

State Support of Public Library Services

October 29, 2007 Meeting Notes

Meeting Purpose: *The intent of this meeting is for the group to continue the discussion on concepts for establishing new guidelines for use of state funding. The team will be working on documentation from the September meeting as a foundation of shared work. Material from this meeting will be out for comment.*

Expected Outcomes of the meeting:

1. Define outcome and success measures
2. Draft a definition of equitable use.
3. Select and refine a model of accountability.
4. Define next steps.

Please note that the morning treats and lunch were not purchased with state funds.

Participants:

Nick Bozen
(HAL Office of Regulatory Affairs and Legislative Liaison)

Gretchen Couraud
(Executive Director, Michigan Library Association)

Suzanne Dees
(Superiorland Library Cooperative, Upper Peninsula Region of Library Cooperation)

Betsy Hull
(Community District Library, Class 4, Mideastern Michigan Library Cooperative)

Kay LaPierre
(Richland Community Library, Class 2, Southwest Michigan Library Cooperative)

Joan LundBorg (Absent for second meeting)
(Hart Area Public Library, Class 3, Mid-Michigan Library League)

State Support of Public Library Services

October 29, 2007 Meeting Notes

Sheryl Mase
(Library of Michigan Director of Statewide Services)

Martha McKee (Absent for first meeting)
(Statewide library consultant)

Valerie Meyerson
(Charlevoix Public Library, Class 3, Northland Library Cooperative)

Heidi Nagel
(Ionia Community Library, Class 4, Lakeland Library Cooperative)

Larry Neal
(Clinton-Macomb Public Library, Class 6, Suburban Library Cooperative)

Stephanie Olson
(Iosco-Arenac District Library, Class 5, White Pine Library Cooperative)

Jim Seidl (Replaced Ann Holt, CLC, for second meeting)
(Woodlands Library Cooperative)

Nancy Skowronski
(Detroit Public Library, Class 6, Detroit Library Cooperative)

Jean Tabor
(Canton Public Library, Class 6, The Library Network)

Lance Werner
(Library of Michigan Library Law Specialist)

Trixie Wint (Absent for second meeting)
(Homer Public Library, Class 1, Woodlands Library Cooperative)

Mark Hoffman, Deputy Director, Dept. of History, Art and Libraries was present at both meetings

State Support of Public Library Services

October 29, 2007 Meeting Notes

Finalize Guiding Principle In our September meeting the group was asked to develop a guiding principle. The intent of a guiding principle is to help guide the State of Michigan and Public Libraries concerning the use of state funding to provide library services.

The group was divided into table teams. One of these teams revised the following draft guiding principle.

DRAFT

Guiding Principle: Ensure a benchmark of service is delivered to the citizens of the state.

9/24/07

Benchmarks such as:

- **Equity (library & citizen)**
- **Efficiency**
- **Cost Effectiveness**

The revision made by this team was done in an effort to maintain simplicity while enhancing the clarity for others. This was presented to the whole group and they agreed to this final version of a guiding principle.

Final Guiding Principle: In addition to locally-funded public library services, all Michigan residents will have access to regional and statewide resource sharing and electronic information sources which would not be feasible or cost-effective on an individual library basis.

Definition of Equity In preparation for discussing measures around equity a table team was asked to define equity. This was presented to the whole group, and they agreed to this definition.

Equity In State Aid To

Public Libraries Is Defined As: All residents have access to essential state-funded core services.

Core Services are defined in the September meeting as:

1. **Resident access to books, etc., through statewide reciprocal resource-sharing systems.**
2. **Delivery of resources. (resources that are physical in nature and not electronic)**
3. **Access to electronic resources.**
4. **Connectivity/Broadband**

State Support of Public Library Services

October 29, 2007 Meeting Notes

Define Measures for Core Services Participants were asked to review the core services that were identified in the September meeting and identify a measure and its outcome in each of the measurement areas. Two additional services were proposed by some in the group. The team did identify measures for those 2 additional services but were not asked by the facilitators whether or not these should be added to the core services.

Core Services	Measurement Areas			
	Efficiency	Cost Effectiveness	Equity Funding and Resource	Other
1. Resident access to books, etc., through statewide reciprocal resource-sharing systems.	<p>Fill Rate - % of what a resident requests is provided.</p> <p>Turnaround Time – The time it takes a resident to receive material once requested.</p>	<p>Citizen Perceived Value.</p> <p>-Resident rank value to obtain access to resource verse other options i.e. online book stores, local book, music, video stores etc.</p> <p>-Average patron cost savings obtained by borrowing resources and access to services.</p> <p>% savings obtained for public library by using MeLCat. (Cost per MeLCat less than local purchase or OCLC ILL)</p>	Turnaround Time – The time it takes a resident to receive material once request.	<p>Number of new patrons.</p> <p>% of residents that found solutions to their problems.</p>
2. Delivery of resources. (resources that are physical in nature and not electronic)	Turnaround Time – The time it takes a public library to receive material once requested.	% savings obtained for public library through use of delivery service. (estimated cost per item delivered)	Turnaround Time – The time it takes a public library to receive material once requested.	Number of items processed through the delivery system.
3. Access to electronic resources.	<p>% of full text in resource</p> <p>% of public library needs met by MeL</p>	Cost of electronic resource divided by the number of users.	% of resident population that are still potential users.	Number of log ins.
4. Connectivity/ Broadband	% of libraries with scalable bandwidth to meet peek needs.	% savings obtained for public libraries through volume/group discounts.	% of libraries with scalable bandwidth to meet peek needs.	% of libraries with scalable bandwidth to meet peek needs.
Other: Training	% increased use of electronic resources by residents.	% savings obtained by public libraries through state/region coordinated training.		% resident satisfaction with training received.
Other: Statewide Awareness C:\DOCUME~1\NORRIS~1\K02\LOCALS~1\Temp\SLAC October Meeting Notes.doc	% of local board participating in promotion of awareness. (measuring board ownership of this responsibility)		% increased resident awareness of resources and services.	% increased resident awareness of resources and services.

State Support of Public Library Services

October 29, 2007 Meeting Notes

Accountability Model The group was divided into table teams to review the accountability models that were drafted in the September meeting. They were asked to redraft a model based on their accumulated knowledge. The group came up with 3 models that had the following similarities:

- The state uses some of the state aid funding toward the cost of providing 3 cores services, and the other core services are provided by libraries independently purchasing them.
- Membership in Library Cooperatives is optional.
- Oversight and accountability are included.
- Planning element among the state and libraries and/or co-ops.
- The models are not intended to have to have the specifics concerning a funding formula, reporting mechanism and planning.
- The models will need a summary to explain the change(s).

Key Points of Discussion Were:

- If Library Cooperatives are considered a service provider/vendor it may change their status as governmental entities.
- There will be a need for a transition plan between the current model and any proposed model.

Three members of the group volunteered to review the different models and, utilizing the one around which there was the most consensus as the base model, come up with one that best captures the intent of the group. These three volunteers were:

Jean Tabor, Larry Neal, and Val Meyerson. They will meet to incorporate the three models into one, after which they will confer with Nancy Robertson to discuss what they arrived at and how they developed their model. Nancy will share the model as she intends to propose it with the entire advisory committee for comment and discussion prior to the model being shared with the library community at large for comment and discussion there.

Conversation Recap Presentation Revisited At the September meeting Nancy Robertson provided a handout recapping all the conversations and feedback received through the last year from the web blog, town hall style meetings, letters and other sources. Since the September meeting Nancy reviewed that handout and found that the group had discussed or addressed every item except for the following:

ARGUABLE STATE FUNDING

- Logical distribution formula needed
- Straight per capita does not account for geography
- Make formula simple
- Must prioritize what the state should fund and what local dollars should fund

*EQUITY

- Haves and have-nots

State Support of Public Library Services

October 29, 2007 Meeting Notes

STATEWIDE/REGIONAL PROGRAMMING

- Fund statewide library card

*REGIONALLY PROVIDED CORE SERVICES

- Liaison with LM and others for rolling out statewide initiatives

CHANGE

- Keep current co-ops harmless until new model in place
- Distribution of current common assets
- Grace periods and time lines

- Methods for consolidation or dissolution of coops
- Pension funds, current contracts, current assets resolved

*PROCESS

- Time for comment

- Least disruption possible to current system while it's in place -- transition

The facilitator reviewed these items with the group and noted which of these had been addressed in today's meeting. (These are marked above with asterisks*)

Adjournment The meeting was adjourned with the agreement that the notes from this meeting would be distributed. The Accountability Model Sub team would send out their model for distribution and comment. It was not foreseen that this team would need to meet again. Nancy Robertson will coordinate efforts to ensure comment and feedback is received.