**LSTA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, October 16, 2019**

**Ruth Culver Community Library**

**Prairie du Sac**

**Attendance:** Larry Oathout, Brittany Larson, Brooke Newberry, Jen Peterson, Mindy King, Chris Baker, Joe Davies, Rebecca Schadrie

**DPI Staff:** Bill Herman, Tessa Schmidt, Monica Treptow, Ben Miller, Martha Berninger, John DeBacher, Cindy Fesemyer, Shannon Schultz, Michael Dennison

**Members of the Public:** Martha Van Pelt, SCLS; Josh Klingbeil, WVLS

**Excused:** Tanya Misselt, Katharine Clark, Brian Williams-Van Klooster, Jamie Mercer

**Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order at 10:00 am by DeBacher.

**Welcome and Introductions**

DeBacher welcomed committee, and both members and DPI staff introduced themselves. DeBacher thanked everyone for taking the time to be here, including the public members, and expressed gratitude to outgoing committee members on Kiefer’s behalf.

**Review Agenda**

DeBacher referenced the agenda for today.

**Approval of April 18, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

*Davies moved to approve the minutes from the April 18, 2019, meeting; Newberry seconded. Motion carried.*

**National, State, and DPI Updates**

DeBacher presented updates on Kiefer’s behalf. At the national level, IMLS funding and continuity is ok for now. Currently they are looking for a reauthorization with additional funding. The goal is $1 per capita, nationwide, for the Grants to States program, which is where the LSTA funds administered by this body come from. There are other IMLS funding sources, like the Libraries Activating Workforce Development project. Smaller states would be guaranteed no less than $1 million.

DeBacher continued that, at the state level, we are in a biennial budget, we were not granted funding based on the DPI request for an increase each year;, but the base has been re-established for the next biennial budget at the 2019 funding level.

DeBacher then offered DPI updates. The PLD Director position will soon be vacated due to DeBacher’s retirement. DPI is also developing a position description for a special projects coordinator. This person will start by coordinating those projects that have resulted from PLSR.

Larson asked if the project coordinator will start with PLSR, will they later work on other projects as PLSR task complete. DeBacher responded to the affirmative, indicating that projects like BadgerLink procurement was a major undertaking, and projects like broadband expansion and others will follow. Berninger added that the intention for the project coordinator is not to be a subject matter expert, but they will help make sure things get done. Not looking to replace existing expertise, but help with the architecture of moving projects forward. DeBacher followed that this would use an existing position authority that is LSTA funded. Larson asked if this would free up the PLD director to do other things, including innovation, and DeBacher said it would.

Miller stated that DPI has also convened an advisory group to advise the BadgerLink program. This is designed to address equity in state leadership as well as create champions and advocates for funding.

**Review of LSTA Plan**

Schmidt explained and clarified the purpose of this Advisory Committee meeting. DPI will ask this group to approve both the budget and the programs described. LSTA in Wisconsin is prioritized for statewide projects, especially those that benefit equity. Schmidt reinforced the model that federal money in WI is used for statewide projects, state aid is used to support library systems, and local money stays local.

Schmidt also provided an overview of the 2018-2022 LSTA Strategic Plan. Schmidt reminded LSTAAC to keep the five goal areas and the five posted considerations in mind during project presentations:

1. Will this project have statewide impact?
2. Does this project help to address inequities in the state?
3. Does this project have a realistic and appropriate timeframe?
4. Is the fund appropriation for the project realistic and appropriate?
5. Are any noticeable gaps in the scope of the project? Overlap with other projects?

**Budget Overview**

Dennison reviewed the LSTA budget cycle as it relates to the budget document provided to LSTAAC members. He also reviewed the formatting of the budget sheets in the budget document so committee members can follow along during the project presentations.

**FFY 2018 Final Budget**

Dennison described the use of added WISE funds for library projects at the end of the 2018 LSTA budget. Larson asked if DPI anticipates this scenario of having additional WISE funds becoming available again this year. Miller replied that the agency is getting better at budgeting this fund, but a surplus can be expected on occasion, and in this case it was beneficial to the library community as it resulted in additional money for library projects. Dennison added that, by shifting funding such as delivery to the 2018 LSTA budget, it freed up funds in the LSTA 2019 budget.

Berninger stated that some complexities exist with the WISE budget because multiple DPI teams draw on it. Also the WISE guidelines restrict the type of public library projects that can be funded. In addition, some of the projects intended to be funded by WISE may be underspent or not move forward, which results in the unanticipated availability of funds late in the year.

Oathout clarified that WISE allows DPI to leverage the LSTA funds better, and DeBacher concurred. DeBacher then added that things such as LibPAS, which is used for annual reporting, managing statewide documents, and digitized materials, can funded in the WISE appropriation moving forward. However, sometimes the shift does go the other way; LearningExpress Library went from a WISE appropriation to LSTA.

Dennison then described how the project abstracts are linked to each budget lines and explained the reporting requirements DPI provides to IMLS.

**Break**

**2019 Project Updates**

Miller prefaced that everything from PLSR recommendations are called out on the slides, as well as on the budget document, just to be transparent. Gathering information and such before project coordinator (PC henceforth) is hired.

**Technology**

Miller explained that the work on the Continuing Ed/Consulting platform is largely in-house so DPI can proceed with that. Such projects as backup and digitization infrastructure are necessary for other projects. Miller provided a brief timeline of activities through Spring, which include gathering information, supporting ongoing collaborative efforts, and hiring a project coordinator, culminating with an implementation summit to set expectations, establish communication, and serve as a kickoff to forming implementation groups. Larson asked how the implementation groups would be selected. Miller replied that the method would likely be determined at the Implementation Summit.

**Resource Sharing**

Miller described the first statewide ILL meeting, which consisted of 80 rank and file participants, not just the same group of individuals/directors that are seen at the majority of offerings. Participants reported that they work in silos and/or are Part Time employees; they don’t necessarily see what happens with delivery, etc. Miller stated that the face to face time was very important and that participants were very engaged.

Oathout asked about the future of WISCAT and the number of libraries utilizing it. Miller responded that RL&LL is maintaining union catalog for now, and that doing so increases equity because anyone can get any item from anywhere. Miller reported that 80 to 90 percent of public libraries in Wisconsin use WISCAT, as well as many academics and K12s. A total of 500 libraries actively use it. Berninger asserted that WISCAT may need to change as PLSR evolves; Miller added that the discovery layer may influence its future.

King asked if there was a timeline for the delivery hub pilot. Miller replied that the study, a pre-pilot, would be outsourced, so 2020 or 2021 may be a possible timeline. The additional SCLS hub is tangential to this project, not part of it.

**Leadership Capacity**

DeBacher described the two forthcoming issue papers. The first, the Funding Formula Study, will be a history of how the state arrived at the funding formula used today and how those decisions may affect future adjustments for equity. The second, a study on System Fiscal Practices will outline the fiscal practices currently used by systems. Attendance at a relatively recent SOMBAW meeting helped DeBacher and Dennison to better understand this issue. Larson asked if the fiscal practices paper will include recommendations, such as best practices, or if it will be more mandatory in nature. DeBacher replied that DLT has the authority to set certain requirements by rule under PI 6 and that any requirements would require changes to administrative code.

**School Librarian Leadership**

Treptow stated that the statutory requirement for each school district to have a library media plan has been challenging for some districts. Treptow described her efforts to create 200 sponsorships for WI school library media specialists to participate in a program that allows school librarians to form the foundation of the school media plan required of the district.

**Community Engagement**

Fesemyer looks forward to hiring a statewide trainer to run the community engagement project; a small advisory group will provide input on the selection of the trainer and participants in the initial cohort, made up of 20 to 25 libraries, each of which will be represented by one library professional and one community member.

Oathout ask if it was always the intent to outsource rather than running the project in-house. Fesemyer responded that the scope of the project is too big to do in-house and requires a variety of expertise. Fesemyer added that she will be working closely with them and will bring her expertise to the table as well. King asked for clarification on the number of libraries per cohort and Fesemyer confirmed.

Dennison reviewed outcome measures, use of date, and support. He added that RIPL will be in Chicago in 2020, so scholarships will be offered to attend. Larson commented that she appreciates the work of the people at DPI, is excited to see these projects, and offered thanks.

**Inclusive Services**

Schmidt reviewed public and school library collaboration through subawards, which build on success and create new opportunities. She added that this project is similar to the Connect and Create project of 2018.

**2020 Project Proposals**

**Technology**

Schmidt reviewed the coding initiative and explained that the 2020 portion of this multi-year project will focus on North East WI CE Partnership (NEWI). Schmidt next spoke to the Continuing Ed and Consulting Platform project. She asserted that this is much more than a simple platform, and it comes from work group recommendations.

DeBacher addressed Sparsity Aids and the phasing out of technology block grants. Oathout asked for an example of sparsity aid. Miller answered with an example of Southwest utilizing Lakeshores for technology support. Schadrie added that MCLS contracts with contracting with South Central to utilize their expertise.

In addressing the Tech Days co-sponsorship, Fesemyer stated that DLT will continue sponsoring the well received, multi-site, multi-day workshops.

**Resource Sharing**

Miller reviewed Resource Sharing topics: WISCAT continues to provide equitable access to Wisconsin; that a delivery workgroup will be derived from the pre-pilot study referenced in 2019 projects, a hub study will go to RFP, and action will follow; and a collaboration guide will be a deliverable to use as a reference. Larson recommended that research to enhance collaboration through incentives should come from a workgroup not an individual. Miller appreciated the feedback.

**Leadership Capacity**

Schultz reviewed annual training for new directors, system standards recommendations, system best practices, and the possible changes to administrative code. Fesemyer reviewed adult services support and a library leadership summit. Treptow presented a project to continue to train the school librarians that were not trained in the 2019 project (the other half of the districts). Treptow continued with a description of a new School Library Development Institute, which will be similar to the Youth Services Institute conducted by Schmidt, but to allow school librarians to develop portfolios to obtain licensure.

Schmidt reviewed the 2020 co-sponsorship projects: continue to support statewide speakers, Trustee Training Week and Wild WI Winter Web Conf. Statewide speakers could be used for WLA or other statewide events to bring more equity to the support. This sponsorship may also cover ASL interpreters.

Larson asked about DPI’s relationship with WLA. DeBacher replied that DPI staff meet with and attend some meetings, but that DPI has limitations in participation, particularly where lobbying occurs such as on Library Legislative Day.

**Community Engagement**

Fesemyer offered that the 2020 projects for community engagement were all continuations of the projects begun in 2019.

**Inclusive Services**

Schmidt described the continuation of inclusive services projects. These are all either continuations or resurrections of projects that have existed in the recent past. Subawards are in the realms of CE and IS; no SLP subawards will be given due to other funds devoted to that topic.

Schmidt closed with an invitation for questions on any of these topics or other LSTA items.

Oathout asked where the 2019 carryover went. Dennison corrected the budget document during the meeting. DeBacher elaborated on the past situation of carryover and the potential elimination of IMLS funding, which led to his recommendation that funds would be carried forward for the continuation of existing projects. He recommended maintaining some carryover. Dennison clarified that the carryover from 2019 to 2020 covers those projects with a slight deficit, so it is essentially a zero balance.

**Public Comment**

Kristen Anderson of WRLS submitted a letter with a recommendation to use LSTA funds bring standalone ILSs into shared ILSs. Miller stated that this could be a resource sharing item and is connected to both PLSR and equity, especially in consideration of potential discovery layer implementation. Newberry stated that there are currently 5 standalones at WRLS, and that this recommendation would be important from an equity of service standpoint. Miller added the letter to the LSTAAC folder.

Marty Van Pelt of SCLS read a letter from Corey Bauman offering thanks to LSTAAC for grants on behalf of SCLS employees and clients. SCLS manages four routes that connect Wisconsin libraries. Network evolution related to the PLSR process is expected, and they hope to continue collaborations already in place to enhance physical delivery of materials. Schultz added the letter to the LSTAAC folder.

Vickie Teal Lovely of SCLS spoke to the decrease in technology sparsity in 2020 for which not all systems are eligible. She inquired if other funds are available for technology collaboration, and asked if funds for technology would be restored in the future.

Joshua Klingbeil of WVLS spoke on behalf of IFLS, NWLS, and WVLS, to thank the LSTA Advisory committee. He spoke of concerns expressed to him on the use of LSTA funds for PLSR recommendations and thought that this could be mitigated through clear communication and messaging. He looks forward to the delivery research project with the hope that it will make delivery service more cost effective. As a technology manager, he stated that he is not concerned about reduction of subawards to technology, but asks the committee to consider ways to empower everyone to better address delivery support.

DeBacher reminded the committee that technology “block grants” had been openly slated for reduction towards elimination for the past few years, that there were not an entitlement. He also reminded the committee of the need to afford funds to address equity of service sparsely populated geographic areas. He continued that cost effectiveness of delivery should definitely be an outcome of PLSR actions, and that if the LSTAAC wants to add libraries to shared ILS, that should be taken into account as part of the bigger budgeting process. DeBacher also recognized that systems are focusing on a flat budget because there was no increase in state aid, so that makes providing services at a similar level a challenge.

Larson asked Dennison for clarification on 2019 carryover, as she would like to possibly recommend a line item addition to 2020 to address one of the comment suggestions. Dennison replied that some costs, such as the project coordinator, are not reflected but that the budget is potentially about $200k in the black.

Davies asked for clarification from Miller that adding libraries to the ILS could be PLSR adjacent. Davies thought that perhaps any carryover from 2020 could be built into 2021 projects to address this issue.

**Break**

DeBacher opened by saying that Dennison had refreshed the budget in regard to personnel costs. DeBacher then cautioned obligating carryover from 2019, as it might be better to wait until later in the budget cycle to assess the availability of funds for projects like adding standalone libraries to shared ILS.

Larson acknowledged that the carryover is not an exact, knowable amount, but recommended that LSTAAC should consider prioritizing the ILS project if, at the end of the 2020 budget year, funding is good, WISE money comes in, and there is a pool. General consensus was observed from other committee members. Schadrie asked to widen that scope to ILS mergers as well. Baker asked if any project determines if libraries are willing to migrate or join a shared ILS? Miller mentioned that as part of the PLSR implementation, the research being done for the discovery layer could overlay with this, so DPI will try to include this data in that research.

**2019 LSTA Budget Endorsement**

*DeBacher requested general consensus on plan. Taken as endorsement of projects as presented.*

**2020 Project Plan**

Oathout asked DeBacher to clarify how sparsity aid could address the Northern Waters delivery issue, and to offer a history of that funding. DeBacher replied that years ago NWLS paid Waltco to bring their statewide delivery items to Ashland or maybe Superior. DPI provided about $5,000 for that cost. SCLS received $60,000. Then fuel costs and volume both increased, so the committee approved an increase in funds of $15,000 for NWLS and $75,000 for SCLS. In the course of that, NWLS changed vendors to Action Logistics. SCLS paid Waltco to connect our system to Minnesota, and DPI was also paying for the connection. Those grants continued, but DPI was no longer able to pay for the connection as an agency. It became clear that SCLS was already paying for the interchange, so DeBacher suggested that the delivery funding to NWLS should be weaned down by $5,000 each year until it was no longer provided. NWLS will receive the largest eligible amount of proposed sparsity aid at about $16,000.

Newberry asked if the new delivery hub would be statewide or specific hubs. Miller stated that a pilot would be needed to study cost effectiveness of delivery hubs to see if they will work on a larger scale. DeBacher reminded the committee that delivery is not operated by the state.

DeBacher noted that DPI would take under advisement a grant to have standalone libraries added to shared ILS. DeBacher then asked if the committee was comfortable with DPI proceeding with 2020 as presented. No dissenting responses.

**Select dates for future meetings**

Next meeting will be held on Thursday, April 9, 2020. Location to be determined.

Following meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 18, 2020. Location to be determined.

**Meeting Evaluation**

* Better than last time, we had good pacing and balance of talking about projects and budget
* Documents were easier to find and navigate
* Lunch was excellent
* Sparkling water was good

Berninger thanked DeBacher for his work and this was acknowledged by the group.

**Adjournment**