

**LSTA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 18, 2019
Portage Public Library, Bidwell Room**

Attendance: Katharine Clark, Joe Davies, Chris Baker, Jen Peterson, Brittany Larson, Larry Oathout, Tanya Misselt, Jamie Mercer, Mindy King, Becky Petersen, Brooke Newberry

DPI Staff: Martha Berninger, Michael Dennison, Kurt Kiefer, Shannon Schultz, Monica Treptow, Tessa Michaelson Schmidt, John DeBacher, Ben Miller, Maria Ingraham

Members of the Public: Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), Corey Baumann (SCLS Delivery), David Kranz (SWLS)

Excused: Brian Williams Van-Klooster

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by DeBacher.

Welcome & Introductions

DeBacher and Kiefer welcomed committee and both DPI staff and committee members introduced themselves. Members of the public also made introductions.

Kiefer thanked everyone for taking the time to be here, and the importance of the collaboration work during this time and on this committee, as well as the public members who took the time to be here.

Review Agenda

DeBacher referenced the agenda for today, and then spoke to the Office of the State Superintendent (OSS) request for future representation demonstrating racial diversity on the LSTAAC committee.

Minutes of Sept 18, 2018 Meeting

Misselt moved to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2018 meeting minutes, Davies seconded. Motion carried.

Updates: National, State, DPI

Berninger presented the [Updates for National, State, and DPI](#), particularly the LAWDS section. Clark asked if there was data collection on which libraries need such services. Berninger said the grant was done so staff in all libraries have opportunity to know partners. Kiefer noted also that it is about building relationships.

Treptow presented the School Libraries section. Emphasized establishing goals and building school library

plans. Trying to support the planning efforts; will continue into the next school year.

Schmidt provided an overview of the recent State and System Services meeting.

Berninger presented PLSR section. Directed any future PLSR questions and comments to DeBacher. Kiefer added that we are now in the implementation stage. The focus of listening sessions was to get insights, and this body will also have insights on how to move forward with implementation. (DeBacher added PLSR report on behalf of COLAND).

Public Hearing

DeBacher opened the meeting to comments from the public. All comments made were in-person.

Corey Baumann (SCLS Delivery) thanked the group. Represent 20 FT and 11 PT staff. Grant to supplement delivery service has helped close the funding gap, supported $\frac{1}{3}$ by statewide library systems, $\frac{1}{3}$ UW outside of Madison, $\frac{1}{3}$ everything else including UW-Madison campus. On the horizon: preliminary discussions with Marathon Co library to establish a hub; excited about how this fits with the PLSR goal for delivery service. Hopes to be part of the process of moving forward. DeBacher elaborated some of the LSTA grant fund issues that were changing, particularly the reduction of delivery grant funds to Northern Waters with the eventual elimination of that grant, since SCLS funds the vendor that provides the inter-system link. Kiefer asked if the WALTCO arrangement could be impacted by potential pilot programs. King commented on the heavy use of the delivery service at her institution, and asked when to anticipate the change. Kiefer asked if in addressing the PLSR recommendations, the delivery recommendation could be implemented in FY July 19-June 20. Baumann acknowledged this could be possible. Need to work through kinks and make sure that the plan is sound. Petersen asked if UW was to have significant savings, how would SCLS make up the revenue. Baumann commented that the increased efficiency could reduce cost. Depends on model development.

[Vicki Teal Lovely \(SCLS\) printed copies of her public testimony to the committee.](#) See Collaboration of Technology Infrastructure. Will take a few years to implement. This project is in 2 phases; 10 systems indicated support. Kiefer commended VTL on the spirit of this project and the collaborative nature. Excellent example of what DPI is talking about regarding collaboration. Clark asked what suite of services would be. VTL- cradle to grave support, call center, network support, PC support, firewall. Kiefer confirmed that this is a capital expenditure, 5 year program. DeBacher clarified that this is system level backup, not daily ops on PCs on the library level. There has been an appeal for increased funding and that may see this project through, with LSTA offering supplemental funding.

David Kranz (SWLS) offered that he is very supportive of the revolutionary collaborative project VTL presented. Offered thanks to the LSTAAC for not just those big projects, but the significant improvements offered at the library level- used sparsity and collaboration funds for routers, equipment, wireless, etc.

Break

The committee took a break at 11:21 and reconvened at 11:31.

LSTA Committee Composition, Vacancies

DeBacher presented the LSTAAC Member Term Updates document. Asked for questions. Larson asked about the conflict of interest language on p. 9 related to recusal or admit conflict of interest if there is a direct benefit. DeBacher said it to the handbook discussion. A member should recuse if the library would benefit; the handbook provides information and context. If grant is to library system, use best judgment (let conscience be your guide).

LSTA Advisory Committee Member Handbook

DeBacher presented the handbook. Asked for questions on the handbook. Approval of 2020 cycle, part 2 of annual budget. Will see budget review slides. Dennison gave kudos to Baker's guidebook binder. The guide was putting together all info for committee in one spot, and how processes work at DPI. DPI invites comments or feedback. Misselt: is this new? Schmidt: not new in concept, but have not had in the past handful of years. Misselt comments that it was very helpful for new members, wished she had had it before.

Review of the 2018-2022 LSTA Plan

Berninger will accelerate through the slides since they were provided to the committee ahead of time. She noted that IMLS has 8 goals, project must align.

[Reviewed slides for Five Year plan for WI](#), goals and projects and the LSTA priorities.

DeBacher invited questions.

Schmidt pointed out that each of the 5 strands are color coding, which will help to see which goals project align with. Kiefer added that we are driven by these goals. DeBacher noted that goals can be added, but would need to amend the plan if projects don't fall into these goals.

Budget Review

Dennison shared the [LSTA Budget Years at a Glance](#), and gave kudos to Schmidt for its creation. Point is to see the three different LSTA awards running concurrently by fiscal year. Oct 1, 2017 - Sept 30, 2019. Trick to remember FY, is that one full calendar year for 2018 which is end of 2017, all 2018, and first 3 months of 2019. 2019 award received in January after it was allocated to states by Congress; when all factors considered, 24 month period is actually around 18 months. No questions on this visual tool from the committee.

Current Project Updates (slides 1-20)

Miller reviewed the [first 20 slides of the set for current 2018 and ongoing projects](#) that was provided to the committee ahead of time. Reminder of color-coordinated projects by five goals.

DeBacher suggested the committee break for lunch, and noted the meeting was back on track due to fast slide reviewing.

Lunch

Committee broke for lunch at 12:20 pm. Reconvened at 1:03 pm

Project Proposals (slides 21-34)

DeBacher review the [proposed future projects slides](#) as provided to the committee in advance. We are already in the 2019 FY spending period. We have 2019 projects proposed (budget to be reviewed and approved by committee later in the agenda). Future Fall meeting we will establish budget for 2020,

assuming we get the funding?

At the last meeting, DeBacher proposed a FT technology consultant position, but due to position authority it was changed to a PT support position within the Division, supporting E-rate, broadband.

Newberry asked for clarification on whether this is an existing staff member, not new. DeBacher confirmed that is for an existing DPI staff member.

Schmidt commented on Technology CE and platform dev slide. Stemmed from PLSR, this project formally states that effort was put to what is out there and needed. Some pieces are already there with DPI, but formally brings things together as feedback on the PLSR recom. Are reviewed.

Berninger commented on the Delivery Hub Pilot slide. Dev of secondary hub for delivery among a series of grants to redesign a more efficient system. Question from Larson: since it is an ongoing conversation, is this something that would move forward regardless of PLSR recommendation. Kiefer said there is convergence here, and since it is farther along, up to the committee to say they like the direction or not, so could leave meeting endorsing additional investments. Larson asked then if COLAND timing, Kiefer said it is complementary. LSTAAC is independent of COLAND, just weighing in, influence of COLAND vs this group. Kiefer says both are. DeBacher spoke to Larson's question of timing, that it had been assumed the process would have been wrapped up sooner with the recommendations. Likely projects proposals were then presented. Among them:

Treptow commented on the School Librarian Leadership Training slide. This proposal is based on giving all school librarians in each district access to ISTE online course, equitable opportunity. This training aligns to concept of library planning. 420 school districts, # don't have library plan and can't leave districts for same reasons as librarians leaving for training from their libraries. A survey was sent out; half have responded so far, showing 78% interest in this training just from basic outline of the offering. Larson supports this idea, and that school librarians often work more with less. Peterson also added that many work in more than one district. Kiefer also added that this helps build the foundation for what a quality school library program can be.

Schultz commented on Lib Admin 202 slide. Success of Boot Camp for new library directors, and there is need for next level training. Budgeting, HR management are among the topics needed. Looking towards municipality perspective and potential, non-librarian trainers are already being looked at. Larson strongly supports this idea as a recent Boot Camp participant. "Just enough to be dangerous" and other committee members Misselt and Peterson verbally added support to the idea.

Schultz also commented on the Standards Interface slide. A visual of where a library stands with the standards. Something robust and how compare to others can be beneficial.

DeBacher reviewed the Funding Formula Study slide and the tie in to PLSR recommendations . DLT will need to work with representatives from the systems and the agency. Dennison clarified that this is for the system state aid funding.

DeBacher also covered the System Fiscal Practices slide, also a PLSR tie in. How system expenditures and

revenues can be tracked more comparably in bookkeeping. It started as a discussion about recommending a common chart of accounts for systems, then got broader in scope. The “Best Practices” component could address difficulties increasing territories or merging systems. Dennison commented that going down this route, it can help achieve consistent and faster LSTA funding through grants.

DeBacher announced Cindy Fesemyer will be the new adult and community services consultant. Schmidt talked about the project slide on Community Engagement Statewide Training. Findings from statewide survey will be presented at WAPL next month by Schmidt and Schultz. They referred to the [Community Engagement Needs Assessment final report](#).

Oathout asked what would efforts around community engagement look like, how would they be used; Schmidt gave examples of the need for facilitation skills, which could take the form of regional trainings, a list of resources, best practices, etc.

Inclusive Services Development slide. Schmidt says this has been an evolutionary process. What does this mean, look like for individual at library which the [assessment tool](#) developed from the Institute. This project proposal speaks to additional content needed, co-created by peers,

In reviewing the Inclusive Services Grants and Support slide, Schmidt shared two subawards: 1 - school/public library collaboration off of the success of Connect and Create, something sustainable. 2 - regional library systems CE on youth and inclusive services topics based on needs. Collaborative on topics such as equity and diversity, social services, etc. Not new, but continually asked for. Petersen asked if the category would be competitive, Schmidt said we are working on that, known factors and responsive to the realities of systems - awareness and abilities, but not competitive in the way grants were done in the past. Realistic and effective. DeBacher noted that 2019 LSTA is not competitive cycle.

Misselt commented that there were a lot more grant opportunities; is inclusive services the one area where there are still mini-grants? Schmidt responded yes and no, because there is potential that some will be available, depending on some pieces currently missing (including team capacity). The 5 year review indicated a lot of challenges with subaward management at the local level. Misselt followed up with a question about whether the application process was made simpler yet. She referenced a WLA session on PLSR with negative feedback about LSTA model going more toward the “state-managed only;” she recommended that we not go too far in that direction and that it was important that some awards be available at the local level.

Dennison responded that the change is to put focus more on outcomes for those applying, rather than the burden of checking boxes and the reporting to IMLS. Schmidt reinforced the focus on outcomes, and that we can make the application process simpler, etc., but those outcomes need to be demonstrated. So perhaps the system is the regional recipient and then funds can be distributed to local libraries, around a CE opportunity. Kiefer stated that Schmidt’s reply is indicative of the IMLS feedback around successful sustainable investment and addressing inequities for smaller libraries, which was something we were not doing well in the past.

DeBacher spoke to the 2020 Planning slide. Larson asked DPI is looking for feedback now, or later. DeBacher recommended that emailing is fine but do NOT reply all or send to the group for risk of

meetings violation. Mercer asked about the direction of SLP. Schmidt talked about surveys conducted on summer reading program at the library level to get a scope of what it looks like around the state. Discussion at national level group - are we still meeting needs? Also had a survey last fall to deep dive into use of CSLP materials, and DPI has only started digging into the data from that national survey. Nothing ready yet to present to the committee, but change and support are forthcoming.

Larson had 2 ideas, part could be community engagement or 202 training: conference session topics don't have the chance to develop into a real conversation; these would be possibly daylong conversations 1. advocacy and messaging training, 2. blood pressure training through HR, good practices in talking to legislators, etc. -- developing leadership muscles.

Misselt commented on the differences in technology between systems at their libraries. At OWLS, Appleton had RFIDs, whereas more IFLS libraries have radio frequency (RFID) tags, evidence of a divide between libraries that have them and don't. Baker talked about the importance of developing a statewide technology cohort; how much it would have helped, for example, with her library obtaining a microfilm reader/printer. Would really help smaller libraries in particular and even the playing field, much like what Misselt said about RFID. Kiefer commented that models in K-12 are there.

FFY 2018 Final Budget

DeBacher/Dennison

Dennison opened up for questions on the [2018 Final Budget](#) made available to the committee in advance. Newberry asked about substitute staffing line. It was clarified it was now called "Barriers to Participation" Larson asked about Biblioboard. Davies wants to see stats. Oathout asked about WISCAT funding amount. Miller clarified cost increase and carryover.

Larson asked about the remaining balance, and if they should make recommendations on where to focus remaining funding. Larson asked about using it toward the tech collaboration project that VTL presented in public hearing.. Petersen asked if money was typically rolled into next year. Kiefer confirmed the balance for FY18 does need to be spent by September. Davies talked about Increased Capacity for Technology Tools & Resources that has already been expended (\$250K); perhaps it (tech collaboration project) could be run through that formula.

Lovely was allowed to comment, and added, maybe yes, but LSTA allocations to other systems had been used for other projects already. Agrees that running through the formula, as Davies suggested, would be more palatable. Dennison noted that if system put into projects already awarded, it would require amendments to awards. Newberry asked if it was realistic to reopen. Kiefer added that capital investments are easy to do, so should be easy.

Lovely noted that at many systems, backup tapes still going into home closets, better to automate backup solutions. Money allocated for support, licenses, equipment. \$840k total, but split into phases. Also has quote and vendor ready to go.

Larson asked if DPI could talk to system directors. Dennison noted that several are in the room now. Petersen says she is willing to support state level projects, even if her system doesn't benefit from them directly. Baker asked Lovely whether all systems are participating. Lovely said that not all systems participated in the project. Petersen added again about ILS is backed up by her vendor in cloud services;

Kranz from SWLS noted that his system's ILS is, too. Lovely added that the project can at least close the gap; down the road they would help other systems participate that currently don't have funding for the project.

Schmidt added that current projects could be extended, and that some proposed projects can be moved forward to address the fund balance. The DPI is not necessarily looking for something additional to do with this money. Examples: the Barriers study- we need to work through mechanics, but there are things that can be done in a shorter window of time.

Treptow spoke to her ISTE training project, that she had wanted to apply funding to trainings this summer, however, the state procurement process was a barrier. Her dream was to apply \$80k at once to do it large-scale in FY18, but now it is a proposal for FY19.

Miller offered the example of moving \$66k for items moved to WISELearn (WISE/LSTA interconnected items). Digitization projects. Kiefer stated that the team will follow up with a list of projects that will lock up the fund balance and then solicit the committee's endorsement in whatever way necessary. Pushing back the endorsement until that happens.

Larson stated a strong endorsement for the technology collaboration project.

2019 LSTA Budget Development

DeBacher asked for feedback on the 2019 LSTA budget document. "Funding Formula" was changed to "System Funding Formula." Larson asked about the stability of LSTA funding in the future -- Kiefer and DeBacher concurred that although it has shown up before on the legislative chopping block, it is no longer at such a dire risk. DeBacher noted that perhaps he had been too cautious in withholding spending with the 2018 grant, accepting responsibility for the current fund balance.

Davies made a motion to endorse the FY 2019 LSTA Budget, Petersen seconded. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

Select dates for future meetings

Schmidt shared the following potential dates and committee narrowed it down to two:

- Wednesday, September 25
- ~~Tuesday, October 1~~ No due to conflicts
- ~~Thursday, October 3~~ No due to conflicts
- Wednesday, October 16

Committee decided that DPI will pick one of the two dates remaining dates, and that they will have 24 hours to contact Ingraham with conflicts.

DeBacher and Kiefer thanked DPI staff for their work, and DeBacher gave special thanks to Baker and the Portage Public Library for hosting the meeting,

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm.