

THE STATE LIBRARY



Washington
Secretary of State
SAM REED

Library Council of Washington

Tukwila Elementary School
5939 South 149th Street
Tukwila, WA 98106

July 10, 2003

LCW PRESENT

Carol Cahill, Public Libraries
Kevin Comerford, Information Technology
Eve Datisman, School Libraries
Nancy Graf, School Libraries
Lisa A. Oberg, Special Libraries
Linda Pierce, Academic 4-Year

Deborah L. Reck, Disadvantaged
Leonoor Ingraham-Swets, Academic –2 Year
Jan Walsh, Ex-Officio, State Librarian, WSL
Sharon Winters, Information Technology
Bruce Ziegman, Public Libraries

WSL PRESENT

Rand Simmons, Library Development
Program Manager
Jeff Martin, LSTA Administrator
Anne Yarbrough, Secretary Administrative

SPECIAL GUESTS

Kay Evey, Tukwila Elementary School Librarian
Allyson Carlyle, iSchool, for Mike Eisenberg
Mel Oyler, PhD, Lecturer, UW iSchool
Rhona Klein, Consultant, WSL

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Library Council of Washington meeting was called to order by Sharon Winters, Chair.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 29, 2003 MEETING NOTES

The April 29, 2003 meeting notes were approved without changes.

REVIEW MEETING AGENDA

The agenda was reviewed; no changes were made.

UPDATE ON WSL

Jan Walsh provided an update on the Washington State Library.

- Due to budget cuts, The Office of Secretary of State was considering charging an indirect rate to each division; however, they recently decided against this because it would have too drastic an effect on the Library and Archives Divisions. However, The WSL Library Development program will be paying its share of the rent, utilities, and other direct costs which will be approximately \$40,000. This will be the first year since the mid-90s that these costs will come out of federal funds instead of state funds, but this is very typical of most state agencies.
- On July 1, 2003, as a result of the Governor's request to the Washington State Legislature, WSL will no longer provide specialized library services for state employees. WSL will, however, continue to serve all citizens of Washington. Announcements and a FAQ sheet were prepared and distributed outlining the new mission of the WSL. This is

the first time the Library's mission has been changed in 150 years. The University of Washington, the Evergreen State College, Saint Martins College, and the Timberland Regional Library have been informed of this change and that they can expect to be contacted by state employees seeking these services we no longer provide.

- WSL will take a leadership position and provide information on filtering technology and the effect of the recent CIPA Supreme Court ruling. In order to provide the information that will best meet the needs of the state's libraries, a survey was developed and disseminated to Washington's library community. A non-funded advisory group will be formed to prepare information on implementation rulings and guidelines provided by IMLS and FCC; gather information on filtering companies, including pricing; determine ease or difficulty of turning filters on and off; determine legal and technical feasibility and ramifications in libraries developing their own filtering systems; determine implications for federal projects; determine implications on cooperative ventures/consortia in Washington; address any other concerns that come out in the survey; and prepare and disseminate options for WSL and the library community.
- The WSL state-funded initiatives for FY2003-05 will go forward. These initiatives include a Kid's Web Page; GILS Migration; Digital Imaging; Electronic State Documents, Acquisitions and Database of Record; the WSL Web site; Leadership; Stabilizing Branches; Historical Collection and Outreach; WTBBL; RECON, etc. To accomplish this, a new Strategic Plan will be developed.
- The Library and Archives Divisions are jointly purchasing a high end production scanner which will enable the Library to quickly and efficiently scan newspapers.

RESULTS FROM SDL FOCUS GROUPS

Rand Simmons provided an overview of the six State Database Licensing (SDL) Focus Groups, facilitated by Karen Goettling, WSL. The final report won't be available until August, but the preliminary report showed that the 50% subsidy from LSTA funds is deeply appreciated and libraries are hopeful it will stay at that same level; that individuals are beginning to see the value of the other services SDL provides; that there is interest in getting state funding for SDL, rather than using LSTA funds; and that there is a lot of interest in training. Nancy pointed out that good training becomes good marketing.

Judi Guzy, SDL Coordinator, reorganized the advisory group so that the committee now goes to their constituents and asks what they want, rather than the committee being approached by the vendor. The goal is to provide two negotiated database contracts for each constituent group.

Judi and Karen also obtained permission from OSOS fiscal department to become a "fiscal agent" for the contracts with the vendors. This means significant savings on contracts since the vendor now only has to bill one customer—WSL—who then bills the individual libraries. For example, when the Gale contract was renewed, Gale agreed to hold prices down to last year's level and even added some databases due to those savings. Leonoor stated that if the price was good, her library would be interested in Gale. Rand will pass this on to Karen.

Rand announced that Elizabeth Laukea is the new training coordinator for the State Library and that Judi recently left the agency for employment in Kansas, so her position is now vacant.

INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSAL PROCESS

Sharon Winters provided a brief explanation of the proposal process. This meeting's review was to clarify questions and offer specific guidance to the proposal writers for submitting their revised proposals at the next meeting in September. If the Council did a "thumbs

down” to a proposal that they didn’t believe met the criteria, specific feedback would still be provided and the proposal writer would be given an opportunity to revise the proposal.

It was agreed that instead of Council sponsors being “advocates” for a proposal, sponsors should be asking the hard questions and playing “devil’s advocate” as well, and that the Council needed to look at how well a current project is working or if there is a better way.

Bruce asked if, in the history of the Council, continued proposals had been turned down in favor of new proposals. Jeff responded that continued proposals had received reduced requested funds and there had been some discussion on how long a project should be funded, but “no”, none had been turned down that he could recall. Nancy pointed out that it takes a year for a project to get off the ground so the 2nd and 3rd years become very important for continued funding. Sharon stated that projects typically run 3-4 years in length. Last year, 3 small library proposals were declined but a Council sub-committee was formed to consider the total needs of the small libraries. This sub-committee could lead to a new proposal in the future.

Allyson asked about evaluation. While the K-12 included a strong evaluation piece, most proposals didn’t. After some discussion, it was decided that as Council reviewed each proposal, they would look at the evaluation included within the proposal and would then request more or better evaluation if necessary. Kevin pointed out that the Council needs to have standard evaluation criteria for all. Next year’s proposal form should include an evaluation piece and all continued proposals should include a report on what they accomplished the previous year and what they hope to accomplish with new funding. An evaluation subcommittee was formed.

Assignment: Rand, Jeff, Lisa, and Kevin volunteered for this subcommittee.

Bruce requested a matrix showing the years of each project and the funding for each year. Sharon asked for that matrix to be included in the next meeting packet.

REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

Jeff and Rand introduced each proposal, Council discussion followed, and Council sponsors answered questions on the proposals. The next step is for the sponsors to take revision/clarification requests back to the originator of the proposal. At the next meeting, in September, revised proposals will be reviewed. See attachment for revision/clarification requests.

Ideas were discussed for the future proposal processes. The discussion will continue over the LCW listserv. Some suggestions:

- Include the statewide plan in the application.
- Focus on “themes” since we have limited funds.
- Fund all or most proposals, but scale back.

TOUR OF HOST FACILITY

Kay Evey, Tukwila Elementary Librarian, provided a “verbal” tour of the library. The Tukwila District is a small district with three grade schools, one middle school, and one high school. The building is only three years old and she felt fortunate that the architect allowed her to have quite a bit of say in the planning of the library space. The library is large, bright, and allows flexibility in rearranging the space for classes and activities. Kay invited the Council back when school was in session so we could observe the students using the library.

WSL LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

Rhona Klein, WSL, and Mel Oyler, iSchool provided an overview of the results of the Customer Service Survey. The purpose of the survey was to assess customer awareness of services provided by the Library Development program, to assess customers’ needs, to

measure customer satisfaction, to determine improvements needed, to draw comparisons with the last survey in 2000, and to set a benchmark for future surveys. They were pleased with the number who responded and the high satisfaction report. Council can request that Rhona and Mel generate various reports from the survey or they can generate their own reports since the software is very user friendly.

Assignment: Rhona will send information to Jeff on how to access the survey results and generate reports; Jeff will forward the information to Council.

FILLING UPCOMING COUNCIL VACANCIES

Jeff reminded Council that two members will be rotating off Council next year, creating vacancies for positions representing Information Technology and School Libraries. A nomination subcommittee was formed to begin the recruitment process.

Assignment: Kevin, Nancy, and Linda volunteered for this nomination subcommittee.

MEETING DATES FOR 2004

Jeff led a preliminary discussion on the 2004 meeting dates and locations. Eve asked that the September meeting not occur during the first week of school as it has in previous years. The Council will check the tentative dates against their other commitments and then continue the discussion at the September meeting.

INFORMATION SHARING AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- Carol asked for a list of the advisory committee members for the LSTA projects and asked how these committees get formed. This information will be provided in the next agenda packet.
- Sharon will get together with the WSL staff to further discuss the proposal process.
- Council was directed to the materials in the handout folder:
 - Letter of Response from Senator Debbie Regala
 - WSL bi-monthly project reports
 - IMLS Primary Source Newsletter
 - Council happenings – April News
 - Update on LSTA Re-Authorization

NEXT MEETING:

- September 4, 2003 at the UW's Suzzallo Library Seattle

NEXT AGENDA ITEMS:

- Review of FY2004 proposals
- 2004 Meeting Dates
- Report from the nomination subcommittee
- Report from the evaluation subcommittee

*Respectfully submitted,
Anne Yarbrough*