

LSTA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 30, 2017
DeForest Public Library, DeForest
Community Room

Attendance: Inese Christman, Joe Davies, Rachel Arndt, Nyama Reed, Kristin Stoeger, Katherine Clark, Omar Poler

DPI Staff - Martha Berninger, Kurt Kiefer, John DeBacher, Tessa Michaelson Schmidt, Ben Miller, Shannon Schultz, Monica Treptow (11:30)

Members of the Public - Corey Baumann

Excused: Brian Williams-Van Klooster, Tanya Misselt, Amanda Hegge, Cherie Sanderson

Call to Order & Introductions

The Meeting was called to order at 10:00 am by Tessa Michaelson Schmidt. Advisory committee members and DPI staff introduced themselves and indicated their connection to the LSTA program.

Review Agenda

TS reviewed the agenda and welcomed questions or changes suggested by the committee. There were none.

RA moved to approve; KS seconded. Motion carried.

Welcome and [Big Picture LSTA Updates](#)

KK thanked the committee for their attendance.

KK's colleagues in COSLA met in Nashville recently. A primary focus was on the federal budget. ALA's new Executive Director provided an update. ALA feels they need to narrow their focus in the coming year. IMLS is currently operating on the federal Continuing Resolution. The hope had previously been for the passage of a federal budget following that Continuing Resolution, now the hope is for another Continuing Resolution. DLT is mindful of this uncertainty and planning for that. COSLA's Measures that Matter project, concerned with data and data infrastructure in libraries, convened a summit and are planning to have a final action plan by the end of 2017. Data models from outside the library world are being looked at as a way to inform the overall action plan. DLT is hoping to provide more funding flexibility to fund activities around this topic.

KK mentioned that there is a bill in front of the legislature now to provide flexibility for library activities. DLT's funding philosophy in general is that federal funds are to be used at the statewide level, state funds used at the regional level, and local funding at the local library level.

KC asked if the PLS is the only national data collection happening. KK replied it was not. PLDS, Edge Assessment, Project Outcome, and others collect data at the national level, but the PLS is still the dominant collection happening.

IC asked if data collection is based on library users and whether or not non-user activity is somehow captured. KK replied that most data collected is library operation behavior. But Measures that Matter has talked about that question and how to identify what data is important to collect and how that can inform library policy.

OP asked where IMLS and LSTA funding ended up. KK described it as flat funded, but there is a very small increase. Requests were made for substantial increases in order to make the point that library service should be valued and funded as a priority service. The point is well made, but the ultimate outcome is flat funding.

JDB clarified that while we use state money for regional projects that doesn't mean that local libraries won't be able to benefit from the LSTA program. More projects and initiatives will be offered around a focused topic, such as coding, that local libraries would be able to take advantage of. Additional support and framework would be available at the statewide level. DLT has messaged previously that in 2017 individual grants wouldn't be offered. Because the Continuing Resolution expires in a week, DLT is still holding that position. This decision will be revisited in the future of the LSTA program.

JD discussed DLT staffing. The PLD team has recruited for an Operation Program Associate, a position that has been left vacant since 2008. They are planning to recruit for a Data Consultant next. The Resources for Libraries and Lifelong Learning team has also recruited an Operation Program Associate. MB described the support that this position provides related to the LSTA funding stream. BM indicated that an additional Interlibrary Loan Librarian position will be recruited in early 2018. MB reported that a Contract Specialist has also been hired and will start shortly. This position is partially funded by LSTA. TS clarified that none of these positions are new additions to the LSTA program. In fact, LSTA support for DLT positions will see a net decrease.

JDB described the best case scenario as flat funding in 2018. The maintenance of effort penalty incurred by DLT previously has now ended, which will result in a tiny increase in funding. The worst case scenario would be that we would not get funded. DPI can project that staffing can be funded through 2018 in this case. If funding is available, DLT has prepared some quick projects that can allow spending and avoid leaving funds unspent. The LSTA Advisory Committee would be consulted via virtual meetings in the case of this scenario.

Public Hearing

Corey Baumann from South Central Library System extended the gratitude for the grants received for statewide Delivery services. He explained how SCLS used grant funds to deliver 600,000 items between libraries each year. SCLS hopes to continue the relationship with the LSTA program, but recognize that there are difficult decisions coming. Corey also is active in the PLSR Delivery Workgroup working on ways to evolve statewide delivery. JDB clarified that systems also pay for this delivery. The original intent of the grant to SCLS was to facilitate and foster greater resource sharing in Wisconsin. DLT is including the continuation of delivery funding as part of their recommendations for the 2018 LSTA Budget.

TS reported on two submitted written letters from John Thompson on behalf of PLSR and Roxane Bartelt on behalf of Southwest Library System. These documents were available to the committee in advance of the meeting. IC noted that the documentation from SWLS included dollar amounts, but wondered if the PLSR letter had specific funding amounts requested. TS indicated that DLT and PLSR

are in close communication and the funding indicated in the recommended 2018 LSTA Budget can be seen as an accurate funding request for the PLSR project. JDB indicated that he had spoken with Roxanne about SWLS and asked her to include ballpark figures since DLT would be unable to estimate the amount. He sees the broadband support as the most pressing request. RA asked if the funding would come from the 2017 carryover or 2018 technology. JDB indicated that it could be either way. TS indicated that we can place that a little better in the discussion of the budget. RA asked if SWLS had investigated the possibility of working with other library systems or groups to offset costs. JDB replied that some of the cost would be to facilitate this type of collaboration. Also, BadgerNet improvements have already moved the system in a better direction. But it is a possibility for collaboration of the ongoing maintenance and administration in the future.

Break

The committee broke at 11:01. TS asked the committee to review meeting minutes during the break if they hadn't previously.

Minutes of June 1, 2017 Meeting

KC asked if DLT had received feedback from the discontinuation of the grants. TS reported that most grantees were understanding and had more procedural questions. No overwhelming negative feedback. In terms of the messaging about LSTA moving forward, feedback has been generally supportive.

IC made motion to approve the June 1, 2017 minutes as corrected (name misspelling); JD seconded. No further corrections or questions. Motion carried.

2017 LSTA Budget Update

TS introduced and described the budget worksheet. JDB clarified that the 2017 LSTA budget does continue through March 2018. He explained the adjustments that have been made in estimations made based on staff vacancies since the last meeting. There is a new total for LSTA funds that will be expended at the end of the 2017 LSTA budget year. These totals have been verified by the DPI Business Office, but much remains an estimation.

TS asked the committee if they have questions, comments, or concerns about the numbers.

NR mentioned that she appreciated the effort made by DLT to make these estimations. She wanted to know at what point DLT would know federal numbers more firmly. KK replied that DLT isn't in a position to make that kind of projection, but would pass on any information as soon as we hear from our partners. He also mentioned that LSTA had been reauthorized with bipartisan support and an emergence of new legislative champions, so that is a good sign moving forward.

JDB acknowledged that this is a vague budget and more of a framework than a traditional budget.

RA asked if there were things that fell to the wayside because of this funding environment. TS responded that the coding initiative was designed to be more impactful this year, but it was identified as an area where DLT could find additional savings. Expectations were shifted in hopes that activity could be picked up in the future. JDB identified the iLEAD project as another project that has not been active, but that DLT would like to continue. KK reminded the committee that DLT sees the people in libraries as the most important asset. RA responded that a lot of this work might dovetail with PLSR and there was a good deal of work that went into keeping the LSTA program moving forward from her point of view.

[2017 LSTA Projects in the Wings](#)

TS welcomed Monica Treptow to the meeting. MT introduced herself to the committee.

DLT staff reviewed the linked presentation for projects that might be enacted in case of funds that need to be expended. These projects are all aligned to the LSTA 5 year plan and those connections are indicated in the slides.

RA asked if the digitization project would be scalable based on available funds. TS indicated it would. RA followed up asking if systems would be the recipients of the kits. IC commented that they had mixed results using lower end equipment and learned quickly that other types of digitization was requested very quickly. NR indicated that this would align with the PLSR Collection Workgroup's recommendations.

IC commented on the data project that they were very interested in the door counter project that was proposed but not funded. She wondered if that would be a possibility. KK reported that additional budget flexibility might cover that cost. TS added that there is a place for that type of activity in the proposed 2018 LSTA budget.

IC mentioned that the community engagement project is a great opportunity for staff that don't always get professional development and they've done similar projects in WVLS and have seen amazing results.

TS thanked the group for their attention and said that further feedback and questions are always welcome.

Lunch

[2018-2022 LSTA Plan for Wisconsin Crosswalk \(sheet/tab 1\)](#)

TS reviewed the 5 year LSTA plan. DLT didn't prepare a separate document for this meeting because this plan encapsulates the direction and activities of the LSTA program. TS also reviewed the crosswalk which aligns Wisconsin's goals to IMLS focal areas and intents for the LSTA funding.

JDB pointed out the intentional cross-out of "human services" and indicated that a third party prepared the 5 year plan. It was accepted by IMLS without any needed changes. IMLS did request the crosswalk and it has been very helpful in conceptualizing the overall plan and projects of the LSTA plan. Next year the committee will be asked if they recommend making any changes to the 5 year plan.

[Small Group Discussions](#)

TS outlined the intent and process of the upcoming small group discussions. These are intended for the LSTA Advisory Committee to talk amongst themselves. DLT staff will listen and answer questions, but not add to the conversation. The advisory committee split into two groups for discussion.

The groups came back as a whole to share their discussions.

NR reported out for the leadership development topic. They saw a need to increase collaborations. For example, instead of just a new director bootcamp, maybe include current directors for a refresh, adding degreed librarians to the Youth Services Institute, multitype library collaboration, etc. KS mentioned it's

easy to get stuck in a silo at a local library and the need for librarians to view library service at a higher level is helpful. LSTA could provide funding for time and money to cover the desk and provide lodging for attending staff. With WiLEAD there was so much emphasis on the front end of the project, maybe it could be staged differently to allow groups to come together. RA mentioned that as a participant in iLEAD that would have been helpful. IC really liked the idea of a refresher for library directors that would allow discussions between librarians and renew interest in library services. KS mentioned that adult and digital services could be expanded in leadership as well. Digital as technology, coding, and services to the community.

KC reported for the Outcome Measurement Grants and Support (A) and Youth and Inclusive Services Grants and Support (B) group. Having money available to have “bonus” projects done. Data is important for justifying every decision. Lots of communities provide dashboards to give a snapshot of available services. Library staff may need a refresher or tutorial on what the work “inclusive” really means. Giving background education would be helpful. NR noted that many librarians don’t enter the profession because they love math or data. How can we help librarians get over that? KS mentioned that this would be helpful when libraries need to present to a common group (county board) they can all speak the same language. Also, statewide initiatives in the past, like Growing Wisconsin Readers, were very successful and meaningful in the past. Would like to see more like it.

TS asked the group to discuss the “Increase Capacity for Technology Tools and Resources” topic as a large group.

How can LSTA funds best encourage inter-system cooperation, cost, and support sharing? NR clarified that “inter-system” means between systems not within a system. RA mentioned that data needs to show that this cooperation is beneficial to everyone. Analysis needs to be provided to prove that this collaboration is justified. KS agreed and added that LSTA could provide funds to get people together to talk and coordinate this type of collaboration. IC wants to see the reduction in duplicated effort and framing it in a way that shows what else is possible with the increased capacity that would result. Some standardization at a high level could help libraries provide even more unique services at the local level. RA framed it in terms of defining benchmarks for a basic service that libraries and systems could individualize at a more local level. JD talked about his experience with Lakeshores. People don’t need to know how a thing works, only that it does work. Those are the areas that are ripe for collaboration.

What appeals to you? What do you see as pitfalls? JD likes the first option. It gives the library community a way to capitalize on all the work done in the PLSR process so far. RA agreed that this would compel the community to drive toward change. KS said there needs to be leadership to drive these initiatives forward. NR likes the second option of specific projects. How can we scale these types of projects up to a statewide level. JD agreed, but only if it would require inter-system cooperation in some way.

How can these types of funds help overcome inequities among systems? NR pointed out that broadband issues are a big concern. Lynda.com could be available, but if people don’t have broadband at home, it isn’t useful. IC mentioned struggling with vendors who promise a lot, but then never come through. Could a larger groups be established to give libraries more bargaining power and consortial purchasing power? We know that ILS vendors often give us lines, it would be nice to “punch back.” RA pointed out that teaching libraries *how* to get out of some of the small things they’re dealing with will help them build a better baseline to solve bigger problems and reduce inequities.

JDB explained the history of Technology Block Grants and how the funding was structured. He has been working on a worksheet on allocating funds. It is still being reviewed by DLT and will be shared later. He also explained that Biblioboard is a small amount of funds, \$25,000, that would be a one-time boost to get it going and then working on getting systems and libraries to support it moving forward. This would be a topic for a later discussion. Maybe WLA could offer some sort of award to reward and incentivize getting local author content available.

[2018 LSTA Budget \(sheet/tabs 2 and 3\)](#)

TS explained and walked through the budget sheet. The budget is aligned to the previously discussed crosswalk and budget lines are tied to intents and focal areas.

JDB explained the budget in more detail, pointing out differences between staffing costs and other costs. The PLSR line is a placeholder amount to allow for work to be done based on the completion of that project.

RA asked when the “potential WISE funding” would be known/available. KK explained that it is tied to the bill going through the legislature now, and that if it is approved it should become available in Spring 2018.

NR asked about the public library standards interface. SS explained that the newest version of Public Library Standards were recently endorsed by COLAND. The interface would be an environment like a dashboard that would allow libraries to look at a snapshot of their activities. KK pointed out that this might be part of the WISE funding previously discussed. JDB indicated it could help libraries make comparisons.

IC asked for clarification about the PLSR allocation. Would it pay for an ILS merger, for example? KK replied that ILS mergers would be one example. If it doesn't require the legislature, that recommendation might be funded from this budget line. IC asked about system aid. JDB responded that any change to system aid would require legislative action. IC asked about these dollars for “low-hanging fruit,” is anyone looking at the other things and creating an inventory? JDB indicated that is being done by the Chapter 43 workgroup. KK clarified that much of that work is waiting until the other workgroups bring forward recommendations to see where the overlaps are and what might come forward.

JD clarified that the ideal action at this meeting is an endorsement. Would the committee get a chance to officially approve this budget at another meeting? JDB indicated that this is the path DLT envisioned.

NR made a motion to endorse the 2018 LSTA Budget, JD seconded this. Motion carried with a unanimous vote.

Discussion: RA clarified that the LSTA program will move forward and that changes in funding would be brought back to the group.

TS mentioned that the committee did not vote to approve the 2017 budget before lunch. That needs to be finalized.

IC moved to approve the 2017 LSTA Budget, RA seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Select dates for future online quorums

TS clarified that the format of these meetings are not decided yet, but they will be virtual meetings most likely. These meetings might not actually take place, but holds should be placed on calendars.

Hold date #1:	Tuesday	1/16/2018	10:00 - 11:30 a.m. (3)
	Wednesday	1/17/2018	3:00 - 4:30 p.m. (1)
	Tuesday	1/23/2018	3:00 - 4:30 p.m. (0)
Hold date #2:	Wednesday	2/7/2018	12:30-2:00 p.m. (2)
	Tuesday	2/13/2018	10:00 - 11:30 a.m. (3)
Hold date #3:	Tuesday	2/27/2018	3:00 - 4:30 p.m. (2)
	Thursday	3/15/2018	2:30 - 4:00 p.m. (3)
	Monday	3/19/2018	9:30 - 11:00 a.m. (3)
	Tuesday	3/27/2018	3:00 - 4:30 p.m. (2)

TS wanted to formally thank KS, NR, and IC who will be leaving the LSTA Advisory Committee after this meeting.

KK thanked all the members of the LSTA Advisory Committee for their service to the Wisconsin library community.

Adjournment

KS motioned to adjourn, RA seconded. Meeting adjourned at 2:29 pm.