and interlibrary loan services from the system resource library, including the development of and access to specialized collections, as evidenced by a written agreement with that library.*"

How often have you contacted your system's Resource Library for any of the following services (as stated in Chapter 43)?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
Reference assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to a specialized collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary loan	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How often have you referred a patron to your system's Resource Library for any of the following services (as stated in Chapter 43)?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
Reference assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to a specialized collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary loan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Why have you used or referred a patron to your system's Resource Library for reference assistance _____?

(Please select all that apply)

- Library had access to reference resources or specialized collections that were needed
- Staff expertise
- I have a regular contact who assists me and/or our patrons
- Provided faster turnaround time to fulfill request / answer question
- Have not used
- Other (please specify)

Why have you used or referred a patron to your system's Resource Library for a specialized collection _____?

(Please select all that apply)

- Only library with the specialized collection that I and/or the patron needed
- Provided quickest access to the collection that I and/or the patron needed
- Have not used
- Other (please specify)

Why have you used or referred a patron to your system's Resource Library for interlibrary loan services (Please select all that apply)

- Library handles placing and processing interlibrary loan requests for system member libraries
- Provided quickest turnaround time to fill request
- Staff expertise
- Have not used
- Other (please specify)

How important to your library are the reference, specialized collections and interlibrary loan services provided by the Resource Library in your system?

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important	Unsure
Reference	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Specialized Collections	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary loan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

In this section, we will ask you to think about your usage of other libraries in your system or the state for the same services.

How often have you contacted another library in your system or the state for any of the following services?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
Reference assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to a specialized collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary loan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate what libraries you have contacted, if any.

How often have you referred a patron to another library in your system or the state for any of the following services (as stated in Chapter 43)?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently
Reference assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to a specialized collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interlibrary loan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

To what libraries did you refer your patrons, if applicable?

Why have you used or referred a patron to another library in your system or the state for reference assistance? (Please select all that apply)

- Library had access to reference resources or specialized collections that were needed
- Staff expertise
- I have a regular contact who assists me and/or our patrons
- Provided faster turnaround time to fulfill request / answer question
- Have not used
- Other (please specify)

Why have you used or referred a patron to another library in your system or the state for a specialized collection? (Please select all that apply)

- Only library with the specialized collection that I and/or the patron needed
- Provided quickest access to the collection that I and/or the patron needed
- Have not used
- Other (please specify)

Why have you used or referred a patron to another library in your system or the state for interlibrary loan services (Please select all that apply)

- Library handles placing and processing interlibrary loan requests for system member libraries
- Provided quicker turnaround time to fill request
- Staff expertise
- Have not used
- Other (please specify)

PLSR - RESOURCE LIBRARIES

Please indicate if you receive, either via a contract or other agreement between parties, any of the following services or resources and who you receive them from. Note that other includes, but is not limited to, Historical Society; state, county or municipal agencies or departments; non-profit organization or a business/vendor.

Note: This is not a comprehensive list of services offered by libraries, but reflect what Resource Libraries may provide across the state and how libraries might receive those types of services.

	Your Resource Library	Resource Library)	Your Public Library System	Public Library System	Other	Did not receive
Security services or consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cataloging/bibliographic control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ILS management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADA coordination of services or consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Technology support services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OverDrive and/or database support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Continuing education/professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Misc. consulting (facility, organizational, service, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Website design and management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marketing/Public Relations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Library policy and/or procedure knowledge, resources and/or expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please list other types of services your library needs or receives or note the other institutions/organizations that provide your library with any of the above services.

Please respond to the following statement: "Resource Libraries, as currently defined in Chapter 43, should remain a part of State Library Law."

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Please provide any additional thoughts if you would like regarding your response to this question.

Please respond to the following statement "The State needs a new definition for Resource Libraries in Chapter 43 to align with current practices and use of resources and services provided by Resource Libraries, or other libraries, outside their municipality either regionally or statewide."

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Please provide any additional thoughts if you would like regarding your response to this question.

Please share any other comments or thoughts you have regarding Resource Libraries.

APPENDIX E: RESOURCE LIBRARIES SCENARIOS

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
A	Keep Resource Libraries - recommend no changes to statute	No. Current statute does not mandate any funding to RLs. Local relationships and agreements dictate funding.	We believe current statute is valid and supports providing equity in library services throughout the state	Perception throughout library community that current statutory role is not relevant.	Current statute does not bind the hands of agreements between systems and RLs and does not require any funding is provided.		No. Current statute does not mandate any funding to RLs. Local relationships and agreements dictate funding and would not be required to change unless those local agreements change.

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
B	Modify Resource Library Statute - Keep definition of who qualifies as a RL, but change statutory mandated roles	Maybe - depends on modifications	We believe RLs provide a value and support providing equity in library services throughout the state but that the current statute is out of date	Some systems may have to contract outside of system because there is not a member library that meets statute definition (currently SWLS)	It could update roles to reflect what RLs are currently doing.	Opportunity for RLs to serve as laboratories for innovative services.	Maybe - depends on modifications and what the local relationship and current agreement is.

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
C	Modify Resource Library Statute - Change definition of who qualifies as a RL but keep statutory mandated roles	No. Current statute does not mandate any funding to RLs. Local relationships and agreements dictate funding. Changing who can serve as a RL does not dictate any funding will be provided.	We believe RLs provide a value and support providing equity in library services throughout the state and the current roles are valid but we believe in some cases RL roles could be better satisfied by other libraries than those currently defined by statute.	Perceptions within library community that current statutory role is not relevant. Would the RL need to be in the system or region? Could a system contract with someone outside the system or region? This could solve the Scenario B complication.	Too many variables to determine	Opportunity for libraries outside of largest in the system to shine	Maybe - depends on modifications and what the local relationship and current agreement is.

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
D	Modify Resource Library Statute - Change definition of who qualifies as a RL AND change statutory mandated roles	Maybe - depends on modifications	We believe RLS provide a value and support providing equity in library services throughout the state but we believe both that in some cases RL roles could be better satisfied by other libraries than those currently defined by statute AND that the statute is out of date	Lots of variables, including statute change. Complications will come from what the specific modifications are. Could more than one system library be considered?	Too many variables to determine	Allow all systems to have RL representation no matter member library size (Jeff)	Maybe - depends on modifications and what the local relationship and current agreement is.

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
E	Modify Resource Library statute and create categories of essential services where systems must have a contractual relationship with a member library. Could be multiple contracts with different libraries depending on strengths within the system	Not directly but would be more complicated set of contracts to maintain.	We believe in the value of a defined relationship between systems and member libraries and see this as a method that supports providing equity in library services throughout the state	This would require more contracts but standards could be created and templates could be used.	Provides opportunity for others to serve in leadership capacity and provide service, more collaboration and inclusion.	Opportunity for more inclusion of libraries within the region to provide a service to others. Expertise is already present in many of our libraries, this gives those libraries a chance to contribute, and then we don't have to go out and hire new people to staff a position within a region by looking at what is already there first.	Maybe - depends on modifications and what the local relationship and current agreement is.

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
F	Eliminate Resource Libraries	May result in renegotiating local agreements depending on the local relationship and current agreements and desired services.	The concept of RLs by any name provides no value in providing equity in library service throughout the state	Former RLs may participate less in their regions or share less without agreements. Could result in local municipalities less willing to contribute to statewide equity without recognition that RL designation provides.			Maybe - depends on modifications and what the local relationship and current agreement is.

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
G	Have one Resource Library for the entire state	Probably, in order for that RL to serve statewide.	There is a value to an RL but do not need to volume nor geographic proximity in order to provide equity in library service throughout the state.	Variables depend on if current statutory roles remain or are changed? Also, libraries and patrons nearby may receive a greater value from this.	Too many variables to determine		Maybe - depends on the role

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
H	Have fewer resource libraries for different regions in the state	Probably, in order for that RL to serve larger geographic region.	There is value to having RLS but it does not require as much geographic proximity nor require the current volume of RLs to provide equity in library service throughout the state.				Maybe - depends on the role

	Scenario Description	Requires state budget funds?	What does this mean for providing equity in library services throughout the state?	Complications	What is good about this option?	Opportunities	Requires additional local funds?
I	Designate any library that meets certain standards as a resource Library. Doesn't need to connect to systems or regions at all.	Not necessarily but could require funds depending on the standards.	Could be more of an "accreditation process" with standards of collection size, budget, access, sharing, number of MILS staff, etc. Undetermined if this would provide equity in library service throughout the state.	Could lead to gaps in the state in terms of coverage if there are geographic areas that don't have a library that meets standards	Could have more than one per system.	Would highlight a status of libraries whose communities are supporting their library highly. Could this be something that doesn't need to be in Statute but is in policy?	Maybe - depends on the role