Library Council of Washington
September 4, 2003

University of Washington
Seattle, WA

LCW PRESENT

Carol Cahill, Public Libraries
Kevin Comerford, Information Technology
Michael Eisenberg, Ex-Officio, iSchool
Nancy Graf, School Libraries
Lisa A. Oberg, Special Libraries
Lethene Parks, Rural Libraries

Linda Pierce, Academic 4-Year
Deborah L. Reck, Disadvantaged
Nola Sterling, Special Libraries
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
Karen Goettling, Consultant
Anne Yarbrough, Secretary Administrative

SPECIAL GUESTS

John Backes (on behalf of Leonoor Ingraham-Swets, Academic 2-Year)
Betsy Wilson, Director of UW Libraries

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Library Council of Washington meeting was called to order by Sharon Winters, Chair. Sharon introduced Betsy Wilson, Director of UW Libraries, who then welcomed the Council to the Suzzallo Library.

APPROVAL JULY 10, 2003 MEETING NOTES

The July 10, 2003 meeting notes were approved without changes.

REVIEW MEETING AGENDA

The agenda was reviewed; no changes were made.

PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

Sharon Winters gave an overview of the proposal review process: After the last Council meeting, proposal sponsors were asked to submit a revised budget reflecting possible reductions of 10% and 20%. Council members were assigned to small review teams to analyze and make recommendations on individual proposals. At today's meeting, the lead of each review team would give a 3-5 minute presentation of their review and recommendation. This would be followed by discussion and then either a "thumbs up" or "thumbs down" on whether or not to move the proposal forward.

Discussion: The process changes every few years. Ongoing programs such as CE differ greatly from other initiatives. Is it more appropriate to include funds for programs such as CE with those administered directly by State Library? Within the next 3 years some projects, such as SDL, should be funded by the legislature or other funding sources, not by LSTA funds. The Council's decision is complicated by having 3 different sets of priorities: federal legislative LSTA priorities, State Library LSTA Five-Year Plan priorities, and Library Council priorities. Council needs to develop themes or priorities to clearly indicate a focus for the year. In November, Council will discuss next year's process.

The second step of today's decision making process would be a 5-point scoring system of the LCW criteria identified by the proposal writer. Proposals must also fit with the LSTA priorities and the 5-year plan.

Funding recommendations would be ranked on total scoring and then either the amounts would be adjusted or the number of proposals would be limited—both hard choices to make.

PROPOSAL OVERVIEW
Jeff Martin provided an overview of the 2004 proposals and the previous funding allocations and expenditures from 1997 on. After the Gates Training proposal was withdrawn by its proposer, there was $3,047,639 in FY2004 requests with only $1.8 million funding available.

PROPOSAL REVIEW
Sharon asked the lead in each review team to give a brief synopsis of the proposal and make the review committee recommendations. After discussion, a thumbs up or thumbs down vote was taken. Four proposals received a "thumbs down" and will not be moved forward:
- Connecting Libraries and Communities: Review committee recommended not to fund.
- Family Literacy Initiative: Review committee recommended not to fund this year.
- CTC-CART: Review committee recommended not to fund but to encourage them to apply next year if they developed a more sufficient purpose for the project; there is a lot of potential in the technology.
- ORCA/Universal Catalog and Universal Borrowing: Voted down in part because while it is important to fund, it was the consensus that this is the responsibility of the state to fund, not LSTA.

At this point, there was still $600,000 that needed to be cut. There was a discussion that if we don't fund any new projects this year it will discourage further submission of new proposals in future years. Just because a project has been popular doesn't necessarily mean it should be continued. The Council also needs to look at other factors when making the decision for project continuance.

A second vote was taken and three proposals were removed from further consideration, not because they weren't considered worthwhile proposals, but because they received the fewest votes. (See attachment for general comments):
- Cooperative Automated Systems
- Diversity
- With Consortia and Automation for All

Relevant to each proposal, Council members rated each of the remaining proposals between 1 and 5, with 5 being the high score.
    LCW criteria:
1. Direct Results to Users: Provides direct results to library users
2. Increase Access: Increases access to library resources and services in all areas of the state
3. Public Understanding: Enhances awareness and public understanding of the value of libraries
4. Innovative: Uses innovative approaches to position libraries for the future
5. Collaboration: Encourages collaboration between libraries, between different types of libraries, and/or with other agencies and organizations
6. Support/Training: Provides critical support, infrastructure, or training needed to deliver library services
7. Info Lit: Promotes information literacy such that the people of Washington have greater ability to use library resources and services

While score sheets were being tallied, the meeting continued.

REPORT FROM THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE
Lisa and Kevin provided an update on the evaluation subcommittee who met via email. Next year, Council will ask for more substantial evaluation.

Jeff was asked if Washington will receive IMLS assessment training. He responded that WSL may still receive the training; a date is currently being negotiated. WSL staff will receive a two-day training; Council will be offered ½ day training but will also be welcome to participate in the overall training. Connecting School and Libraries may be the project used as one of the demonstration projects; and a goal within the LSTA 5-year plan may be the second item that is measured.

It was pointed out that Pierce College has a sizeable assessment piece with their Info Lit project and we should watch as a possible model.

REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Only one application has been received for the Information Technology position; one person has expressed interest in the School Libraries position but has not yet submitted an application. Since the deadline is September 19, another announcement should be sent through the listservs.
    Assignment: Jeff will send announcement to Council members again; Council members will forward to their various listservs.

MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS FOR 2004
One of the Council members had a conflict with meeting on Thursdays. After some discussion, it was decided to change the meeting days to Tuesdays and to the 2nd week of the month, rather than the first week. Locations were discussed and suggestions were made.

<div align="center">

Tentative 2004 Schedule

</div>

Tuesday, Jan. 13, 2004	Washington State Library, Olympia
Tuesday, March 9, 2004	Thurston Co./Pierce Co. (near Olympia)
Tuesday, May 11, 2004	Fort Vancouver Regional Library
Tuesday, July 13, 2004	School Library TBD
Tuesday, Sept. 14, 2004	UW Research Facility
Tuesday, Nov. 9, 2004	Special Library TBD

TOUR OF HOST FACILITY
Betsy Wilson, Director of UW Libraries, gave the Council a tour of the Suzzallo Library, the "soul of the university" and "the architectural jewel of the UW campus". The Library's four sections were built in four time periods—1926, 1935, 1947, and 1963—each with its own architectural style. The Library recently underwent a seismic retro-fit that tied all of the building sections together so that they move as one in an earthquake. When the Nisqually earthquake hit, this project was 60% complete and there was minimal damage.

PROPOSAL PRIORITIZATION AND RECOMMENDATION
After scores were tallied and averaged, the remaining proposals were further discussed. Since there was still substantially more in requests than funds available, there was a discussion on whether to drop proposals by ranking order or make cuts to requested amounts. The result of the discussion was that the remaining proposals, with the exception of K-12 and (Gates) Staying Connected, received cuts.

Initiative Proposal	Meets LCW Criteria #	Final Score	Final Recommended Funding	Comments
Info Lit in WA Community & Technical Colleges (ILWCTC)	1,3,4,5,6,7	4.27	$19,494	10% cut. Include someone outside of CC, especially *4-year colleges* on steering committee.
(Gates) Staying Connected Matching Fund	1,2,4,6	4.24	$30,000	No cuts since these are matching funds; Gates $ will be reduced if we cut.
SDL	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	4.2	$630,700	Savings come from eliminating town hall meeting and some salary savings. Can't cut anything already under contract. The advisory committee should discuss a weaning schedule for 2005.
K-12	1,2,3,4,6,7	4.17	$110,000	No cuts. Coordinate with Connecting Libraries and Schools Through Info Lit.
Statewide Marketing Version A	3,5,6	4.06	$450,000	$50,000 cut. Needs better timeline.
IT CE	4,6	3.85	$30,000	Need to be more aggressive on selection criteria.
Connecting Libraries and Schools Through Info Lit	1,3,4,5,6,7	3.81	$182,825	First year for assessment and data gathering; postpone training, don't do new website. Need to look for national IMLS funds for grants in 2005.
CE	1, 2, 6	3.73	$30,000	Cut possible because of availability of 2003 funds. Need to look at selection criteria; need to be careful not to run out of funds.
VRS	1,2,3,4,5,6	3.64	$131,727	Marketing and evaluation are the most important focus.
WA Preservation	1,2,4,5,6	3.59	$185,000	Consider reducing grant cycle and training. Explore possibilities of national IMLS grant.
	TOTAL		**$1,799,746.00**	

A vote was taking again in consideration of the cuts; recommendation was approved. If there are additional IMLS funds available, Council decided to defer to WSL staff, the

State Librarian, and the Secretary of State to make the decisions on restoring funds to those proposals that were reduced.

INFORMATION SHARING AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- Mike announced that he and Secretary of State Sam Reed will meet with Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, regarding a recent decision by the State Board of Education to eliminate the WACs governing standards for school libraries and school librarians. There is a call to action for those who support school libraries to contact the State Board and the Superintendent with their concerns.

- Sharon thanked the WSL staff for pulling together all the information requested by Council.

- Council was directed to the materials in the handout folder:
  - Library Development Program staffing
  - Customer Service Survey – Subgrants and Service Improvement
  - CIPA
  - Advisory committees – Formation and membership
  - Update on LSTA Re-Authorization
  - WSL bi-monthly project reports
  - IMLS Primary Source Newsletter
  - Council Happenings – July News

WRAP UP; ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

- Debriefing on proposal process
- Election of officers
- Recommendation for appointment
- Mid-course report on a wrap-up initiative
- Library Development program staffing

NEXT MEETING

November 6, 2003, at the Microsoft Library, Redmond

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Yarbrough

Comments Related to Proposals Removed from Further Consideration on the Second Vote

CTC-CART

While the review committee received more information/clarification on the proposal and was impressed with the technology, it recommended against funding the proposal because:

- The proposal impacted a limited number of libraries; other proposals were more inclusive
- Although it seemed to be a good test project and potentially a great learning tool, questions remained about what was going to be done with the technology. There needed to be more discussion about how the technology would be used. The question needed to be answered about how the existing programs would be "better" as a result of this technology. Some statements were included about out-of-library use but these statements did not seem definitive – if the laptop lab stays in the library, why is it wireless; doesn't this limit bandwidth; wouldn't a hard-wired solution be better. Also if the project is considered as a test project that could be duplicated elsewhere or further expanded, additional discussion needs to be included in the proposal about how project information would be shared with other libraries.
- If the primary use is to teach information literacy, would other methods be both more effective and also more cost effective.

There appears to be potential in the technology in the future and the Council would be more supportive, if there is a more clearly stated and demonstrated need for the project.

COOPERATIVE AUTOMATED SYSTEMS

Although the review committee recommended funding for this proposal and funding was also recommended by the full Council on the first vote, the proposal failed on the final vote. Some of reasons it was not recommended for final funding were:

- The WSL consultant would provide a quarter-time or less service to the steering committee and a full-time consultant would be scheduled for only the last two months of the first year of the project; the consultant should be available from the start to help advise and to develop the 2005 proposal
- Formation of new consortia requires something much different than joining an existing consortia; a question remained concerning if enough time could be allotted to support those joining existing consortia and to also support the formation of new consortia.
- Looking at the proposed demand for FFY2005 LSTA funding, anticipated requests from continuing projects were larger than what was anticipated to be received; funding levels for LSTA would need to increase substantially to allow additional projects, e.g. Cooperative Automated Systems, to continue – receipt of increased LSTA funding for Washington is not anticipated for FFY2005.

On the first vote, the Council said it could be willing to support this proposal – but with no commitment to additional years until Council saw the results from the work of the steering committee. Council felt the project would need a strong steering committee for the project to be successful.

ORCA

While this is the next logical step to take and is important, it is the state's responsibility to fund this effort--not the responsibility of the State Library using federal LSTA money. Perhaps it should utilize a combination of funding from both the states of Washington and Oregon.