

CONVERSATION RECAP

WHAT'S BEEN SAID AND
DISCUSSED ON THE TOPIC TO
DATE

SUMMARIZED BY NANCY ROBERTSON 9/24/2007

EQUITY

- Choice of coop
- Selection of members
- Even delivery of state funded core services
- Orphan libraries
- Lowest common denominator services
- Haves and have-nots
- Inconsistent use of swing aid

ACCOUNTABILITY

- State oversight of regionally distributed services to libraries
- State employees only for transitional period
- Coop staff accountable to cooperative boards
- State should not employ coop directors
- State unreliable in funding staffing positions
- State not attuned to local/regional service needs

ARGUABLE STATE FUNDING

- Eliminate swing aid
- Logical distribution formula needed
- Only one pot of money to divide up
- Make formula simple
- Reality is everything needed or wanted cannot be funded by state dollars
- Straight per capita does not account for geography
- Must prioritize what the state should fund and what local dollars should fund
- All funds or direct and swing aid funds directly to libraries

ARGUABLE STATE FUNDING

- Revamp entire funding model for Michigan's libraries
- Small libraries reap large coop benefit
- Libraries not needing coop services could opt out
- Local control preferred
- Complete overhaul of funding for Michigan libraries unrealistic right now given fiscal crisis
- State funds should not benefit only the population served by small libraries
- State funding logically based on some state oversight

CORE STATE FUNDED SERVICES

- Ability to identify what state funded services to state's residents will be realized or lacking statewide
- Coop members require voice in what's needed by them
- Need to maintain flexibility/inclusiveness
- Services funded outside of state aid stream need not be constrained by core service requirements
- Mandated but not itemized/defined in actual legislation

STATEWIDE/REGIONAL PROGRAMMING

- % to go directly to fund support for participation in statewide activities like MeLCat, Statewide delivery, MeL Databases
- Statewide negotiated discounts for products and IT support and connectivity
- Statewide automation system(s) independent from coops
- Those state dollars benefit all equally regardless of other service needs or lack of need
- Fund statewide library card
- Statewide delivery system not completely viable for high volume

SHARED SYSTEMS

- Shared systems are the backbone of regional services
- Need to be geographically defined
- Can be defined in ways other than geographic proximity
- 4 ILS coop networks serve 38% Michigan populous
- Lakeland's system had 10M circs recorded last year
- Participation should be optional, not the only way state funding gets to libraries and patrons
- State funding should go to the statewide shared system; based on locally funded local/regional systems

REGIONALLY PROVIDED CORE SERVICES

- Tech support needs to happen from nearby
- IT/Connectivity provision
- Training and staff support for staff to serve patrons better
- Central storage for disaster recovery or offsite collections materials
- Liaison with LM and others for rolling out statewide initiatives
- 26% Michigan libraries connectivity provided through coops
- E-rate critical to library services
- Staff support must demonstrably result in services provided to Michigan residents
- Aggregated contracts/purchasing

COOP SERVICES

WHETHER STATE FUNDED OR OTHERWISE

- Advocate at Legislative level
- Serve multi-type libraries
- Can provide shared systems and support
- Regional grants
- Bibliographic services and cataloging
- Coops are govt. agencies of sorts; can they lobby?
- State aid to public libraries must benefit patrons of public libraries, although not exclusively

TOWN MEETING RESULTS

- Challenges: funding, space, and technology support
- Best services or resources of libraries: staff, collaboration, community space, technology, programming, and collections
- What libraries need: resource sharing and delivery, online databases, technology support, and coordinated marketing

Boundaries

- Self defined
- Situations besides geography may be relevant
- Boundaries should not be permanent
- Orphans
- Lack of contiguous geographic coverage

CHANGE

- Keep current coops harmless until new in place
- PA 89 1977 no longer keeping up with the times/needs
- Methods for consolidation or dissolution of coops
- Urgency stems from funding in jeopardy as we speak
- Distribution of current common assets
- Pension funds, current contracts, current assets resolved
- Grace periods and time lines

CONSOLIDATION/ EFFICIENCY

- Reduce number of cooperatives
- More funds to programming rather than administrative costs
- Too large coops can lack cohesiveness
- State too large to cover with less coops
- Need to keep successful coops and successful activities going
- Just fix the inefficient/what's not working

COOP DEPENDENCE ON STATE FUNDS VARIES

- % of coops' total income from state aid varies greatly (21.7% to 97.4%)
- Staffing varies from .05 to 31.5 FTE
- Population served varies from 66.3K to 2.7M
- Assets range from \$17,832 to \$2.34M
- % salaries/benes compared to total state funding:
From 7.7%, 29.2% to 82% and 143.4%
Average: around 60%
- Not all covered by state funds but shows how much could potentially go just to programming w/out local contribution

SOME POSSIBLE MODELS

- IMLS model:
 - State Aid Funding Goals tied to distribution
 - Multi-year Plan submitted by coops
 - Annual report to LM on expenditures and achievement of goals
- All state aid funds directly to libraries
- Competitive grants for cooperative funding
- % state aid directly to regional/state services; % to cooperatives; % directly to libraries

PROCESS

- Openness and transparency
- Time for comment
- Least disruption possible to current system while it's in place -- transition
- Strength in working together
- Timing is important given budget situation and deterioration of state funding for libraries
- Give and take on all sides needed