State of Wisconsin   COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND NETWORK DEVELOPMENT

A G E N D A
Council on Library and Network Development
July 11, 2008
10 a.m. until 3 p.m.
Marquette University
Raynor Memorial Libraries Conference Center
1355 West Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53233

1.	Call to Order	Kathy Pletcher, Chair	
2.	Roll Call/Determination of Quorum	Roslyn Wise	
3.	Welcome to Marquette University's Raynor Libraries	Janice Simmons-Welburn, Dean, Raynor Memorial Libraries	
4.	Adoption of Agenda	All	
5.	Approval of Minutes for March 14, 2008, and May 6, 2008, meetings and May 29, 2008, videoconference	All	Action
6.	Report of the Chair (10:15) a) Correspondence b) Visioning Summit Discussion c) Preliminary discussion of goals for 2008-09	Kathy Pletcher	All; possible action items
7.	ILL/Resource Sharing Subcommittee report (11:15)	John Nichols	Information, discussion
8.	Presentation from OCLC ILL users (11:30)	Representatives from OWLS/Nicolet; SCLS; Winnefox	Information, discussion
	Lunch Break (12-12:45 p.m.)		
9.	Presentation, discussion, tour – Raynor Memorial Libraries (12:45-1:30 p.m.)	Jean Zanoni, Associate Dean, Raynor Memorial Libraries	Information, discussion
10.	Library Legislation Update (1:30 p.m.) a. Federal b. State of Wisconsin c. Legislative Audit Bureau review	Rick Grobschmidt, Mike Cross	Information, discussion

11.	Update on COLAND appointments for terms ending July 1, 2008	Kathy Pletcher	Discussion
12.	Nominating committee report and election of COLAND officers for 2008-09	Kristi Williams	Information, discussion, action
13.	Suggestions for Future Agenda Items	Kathy Pletcher/All	Information, discussion, action
14.	Future Meeting Locations and Dates a) September 12, 2008 – Southwest Wisconsin Technical College, Fennimore b) November 14, 2008 – TBA	Kathy Pletcher/All	Information, discussion
15.	Review follow up items	Kathy Pletcher/All	
16.	Announcements	All	
17.	Adjournment	Kathy Pletcher	Action

COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND NETWORK DEVELOPMENT

Meeting Minutes
July 11, 2008
10 a.m. to 3 p.m.
Marquette University
Raynor Memorial Libraries Conference Center
1355 West Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Members Present: Michael Bahr, Germantown
Mary Bayorgeon, Appleton
Donald Bulley, South Milwaukee
Francis Cherney, Milladore (arrived at 10:25 a.m.)
Miriam Erickson, Fish Creek
Catherine Hansen, Shorewood
Bob Koechley, Fitchburg
Lisa Jewell, Madison
Douglas Lay, Mosinee
Sandra Melcher, Milwaukee
John Nichols, Oshkosh
Kathy Pletcher, Green Bay
Calvin Potter, Sheboygan Falls
Annette Smith, Milton
Lisa Solverson, Viroqua
Kristi Williams, Cottage Grove

Members Absent: Barbara Arnold, Madison
                     Susan Reynolds, Cable
                     Kris Adams Wendt, Rhinelander

DPI Staff: Mike Cross
                     Sally Drew
                     Rick Grobschmidt
                     Steve Sanders
                     David Sleasman
                     Roslyn Wise

Presenters and Guests: Phyllis Davis, South Central Library System
                         Mark Arend, Winnefox Library System
                         Jean Zanoni, Associate Dean, Raynor Memorial Libraries
                         Janice Simmons-Welburn, Dean, Raynor Memorial Libraries

1.   CALL TO ORDER

     Chair Kathy Pletcher called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

2.   ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

     Roslyn Wise called the roll; a quorum was present.

3.   WELCOME TO THE MARQUETTE RAYNOR MEMORIAL LIBRARIES

     Janice Simmons-Welburn, Dean of Libraries at Marquette University, welcomed the group and
     talked briefly about the Raynor Memorial Libraries as a gathering place for Marquette students.

4.   ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

     Miriam Erickson moved to adopt the agenda for today's meeting; Sandra Melcher seconded the
     motion. The motion passed and the agenda for today's meeting was approved.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 14 AND MAY 6 MEETINGS, AND MAY 29 VIDEO CONFERENCE

Doug Lay moved to approve the minutes from the March 14, 2008, meeting; Catherine Hansen seconded the motion. The motion passed with no additional discussion.

Doug Lay moved to approve the minutes from the May 6, 2008, meeting; John Nichols seconded the motion. The motion passed with no additional discussion.

Doug Lay moved to approve the minutes from the May 29, 2008, video conference; Miriam Erickson seconded the motion. The motion passed with no additional discussion.

6. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

a) Correspondence – Copies of two letters approved at the March meeting were included in the meeting packets. One of these was a letter to the governor, thanking him for his budget proposal, which preserves library funding, and the other was a letter to Kimberly Currie from the Department of Natural Resources, expressing thanks for the state parks passes which are among the incentives to encourage participation in the summer library program. In relation to the letter to DNR, Rick Grobschmidt reported on a couple of examples showing the importance of the summer library program. He mentioned that much credit for the success of Wisconsin's program goes to Barb Huntington, DPI's youth and special services consultant for public libraries. Two other letters, one a thank you letter to the State Superintendent for her support of the Visioning Summit, are still in process.

b) Discussion of Visioning Summit's Beginning's report – Kathy Pletcher turned the discussion to the working draft version of the Beginning's report, which she emailed to the group earlier in the week. At the last COLAND meeting the group reviewed and had a lengthy discussion about the vision statement; she tried to incorporate suggestions from that meeting into this draft. The report is being put together in layers. She asked for feedback on the new draft – is it going in the right direction and what's missing. Several people noted typos in the first section; Mary Bayorgeon suggested additions for page 10 (Strategic Directions) – add "and the community" to the end of the last sentence in the third paragraph (…anchor "store") because health care libraries also serve communities. Catherine Hansen commented that some business libraries are not open to

communities. Some discussion took place about separate sentences. Mary then suggested adding "institutional" between community and planning in the last sentence of paragraph five (Embedded Librarians). Miriam Erickson commented there was nothing about reductions in the numbers of school library media specialists mentioned under "Key Findings" on pages 7-8. Some discussion took place about how the key findings were developed. Kathy noted that in the objectives section (on page 14, Strategic Direction 4, Objective 2) it reads "Ensure every child in school has access to a librarian trained in literacy," which came from a summit group bullet point "A librarian in every school." Kathy commented her wording takes into account the idea that it's not just about librarians but about every child having access to a librarian. Annette Smith suggested adding "regular, sustained access to a librarian trained in teaching literacy." There was more discussion about the complementary role between school and public libraries and how to word this so the message is about regular access to a teaching librarian. Mike Bahr commented that he wasn't sure this was a key finding from the summit, and they need to be careful about putting in items that did not come up. Lisa Solverson mentioned a comment from the summit about "school librarians being massacred." There was more discussion about the critical importance of this issue and how and where to incorporate it into the report. Several individuals commented on their recollection of the issue being brought up at the summit and that it should show up in the key findings. Kathy reiterated the importance of putting the focus on the needs of the students and not on librarians themselves. Rick G. mentioned the difficulty in defining "adequate" in relation to the staffing of school libraries. Annette S. remarked that it means "professionally staffed school libraries"; Lisa Jewell added the word "certified." Kathy commented that one goal was to create a document that is substantial enough that information can be lifted out of it for different purposes. Rick suggested that the intent is to support staffing levels for school libraries but the definition of what is considered "adequate" is vague. Steve Sanders commented that No Child Left Behind does not require school librarians to be certified, and that Wisconsin's Standard H does not spell out what is an adequate level. Annette added that the standard does not require library access until secondary grades; elementary and middle level students are not guaranteed access to a librarian. There was more discussion about school librarians partnering with reading teachers because of the importance of early learning. Catherine H. suggested including under strategic directions and objectives to increase access to school librarians, and to change the state statutes to guaranteed access to professional library staff in the early grades. More discussion took place about how and where to include this in the report. Lisa Jewell brought up the study correlating student success and school library media programs. Rick G. cautioned that this was a statewide study and does not define results from individual schools; the important thing is to define it as services to students (patron

services).   Bob Koechley also commented on the importance of teaching kids to read during the early years. John Nichols reminded the group that this is a "Beginnings" report so it is not imperative that COLAND include defined processes for how to achieve these goals. Mary Bayorgeon went back to another section of the report, on page 12, and suggested changing the word "outsource" (last paragraph of Funding Mechanisms section). Suggestions included "increasing efficiencies" and "improve service."

Kathy asked the group to move on to other topics. She said she will make the suggested changes and prepare to send out to summit participants sometime after July 18. Miriam commented that the timelines under "Objectives" in the report are too far out in the future; Kathy said she will take the timelines out for now.

c) Discussion of COLAND goals for 2008-09 – Discussion deferred until a later time.

7.   ILL/RESOURCE SHARING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

John Nichols gave an update on the work of the ILL/Resource Sharing subcommittee; the notes from the last two subcommittee meetings were included in the packet for today's COLAND meeting. At the April meeting the group reviewed the state superintendent's biennial report to COLAND and discussed recommendations for adding items to the report in the future such as identifying trends, emerging problems, and key indicators. The group also finalized an issue paper for the Visioning Summit, and saw and discussed a video clip from the 1980s about Knowledge Navigator. At the May subcommittee meeting, the group discussed the Visioning Summit and the concepts that emerged from it. They also discussed their process document and the work the subcommittee still needs to accomplish. They hope to bring the learning phase of their process to a close by the end of the summer. John plans to schedule another meeting to take place in the next few weeks.

8.   PRESENTATION FROM OCLC ILL USERS

Mark Arend from the Winnefox Library System began the presentation by OCLC ILL users. He started by distributing and reading to COLAND members a prepared statement from Mark Merrifield from the Nicolet Federated Library System (NFLS) who had been invited to today's COLAND meeting but was not able to attend. The statement described NFLS's experiences with using OCLC and what they have learned in the process. (A copy of the full statement will be sent to

COLAND members not in attendance today, and will be included in the meeting file, notebook, and COLAND website as part of the meeting minutes.) After reading the statement, Mark A. added a few comments about Winnefox's experiences; he reported they are happy with their switch from WISCAT to OCLC – before switching they were using two systems, now they are only using one, and he thinks the software for OCLC is easier to use. He ending by saying he agrees with Mark M.'s statement, and turned the presentation over to Phyllis Davis from the South Central Library System (SCLS), who addressed the list of questions that John Nichols had sent to the OCLC group in his invitation to attend the meeting.

Phyllis said SCLS moved from WISCAT to OCLC in 2004 so can longer compare one to the other. She commented that the reasons for their switch are all documented on the SCLS website at **http://www.scls.info/**. She said the resource library could not handle the work load without adding additional staff; this was not possible. The number of requests was going up but the fill rate was going down. They needed additional resources from outside Wisconsin. SCLS likes OCLC better than WISCAT for a variety of reasons and they wanted to be a part of what OCLC is doing. She said they are able to do a variety of searches and they don't have to maintain the system. They can handle the same number of requests they were receiving in 2003 without having to add staff, in addition to a list of other reasons for liking it such as minimal downtime and training needed. She could not break down a cost per transaction. She gave some cost breakdowns to reach a final figure for SCLS of $40,000, which is quite affordable for a system their size.

They were surprised to find OCLC used a different method for keeping statistics so SCLS did have to make a change there; they switched to ILLiad. They have also found that the number of requests they are filling for Wisconsin public libraries is down, but they are filling double the number of requests from academic libraries. She then made some comments about Wisconsin being number one in interlibrary loan but she thinks maybe the state has built a system that is not sustainable. Are local collections too unique? She thinks local collections need to be "beefed up" so they don't need to borrow so many items from other libraries. Is the current system the best use of state resources? She commented that because one system (meaning WISCAT) is paid for with federal funds so it is perceived as being "free." She questions whether Wisconsin should continue to subsidize a system that enables only a subset of public and school libraries to search and borrow from resources only within the state. Their resource library feels that there is a lot of cost shifting to them without reimbursement. She continued with comments about funding models and future products. She thinks the DLTCL should be less involved with interlibrary loan and should pursue other programs

such as those identified in the visioning conference. She suggested a state-level license for WorldCAT, saying it would be a way to help all libraries in the state.

John Nichols asked a question about something he heard Phyllis say at a SRLAAW meeting several years ago, to the effect that OCLC users have "moved on" and that it is a non-issue what the state does about WISCAT vs. OCLC. Phyllis responded that an ILL system that ends at the state border does not fulfill their needs so they "made a different choice." Mark A. agreed with her comments and opened the presentation up for questions and discussion by COLAND members. Mary Bayorgeon began the discussion by asking how critical it is for all libraries to use the same system, citing health libraries' use of DOCLine as an example, a system which is not generally used by other types of libraries. Phyllis responded that she thinks multiple systems are not sustainable and one system for all would be more efficient. Miriam Erickson asked about the fill rate for OCLC users; Phyllis said she thinks it's about the same. Mark A. responded that the fill rate was "improved" but they were seeing fewer requests (since they do not see requests they won't fill). John Nichols asked it there had been a negative impact on other libraries by some library systems switching to OCLC. Sally Drew responded she did not bring fill-rate statistics that they (RLL) was doing a little less referring for the five library systems using OCLC. Sally also clarified that Wiscat has changed since these groups have moved to OCLC, and so the comparisons may no longer be accurate. Bob Koechley responded that it sounded to him like "one card, one library." The discussion continued about how the number of libraries using OCLC versus WISCAT (five have OCLC, as well as a few libraries, the rest use WISCAT). Rick G. asked John N. if he intended to give WISCAT users an opportunity to present their reasons for using WISCAT. Mike Bahr agreed this was necessary and John N. indicated the group would follow up. Rick gave an example of an ILL transaction that took place at a public library in Wisconsin using WISCAT and asked if that same scenario could happen at a library using OCLC. There was some further discussion about whether or not Wisconsin libraries should be cleared first before sending the request to a library outside of Wisconsin. Lisa Solverson then brought up the issue of per capita income as a reason for some libraries staying with WISCAT (poorer libraries stay with WISCAT because they can afford it), she also commented that staff training for WISCAT is "not a big deal." Cal Potter reminded the group of the purchasing process required by state agencies and that vendors must be willing to follow the rules of the bidding process.

9. PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND TOUR OF RAYNOR MEMORIAL LIBRARIES

Jean Zanoni, Associate Dean of Libraries at Marquette, gave a PowerPoint presentation about Marquette University and its libraries. Marquette is largest private college in Wisconsin and is a Catholic, Jesuit school. The Raynor Libraries opened in 2003 and houses computers and the teaching and learning center. The Memorial Library houses the book collections. She presented some additional details about the library collections and services. There are 34 librarians on staff and 38 support staff. The presentation was followed by a guided tour of the libraries.

10. LIBRARY LEGISLATION UPDATE

Rick Grobschmidt gave an update on state and federal issues related to library legislation. He reported that since the state legislature is not in session, there is not much to report on that level. He did add that library system funding will be maintained as in previous years. The recent budget repair bill had proposed that library systems funding for the second year of the biennium to come totally from the Universal Service Fund but this will not happen. He also reported that DPI is putting together its budget proposal for the next biennium. These will be presented to the Department of Administration in September. On the federal level, there is still no budget decision for the Institute of Museum and Library Services, which administers LSTA funding. Also, Title IID grants (EETT) continue to be funded through a continuing resolution.

Going back to state legislation, Rick also reported that the Governor, as part of his deficit reduction plan, wants to cut administrative funding to state agencies by $270 million. At this point, DPI has been spared these cuts. The state Supreme Court also ruled that the state must refund over $200 million to the Menasha Corporation in sales taxes paid for purchases of software developed by the user (not purchased off the shelf). He also reported that Bob Bocher had met with representatives from the Department of Revenue (DOR) on next year's tax forms. The DOR wants to increase the number of electronic filings next year and wants people to be able to use computers at local libraries to file their taxes. SRLAAW has been asked for input on the matter. DOR would also like for people to be able to print out tax forms from computers at the libraries. A discussion followed about the cons and pros associated with using library computers for printing forms and for filing taxes.

Mike Cross followed Rick with a report on the Legislative Audit Bureau's (LAB) Best Practices Review on Public Library Services. He provided copies of a summary of the report, which gives a link to the full report. The LAB performs regular audits of state agency programs, as well as "best practices" reviews of local government services. They recently completed a review of local public library service. He commented that it was generally a positive review of what public libraries in the state are doing, also there were a couple of controversial areas such as the LAB suggestion that libraries use more volunteers but in some situations where libraries were doing that they had run into problems with labor unions. Mike explained that the LAB visited libraries around the state and interviewed staff to make their determinations. A brief discussion followed.

11. UPDATE ON COLAND APPOINTMENTS FOR TERMS ENDING JULY 1, 2008

Roslyn Wise reported that she had received an email from the Governor's appointments director on Tuesday, July 8, and, as of that date no final decisions had been made on reappointments to COLAND. Five members are up for reappointment.

12. NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT AND ELECTION OF COLAND OFFICERS FOR 2008-09

Kristi Williams reported that the three-member nominating committee (Don Bulley, Miriam Erickson, and Kristi Williams) met by conference call on Thursday, June 26 and decided upon the following slate of officers for 2008-09: Kathy Pletcher, chair; Sandra Melcher, vice chair, and Michael Bahr, secretary. Kristi Williams expressed thanks to Cal Potter for his three years as vice chair (Note: this is incorrect – Cal has served two terms as vice chair). Kathy Pletcher then called three times for nominations from the floor; there were none. John N. moved, no 2nd is needed and a vote was taken. The motion to elect the slate of officers as proposed passed.

After the vote, Cal Potter asked to address the council regarding the nominations procedure. He reported that he had been notified by a phone call that the nominating committee had decided to replace him on the slate of officers with an "active" librarian because they felt that should be a criteria for being a COLAND officer. Cal remarked on the irony that he was on the legislative committee that brought COLAND into being in 1978, and provided some background on its origins. The library community did not want a library "board" so a "council" was created. The original make-up was fifteen members, the majority of which would be "public" members. In the 1990s he introduced legislation to expand COLAND to nineteen members, ten of which would be public

members and nine would be practicing professionals, the idea being that public members would outnumber the professional members because regulatory and advisory councils and boards placed in the state statutes by the legislature and appointed by the Governor are created to serve the public and are not intended to be professional organizations. Historically, COLAND has always emphasized the role of the public members. Until recently, the COLAND chairs had historically been public members. Cal remarked that he was disturbed by the fact that the three-member nominating committee had decided, without input from the rest of the members of COLAND, that the leadership of the council would now have to be members who are active practitioners. He said that this is a decision that should have been made by the entire body and not the nominating committee alone. He then suggested as a future agenda item a discussion of the COLAND by-laws relating to this, as well as a discussion of term limits for COLAND officers. He remarked that decisions such as the one made by the nominating committee should be guided by the by-laws and not have the nominating committee make such a decision on its own. He continued that he was not disturbed by the slate of officers that was chosen but by the way the decision was made. During Cal's discussion, Mike Cross made copies of the COLAND by-laws and provided copies for those who needed one. A brief discussion followed about the by-laws and reporting relationships for COLAND. Cal went on to explain the difference between a board, which has final decision-making power, and a council, which is advisory.

13.   SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a) Review of COLAND by-laws and discussion of proposed changes (September)

b) Goals for 2008-09 (September)

c) Continued discussion moving toward finalization of Beginnings report (September)

d) Report on the Delivery Services Advisory Committee (Future)

e) Federated searching across databases including BadgerLink (Future)

f)   Additional discussion of cuts in school library media positions

Some discussion took place how to approach and address the school library media specialist situation, including the potential formation of a COLAND sub-committee to thoroughly review the issues.

g) BadgerLink marketing (from Mike Bahr, who commented that he did want to see items mentioned at previous meetings fall off the list)

h) Promoting the Trust for Public Lands

i) Update on state budget requests

j) Presentation by representatives from the Public Service Commission (Madison meeting)

14.   FUTURE MEETING LOCATIONS AND DATES

a) September 12, 2008 – Southwest Wisconsin Technical College, Fennimore

b) November 14, 2008 – suggestions: Medical College of Wisconsin, Milton High School, and Monona Grove High School.

15.   REVIEW FOLLOW UP ITEMS

There were no follow up items recorded.

16.   ANNOUNCEMENTS

Sally Drew introduced David Sleasman, the new Resource Sharing Technology team leader at the Reference and Loan Library. David spoke briefly about what he did before coming to Reference and Loan.

17.   ADJOURNMENT

Sandra Melcher moved to adjourn; Bob Koechley seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Bahr, Secretary