OWLSnet
Public Library System Redesign
Outagamie Waupaca Library System
July 20th, 2018

Present: Cathy Kolbeck, Algoma; Beth Carpenter, Michael Nitz, Colleen Rortvedt, Tasha Saecker, Appleton; Eva Kozerski, Black Creek; Susan Lagermann, Emily Rogers, Brown County; Jamie Hein, Clintonville; Rebecca Buchmann (online), Rebecca Lin, Door County; Stephanie Weber (online), Florence; Susan O'Leary-Frick (online), Fremont; Allie Krause, Hortonville; Steve Thiry, Kim/Lit; Nicole Lowery, Lakewood; Amy Peterson (online), Lena; Ellen Connor, Manawa; Joanne Finnell, Jennifer Thiele, Marinette; Le Ann Hopp, Marion; Liz Fernandez-Arnold, Menominee; Ann Hunt, New London; Corrie Campbell, Julia Wallace, Tracy Vreeke, NFLS; Kristin Laufenberg, Oconto; Joan Denis, Oconto Falls; Dave Bacon, Evan Bend, Chad Glamann, Liz Kauth, Molly Lawlor, Amanda Lee, Bradley Shipps, OWLS; Elizabeth Timmins, Seymour; Shay Foxenberg (online), Shiocton; Jill Trochta, Suring; Peg Burington, Waupaca; Kelly Kneisler (online), Weyauwega.

1. Call to Order and Welcome - PLSR guests in addition to AAC members

The meeting came to order at 9:33am at the Appleton Public Library.

2. Ground rules provided by Amanda. ACC ground rules apply to PLSR.
3. Introduction of those joining online.
4. Introduction of Beth Carpenter, Appleton and Kristie Hauer, Shawano.

PLSR Presentation by Beth Carpenter and Kristie Hauer

Topics covered:

- What is PLSR
- Steering Committee Overview and Outcomes
- Principles of Structure
- Equity
    - Definition
    - Comparision of differences in services between systems
- Workgroup Models
    - CE + Consulting
    - ILL/ILS
    - Technology
    - Delivery
    - Resource libraries
    - Collections
- Recommendation Development Process
    - End of July/Summer Summit
- Core Recommendation Committee (CRC) Members

- Summit Participants
- Preliminary Models Overview
  - Gold (formerly W)
  - Green (formerly Y)
- Preliminary Recommendation Feedback
  - Feedback period extended to Noon on July 26th, 2018
- Discussion

Corrie Campbell, NFLS, mentioned that it was hard to compare models without a funding model; it's hard to provide input without a model. Beth responded   can anyone join the workgroup? Beth replied that work is being done within the development summit conversations, which are open meetings. Kristie added that they are working on a funding model, which is in flux due to the possibility of selecting elements of each model; not one model over the other.

Ellen, MAN, asked if there was a strong sense of what is presented to DPI, if they will adopt it, and if so, how long that process will take. Kristie responded that some things could be immediate in the process while others could take years. Beth added that there can be a 5 year period of transition as seen in the work group reports. They are seeing a lot of support from the state superintendent office.

Tracy, NFLS, added the models were each created by different groups, therefore the models had different structures. They took all components of each model, unaltered, and formatted them into a matrix, for easier comparison of the two.

Eva inquired about where the streamlining process came from. Beth replied that based on past events they've seen happen in other systems, there were inefficiencies due to a lack in staffing.

Joan asked if more could be explained on the resource libraries and their roles. Why wasn't act 420 not considered in either one? Beth said that resource libraries will still be present in a 6-8 library system; that they could exist on their own. Colleen from APL added that resource libraries receive different money to which some is state shared revenue and Act 420 is different from county funding. Julia Wallace asked via online, what happens to the "lost" resource libraries? Colleen answered that resource libraries don't get funding from the state for being a resource library. She added that nothing obligates funding to resource libraries; that locally things have happened over the years. Bradley added that each system gets state aid, and the rest is highly variable. Such as, OWLS gets little county funding, but collects significant fees through municipal funding, while other systems have little fee collection.

Jennifer from Marinette asked when and how model Gold was developed. Kristie replied that they were considering 3 models but then another member of the group wanted another and so they developed the fourth model, "W." Jennifer then added that there seems to be more money being put into model "W." Tracy added that what they were looking at was more so what do we want? What components can be put on our wish list?

Corri brought up the funding source aspect. Kristie informed her and the group that they are focusing on what is ideal, the "wish list," and that resources would be analyzed later, such as funding.

Eva clarified that this was not about comparing apples to apples but to pick and choose components of each to implement some things based on priority. That this is going to be a long process that will gradually be introduced. Kristie added that it would be like an "a la carte" menu; that they will create a report to submit to DPI and the state superintendent.

Bradley asked if surveys could be reworded and how questions are asked. Currently the survey was a sliding scale but should focus more on picking one or the other choices. Bradley then asked about the timeline; summit and final report date. Beth said that they had hoped to be done at the end of August, beginning of September but now it will most likely go into the fall. After the summit they should have a better clear direction and can establish more of a timeline.

Colleen thanked Beth and Kristie for comparing apples to oranges.

Meeting adjourned at 10:40AM.