

Oregon State Library  
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**  
December 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013  
Oregon State Library, Salem

**STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETING**

**Thursday, December 19<sup>th</sup>:**

Board members present: Ebonee Bell, Aletha Bonebrake, Sam Hall, Ismoon Hunter-Morton, Ray Miao. Not present: Susan Hathaway-Marxer.

Guests present: Carol Dinges, Lebanon Public Library/LSTA Advisory Council, Wyma Rogers, LSTA Advisory Council, John Russell, University of Oregon Libraries/LSTA Advisory Council, Mo Cole, Oregon City Public Library/Public Library Division of the Oregon Library Association, Sarah Miller, Deputy Chief Operating Officer.

Staff present: MaryKay Dahlgreen, Margie Harrison, Shawn Range, Jessica Rondema, Susan Westin.

Chair Aletha Bonebrake called the meeting to order at 10:25 a.m.

**Review of Purpose and Agenda**

Bonebrake stated that the purpose of this strategic planning meeting is to look ahead, and to analyze the various components of the transformation plan and how the State Library is going to respond going forward.

**2015-2017 Budget Process**

Dahlgreen explained that this is the time of year when the Board normally begins to talk about the next biennium's budget. Our 2015-17 biennium budget request will be due in August 2014. The Governor's Balanced Budget is released in December, and will be heard by the Legislature in 2015. The Board is responsible for our budget. In the past, there has been a Budget Committee, which has included selected Board members as well a staff member from each team and managers. We had anticipated that a bill was going to be introduced in the 2014 short session from Senator Steiner Hayward, which would look at the bigger picture of the agencies that are involved in the transformation. Since a bill was not introduced, discussion is taking place between the organizations represented in the redesign about the 2015-2017 budget.

Policy option packages (POPs) are items that an agency can request that are outside of the current budget. A possible POP is the funding of the State Library Specialist 1 (SLS1) position in Talking Book and Braille Services, which is currently being paid for with donation funds. We have submitted a POP the last two biennia for the position and have not been successful. The Ready to Read Grant Program will require discussion by the Budget Committee as well. There was an interest in Ready to Read during the 2013 budget hearings, and there was an increase in funding for this program. The General Government Subcommittee of the Joint Ways and Means Committee discussed how to bring this program into the future, such as changing the name and

encouraging closer cooperation with ODE and the Early Learning Division. Katie Anderson, Youth Services Consultant in Library Development, is convening a task force to re-imagine the Ready to Read program. Bonebrake has asked Hall to participate in this task force on behalf of the Board. The task force includes staff from a variety of libraries, staff from the Department of Education, staff from the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), and others. Anderson will have a proposal from this taskforce for the Board in April 2014. In addition, we anticipate inclusion of the portal project in one of the partner's budget requests.

Last budget cycle, the governor was working on the ten year plan with program funding teams. This year, we will probably not receive budget instruction for another two months, although the process may be similar. We have an agency assessment, as do the Law Library and the Archives. We provide services to state agencies, and they pay us a certain amount of money, based on the number of staff and their past usage. A "fee for service" option could be considered for our Government Research Services, as DAS does with IT and Human Resources. The 2015-2017 price list has to be created and sent to agencies so they can build it into their budgets. We need to release it by the end of February. DAS, the Oregon Historical Society, and the three agencies (State Library, Law Library, and Archives) will be consulting together as each organization puts together a price list.

The Chair of the State Library Board will ask members to serve on the Board Budget Committee. The membership usually consists of three to four Board members, the managers, and one person from each team. Dahlgreen recommends this model for the 2015-2017 Board Budget Committee.

Hall asked if we have ever collaborated with other agencies to develop our price list in the past. Dahlgreen replied that we have not and that if pieces of an agency move during the 2015-17 biennium, the prices have to be taken into consideration as we create our assessment. The price list is essentially a bill for our services, based on an agency's usage two biennia ago. Range stated that we are required to develop our current service level, including our costs now, plus inflation. This will be submitted, along with any policy option packages. As we move through the transformation process, adjustments can be made at the Governor's budget level or the legislatively adopted budget level.

Miao asked Dahlgreen to clarify what she meant about the four organizations working together to develop their budgets. Dahlgreen said that we will be discussing who will be managing the portal, who will be taking certain collections, etc., and the associated costs. This will have an impact on each of the organizations' budgets.

### **Discussion with LSTA Council Representatives**

Three representatives from the LSTA Advisory Council were present for this discussion: Carol Dinges from the Lebanon Public Library, John Russell from the University of Oregon Libraries, and Wyma Rogers, retired librarian from the Newport Public Library. They would like guidance on how to approach the spending of LSTA funds. Most years, the conversations within the council are ad hoc about how things are going to be spent, rather than focusing on the big picture. For example, does the group intend to spend a certain percentage of the funds on statewide projects vs. competitive grants? The council's process has been somewhat reactive, rather than thinking more strategically. The five year plan is general, so it does not target specifics. The council may want to keep it a broad, open process, but it is worth discussing.

Three years from now, does the council want to have achieved specific goals in the Five Year Plan? The council wants to have the opportunity to have a broad conversation about direction and vision.

Bonebrake asked if there was a specific event or issue with the LSTA grants that brought this issue forward. Dinges replied that this year was not any less productive, but they were faced with tougher decisions. In the FFY 2014 grant cycle, the council could only fund half of the projects that were invited back, so they sensed the need for clear priorities. When deciding not to fund a project, it still may have value, but it might not fit the priority as closely as the next one.

Russell discussed the statewide database RFP process and the relationship between the Statewide Database program and the rest of LSTA. He also mentioned that the council would like the Board's feedback on action regarding the digitization consultant's report, which outlines potential approaches to Oregon's digital heritage.

Rogers commented that people on the council who aren't currently working in the library field receive reports like the digital collections report, but they don't know how it affects people's thinking. She would like to know how quickly the council should respond to changing recommendations about how libraries work together.

Russell reported that there is less money available, and that the amount of competitive grants was down this year from last year. The council also changes membership regularly, so new members sometimes have a social mission.

Dinges commented that the roles of libraries are rapidly changing, money is not available, and the needs of school libraries and public libraries are quite divergent. There is tremendous need for innovation and for trying new things. The need for statewide resources is greater than ever.

Rogers said that as OSL transforms, there may be a need for libraries to have access to new things that the State Library does. There may be things that LSTA funds can do to assist with the transformation.

Russell said the Board could state a specific strategic desire, such as early literacy, that they would like the council to focus on. They cannot say that all LSTA funds will promote one activity, but the council could actively pursue and encourage grants for specific topics. Other examples include serving the unserved or digitizing historical Oregon materials, if those are priorities for the Board.

Hall commented that because the legislature would like the State Library to no longer be involved in preserving the state's cultural heritage, should we no longer fund such projects?

Hunter-Morton said that the Board will need to talk about their preferences, as the Board has the final say. This would make the council's job easier, and she would really like to help.

Miao clarified that the council is looking for long-term goals or outcomes that the Board is hoping to see in the state. He said that while the Board's priorities may change, the long-term goals and values should not change year by year. He thinks the values should be for all libraries, not just public. But we need to find out what academic libraries want. Do we want to foster collaboration? We need to be clear about what the Board would like to accomplish.

Hunter-Morton mentioned that we have a great mission. Bonebrake said it is based on the Five-Year Strategic Plan.

Russell mentioned that for LSTA, the Five-Year Plan includes promoting literacy, providing access to information, and promoting a culture of evaluation. In his opinion, having been involved in this council for a while, it is very different year to year, with no long term continuous effect. Many projects have been variations on the same theme, but there has not been something overarching for the council to move toward.

Dahlgreen handed out copies of The Six Purposes of the Library Services and Technology Act 2010.

Bonebrake asked if the changing membership alters the continuity of decision-making. Russell said that members do not join the group with a particular agenda, but each person has different interests and represent different communities. Dinges said that it is good to have a changing board to look at the broader needs of libraries statewide. How much do we set aside for statewide projects versus competitive grants?

Dahlgreen explained the LSTA process. As part of the state grants program, we receive money from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, based on the Library Services and Technology Act. There are six purposes that go along with the act, and are statutory. It is up to each state whether they select one, a few, or all of the purposes on which to spend their money.

Two years ago, a group of people gathered together to create a five year plan. They looked at the State Library's goals, adopted in June 2012, to develop the Five-Year Plan. All of the money we spend needs to be spent on one these goals. All LSTA purposes are included in Oregon's Five-Year Plan goals.

Miao commented that every LSTA grant application he has read addresses the goals, but this does not help the council make their decisions. Grantees should know that a certain number of grants won't get funded. What the council needs from the Board is the following: what are the priorities, and if there are multiple projects that meet those priorities, how do you make the cutoff? He also stated that there is no guarantee that a continuing project will receive a higher score or get preferential treatment the second or third year, unless it meets certain criteria. Is the highest priority going to grants that can be duplicated?

Bonebrake said that these goals were established to meet the needs of the community on a broad basis. If the council is flexible enough to look at the transformation goals and see how the criteria might support these changes, it would be beneficial. Bonebrake would like the council to use their judgment and experience, but she appreciates the fact that they would like to know where to put the emphasis.

Hall has always been impressed with diligence and thoughtfulness of the council and is always willing to yield to what they bring to the Board from the library community. We should be spending our money on things professional librarians say we need. He would like the Board to have enough money for local, experimental attempts, especially if they can be duplicated. There has been a gap with regard to evaluating the successes in order to duplicate them. He is also responsive to the council's desire for more guidance, if they begin spending too much money on

competitive grants, for example. He welcomes more dialogue between the council and the Board, since some of the Board members have been out of the librarian business for years.

Hunter-Morton suggested that libraries need eBooks, as they are so expensive for individual libraries. She wonders if there is a way to fund more cooperative efforts. She has seen very successful early literacy programs and programs for adults. She is not certain that libraries need to digitize, as it is the function of the archives profession. She is interested in funding academic projects that benefit the whole community. She has many ideas and would be interested in assisting with brainstorming.

Russell mentioned balancing statewide projects versus competitive grants. He is sensing that competitive grants are still very important to the Board and are seen as roughly equal to statewide projects, and there is not a need for a radical change.

Bonebrake agreed with Russell. She said when something new comes up; that is the time to discuss the issue at hand. Some competitive grants are powerful, and could become statewide. Bonebrake said that Hunter-Morton made a good point about focusing on the issues that are currently facing libraries. The council could decide to focus on a current issue as people get used to something that is new.

Bonebrake wondered if the council could have a meeting in advance of receiving the grants to discuss what the members would like to focus on and what they see on the horizon.

Hall is leaning toward funding fewer competitive grants, asking if these projects are innovative or experimental enough to be expanded to statewide projects. He feels as if we have played around with digitization at the local level enough, and it is now time for some direction. He likes the model of not funding local digitization efforts for a few years, leaving it at the state level.

Russell mentioned that repeatability of a project is in the guidelines, but perhaps they need to emphasize it more strongly, as well as the innovative aspects. Perhaps they should give priority to innovative responses to problems rather than variations on a single theme.

Hall repeated that we have not spent enough time identifying the successes and duplicating them.

Dinges liked Hall's mention of goal number three, encouraging libraries to use the evaluation results, rather than simply putting them aside.

Bonebrake suggested that successful projects could be marketed more widely, so when a project is successful or interesting, people could be encouraged to replicate it in their own way.

Russell suggested that the council set aside some time to review past projects and discuss successes, engaging more with final evaluations.

Miao finds it very beneficial to have a portion of a meeting devoted to educating ourselves about what the issues are and what others are doing about it. He was very glad to see goal number three included in the goals, so the applicants can measure their success. He said if there is no evaluation, it does not seem that the project was thought through. When less money is available, we need tighter criteria and clear priorities. Miao is not sure whether statewide projects or

localized projects are more beneficial; he would like some more education on that. He would like applicants to research what else has been done.

Rogers commented that they have always had an evaluation as a criterion for receiving a grant. They wanted to push that every library evaluates itself on a regular basis, and then do something as a result.

Miao said that it is extremely difficult for small libraries to do this. They don't have the expertise, the staff, the time, or the money. They want to know what the community wants from its library.

Bonebrake sees the opportunity for a hybrid concept. If we look at a successful project like an early literacy project, which we could identify it as the year's project, putting it out as an option for applicants. Then accumulated money could pay for a consultant to assist libraries with this idea.

Miao commented that libraries should build up a cadre of people in the community to champion it. Perhaps, when evaluating projects, we could ask how it aggrandizes the library. Customers will be so thrilled with the services that they will become strong advocates if budgets are threatened.

Russell stated that this conversation has been very helpful in clarifying the Board's feelings on the subject of LSTA grants. He would like to repeat this at least every two years.

Dahlgreen read the annual decisions about expenditures portion of the LSTA Five-Year Plan:

*“LSTA funds may be used for statewide project and competitive grant programs that meet the priorities of the LSTA Plan. The LSTA Advisory Council will provide leadership to balance the funds directed to various LSTA goals and priorities. The council will annually recommend to the State Library Board anticipated funding ratios between statewide programs, whether administrated by the State Library or other fiscal agents, and the competitive grant program. The council may choose to recommend prioritizing certain Oregon LSTA goals in some grant cycles and announcing interesting grants that achieve several goals or inviting libraries to submit proposals to replicate successful projects. As needed, the council may recommend special requests for LSTA expenditures to the Board.”*

Dahlgreen said it looks like we will be using more of the council's time than we have in the past. Having a day where the council listens to reports about grant activities could be very beneficial. Maybe that day could become a planning day for what to recommend to the Board. Dahlgreen suggested an annual discussion with the Board.

Hall commented that there have been some studies, such as Envisioning Oregon and a study on law library services, which could relate to the spending of LSTA funds. Should the Board pay attention to the fact that school libraries are essentially gone in many places? Should we be commissioning a study to see what the State Library or LSTA funds can do to react to this? The idea would not be to replace school libraries, but to compensate somehow with additional children's programs. Are we neglecting something that we could compensate a little using federal money?

Russell said if there is extra year-end money, this could be a priority. They may be able to do some sort of impact study.

Rogers stated that Oregon School Library Information System (OSLIS) and Oregon Battle of the Books (OBOB) are wonderful programs, but they could be better used.

Hall sees that a lot of young people are using technology, and many do not have the funds. The library could help with training and equipment.

Dinges commented that information literacy and how to use the equipment is sorely lacking. Schools are not preparing kids for one of the most important skills in life.

Rogers said that even if kids can use technology, it is the critical thinking that is missing and needs to be encouraged.

As the mechanism for communicating its thoughts to the Board, Rogers said that the council would have its discussions and would come up with goals, but would not be requesting Board approval, necessarily.

Bonebrake agreed, saying it would be nice to hear about what the council is thinking and what the members are planning to focus on.

Dinges feels that if the council has this additional meeting, prior to evaluating the projects, it would be to set a goal or direction and decide what is most important to them. Then the council will communicate with the Board. She feels that she could be making better decisions with that in mind, looking at past projects. This discussion would need to take place before the grant applications go out in January. Having the meeting in November may be the best time or possibly in September if the fall meeting was extended. It is too late for this year, but could be implemented for next year.

In the grant guidelines, it could say that we are encouraging the following type of grant. It needs to be clear to the applicants before they submit their applications. Once a project has been evaluated, the council can encourage applicants to replicate it.

This will not be implemented until next year but the council can use it this year very generally. Ann Reed mentioned that the council can still make revisions to the guidelines in late January.

Miao wanted the guidelines to emphasize addressing more than one of the goals. He asked if we should rate projects more highly if they address two or three goals.

Dinges did not think this should be so, because sometimes the best projects are those that are extremely focused. Because the project's success needs to be measured, it cannot claim to address too many goals, unless the impact is more than tangential.

Dahlgreen suggested that this conversation be added to every December agenda. If the council has their discussion at their September meeting, they can report their direction to the Board in December.

Dahlgreen publically thanked John Russell for all his work on the LSTA Advisory Council. He has been the reporter for the LSTA for most of their Board appearances and has gone above and beyond.

Rogers commented that he has been a real leader in the committee, leading it toward creative thinking in this process.

## **OSL Organizational Structure**

The Board reconvened at 1:05 p.m. to discuss the Oregon State Library organizational structure. Dahlgreen began by giving an overview. The Oregon State Library is a team-based organization. We have been a team-based organization for twenty years, and have not done an analysis or evaluation on its effectiveness. Dahlgreen referred to the minutes from previous State Library Board meetings. In September 1991, the Board adopted new roles and a new mission for the State Library. It was at this time that the State Library stopped being the public library for the state and moved to the three teams, which would become Library Development Services, Talking Book and Braille Services, and Government Research Services. Dahlgreen could not find the moment when the Board approved a team-based organization. It appears that it evolved out of the restructuring of the staff.

The minutes from the June 5, 1992 meeting stated the denial of filling the deputy State Librarian position caused a rethinking of the organization. A new unit, Library Information Systems, was created to manage the online public access catalog and other automated systems. In October 1992, Scheppke reported the formation of the Library Council, which would meet monthly, and bring recommendations to the group.

Between 1992 and 1996, the staff was reduced from around 75 to around 55. Now we have 41 positions. Dahlgreen started at the library in 1996, when there was a flattening of the organization. Library Council still exists, and is most useful with regard to the committees, as the umbrella structure.

When Dahlgreen started in January 1996, we had just done a pilot project with TBABS to have a team-based organization. Government Research Services was a bit larger than it is now, with one program manager. LD and TBABS were together under one manager. The LAS team was primarily managed by the HR Manager. Consultants moved us through training for creating a team-based organization, including the necessary skills such as facilitation, conflict resolution, “X by Y or Call,” and “Plan, Do, Check, Act.”

Dahlgreen does not think that the team-based organization structure is working very well at the State Library. She has been discussing it with the managers. Everyone seems to have a different idea about what it means to be team-based. We have not followed up on the related training and there are a variety of understandings. The greatest drawback is that we have become very inward-focused. The focus should be on the customers, both internal and external, not the teams. There are expectations for the way the job is done.

Being inward-focused is not a good way to run a public organization. Dahlgreen is uncomfortable leading an organization that is so inwardly-focused. Some staff members have concerns about this as well.

What can we do to be the best state library? Dahlgreen has read the book *Good to Great*, by Jim Collins. How can we, as an organization, get to “great?”

Dahlgreen has been researching team-based organizations, a concept which has been around for over thirty years. Some of the teams in our organization are performing very effectively, and some are not. There are common dysfunctions of teams which relate to issues such as trust, the ability to have productive conflict, and focusing on results as a team.

Dahlgreen would like the State Library to explore other options for our organizational structure. She believes that working as teams is wonderful, but not just for the sake of being a team. We need to look at what we are attempting to accomplish. She wants to improve the organization, rather than improve the team-based organization.

She believes we will still have teams or work groups. But rather than trying to put everyone into the same structure, we need to figure out the best approach for getting our work done.

Jim Collins’ book, *Good to Great*, as well as *Good to Great for the Social Sectors*, is a very valuable resource. The author describes creating disciplined people, disciplined thought, and disciplined action.

Dahlgreen is asking for the Board’s approval to allow her to look for a way to approach this, to make us into a great organization. We have certain functions in each of our teams that could be combined to share the expertise. For example, each team does outreach, and it would be great to have an action team or a group devoted to this. We do have a few cross-team workgroups, such as the Volunteer Services Work Group and the Online Services Work Group.

Bonebrake agreed and encouraged Dahlgreen to explore options, since we are using an old concept.

Hunter-Morton said she loves flat structures, and they can work for nonprofits, but when getting things done, there needs to be leadership.

Bell said she was completely supportive of this idea, but wanted to know what structure Dahlgreen is planning to shift to.

Dahlgreen said she wants to look at what it is to be a great organization that provides really great service. We have not been working with the staff consistently, with regard to training and expectations.

Bell suggested that Dahlgreen is moving from team-based to service-based.

Hunter-Morton liked the idea of serving internal and external customers as well.

Miao said there are three distinct organizations within the Oregon State Library. We really need to come up with a statement that says, “What is the State Library?” He sees that Dahlgreen is asking a management question. He believes the Board should expect Dahlgreen to use current management techniques in a teambuilding environment, where people aren’t ostracized for taking chances. It should be collaborative and cooperative. How she accomplishes this is up to her, without the Board’s approval. He said that the Board trusts Dahlgreen to find something that

works. It is critical to determine your results, not how you will be achieving them. He suggested looking at what other libraries are doing.

### **OLA Public Library Division Standards**

Mo Cole, from the Oregon City Public Library, appeared in front of the Board, representing the Public Library Division (PLD) of the Oregon Library Association. The Board has been given an Executive Summary on the work that has been done on the public library standards out of the Public Library Division Board and standards committee. These standards will be posted on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, but the division wanted to talk to stakeholders first.

The Public Library Division is supposed to periodically review the public library standards. The standards had been broken out into sections, such as facilities, staffing, etc. The document would be reviewed sections at a time; the most recent review had been completed in 2010. The technology section has last been reviewed in 2004, so these standards were extremely out of date. The group needed to redo the entire document. They began by looking at how other states handled public library standards. In many states, the standards were developed by the state library, not the state's professional organization. Some states would offer accreditation for libraries, not just librarians. The group realized that the formatting of the standards makes a big difference in how usable they are and how easy it is to share them with interested parties.

The group met in big groups of more than twenty people from different levels within their organizations. They broke into smaller groups and renamed some of the standards. For example, "access" is no longer its own section, but it is interspersed into every aspect of the document. "Materials and services" are now two separate sections and "community involvement" is now "advocacy." They tried to have a quantitative formula for measuring space, in order for people to ask for funding. But many of the standards are more qualitative now, although still measurable to some degree.

The next step is to post these guidelines and open the discussion. Once the standards are adopted, they will be reviewed frequently. Once people begin using these standards, it will be easier to see which areas need to be revised.

They would also like to see potentially some support from the State Library, being one of their stakeholders. Perhaps create something that can identify libraries as a "star library," so they can prove that they have achieved something and it has been acknowledged.

Cole wanted to make sure the interested groups had some context before the standards were published. The Public Library Directors were very supportive. No other groups have seen it, but it will have been out for a few months before voting. This is intended to be a constantly evolving document. PLD has to be the unit that makes sure this document evolves with the profession.

The standards do not differ for different sized communities, but there are check-boxes, to show where each library is and what they are working toward. Everyone uses these standards differently. These guidelines become useful when a library is trying to build something, get more money for staffing, or going out for a levy. There is no mandatory usage of these guidelines in this state.

These standards are good to be able to provide libraries with some encouragement. Dahlgreen is recommending that we use these standards when identifying unserved and underserved, rather than using criteria created years ago.

Dahlgreen commented that PLD and Cole have done a wonderful job, keeping up with this project. Cole said the PLD Board has been wonderful, with some people making gigantic contributions.

Cole mentioned that she would be happy to appear before the Board again to discuss standards, whenever it fits in with the Board's activities.

### **TBABS Donation and Endowment Funds**

Westin referred to the document that was given to the Board with information about the TBABS Expendable and Endowment Fund. The Endowment Fund was created in 1997. In 2007, the Irene Price Society was created, to allow people to put TBABS in their will and receive recognition. The current interest rate on the Endowment Fund is 0.54%. There may be options to move monies around to different funds, but they have greater risk associated with them.

The current balance is 1.3 million, starting from a bequest of \$75,000 in 1988. Irene Price was a patron of TBABS, who loved the service. When her husband Thomas passed away, he bequeathed the money to the Oregon State Library for Talking Books. These monies were used as a starting base for the endowment fund. We received the family's blessings to use Irene's name in creating the Irene Price Society, which is a program that recognizes people who place Talking Book and Braille Services in their will or living trust.

We have been using the interest on the Endowment Fund to help fund the TBABS librarian position (8%). After an earlier staff reorganization, it became evident that TBABS needed a librarian position. The current librarian at that time was moved to a management position. A State Library Specialist 2 position was re-classed to a librarian position, but required additional funding.

In 2009, the funds were used for the transition to the digital collection, to purchase cartridges, boxes, and equipment. NLS only provided about a half of a collection, and the rest had to be paid from TBABS. For one biennium, we also used the interest to support a State Library Specialist 1 position. The current balance is \$29,000. We could probably support the librarian position until June 2016.

The donation fund began when TBABS moved to the State Library in 1969, from Multnomah County. The main purpose for this fund is enhancements, such as NFB-Newslines, the large-print calendars, recording Oregon books, and other things outside the main services. We are also using it to support volunteer and fund development.

Since 2011, TBABS has had to use the donation fund to support core services, such as our contract with Utah State Library, who provides our Braille services, and Keystone Library System, our ILS. This is due to legislative cuts to the general fund. Our subsequent policy packages were denied. The current balance is about \$146,000. Next fiscal year, there will be some very hard decisions about what can be supported. There will not be enough funds for the SLS1 and some of the core services. The SLS1 position costs \$47,000 per year.

Westin is bringing this to the Board not just due to the financial state, but asking what to do with the Endowment Fund. Our policy for this fund states that bequests, honorariums, memorials go into it. The policy states that the fund's purpose is to assure a long strong future for TBABS by building additional source of income that will supplement the federal contributions, the state general fund, and other donations to achieve its service objectives and goals.

If the interest rate were higher, we would probably be able to fund the SLS1 position. The money is currently with the state treasury. If we go under a foundation, we would have other options.

Dahlgreen commented that people give us donations in good faith, so it is incumbent upon the Board to decide how to use it. She wants to know if there is a way to move it to a foundation, without having to create a foundation specifically for the State Library. This week, we received the final portion of a donation totaling \$278,583.70 from someone who is extremely thankful for the service. We owe it to our donors to be intentional about what we are doing with the funding. If we do need to use it for operating costs, maybe need to look further afield. It may be difficult to take money from the state treasury to give it to a foundation. Miao suggested giving it to a foundation as a donation.

Shawn mentioned the other investment strategy, which moves with the market. We would have someone else invest our money for us, in stocks and bonds. It would not pay out regularly. We would need to do more research on this.

Westin posed the question of whether the Board would like us to take a small portion of the principle for special projects. Dahlgreen said we are asking for direction from the Board, since they have fiscal authority over these funds.

The SLS1 position in TBABS handles the day to day operations regarding the books and equipment. If we no longer had this position, SLS2s would have to help with those operations, and therefore have less contact with our patrons, checking in with them regarding the service. We are also trying to ensure we have a robust collection, which requires work to monitor and make copies.

Most patrons receive digital books on a USB drive in the mail. About 20% can download the books for themselves.

Hunter-Morton commented that the SLS1 technician positions fulfill essential services, as well as the SLS2s with their contact with patrons.

Miao wanted to know what functions could be done with volunteers. We already have volunteers helping with inspection and prepping the books that come in from NLS. We need to balance the work of volunteers with that of professional staff.

Hunter-Morton said that libraries cannot be run entirely by volunteers, as is the case with hospitals and schools. Libraries are educational institutions providing professional services.

Bell expressed concern about cutting a paid position and having volunteers do the work, because it could show the state that we didn't need those positions.

At 2:23 p.m., Chair Bonebrake left the meeting due to illness. Hall had also left the meeting at 12:30 p.m., due to illness.

Dahlgreen said we absolutely cannot replace paid staff with volunteers. It sounds like Miao is discussing redeploying resources, looking at where we need staffing. We are moving toward digital, and will have other needs, such as training, outreach, etc.

Bell summarized that we are going to look into other funds with higher interest rates and look at redeploying resources without cutting a position. The other option is using some of the principle for a project.

Miao would like to see a long-range projection, to see what percentage of the principle would be going away in relation to the replenishment. Miao would be in favor of using some of the principle to solicit bequests, if we had a foundation.

### **OSL Transformation**

The Board re-adjourned at 3:00 p.m. Dahlgreen handed out two documents: Oregon State Library Transformation Progress (December 19, 2013) and the Oregon State Library Draft Strategic Plan. She used the outline from the Utah State Library for the draft strategic plan. The document features the Mission, Shared Values, Vision, and Goals, ending with Activities, Measures, and Outcomes. The last three sections should be created by the staff. Dahlgreen has requested a copy of a book called *Building Your Library Strategic Business Plan*. The other document shows our progress on the transformation.

Sarah Miller, Deputy COO, approached the table to speak with the Board. Last time she spoke with the Board, we had just received the letter from Senator Steiner Hayward and Representative Nathanson. Since then, she has met with the Transformation Advisory Committee to have a conversation based on the new direction we have been given. She has also spoken with the Oregon Library Association Legislative Committee, per Janet Webster's request. Regarding the letter from the legislators, if there are questions, Miller has agreed to seek clarification. The four entities had questions that were answered as an amendment to the letter.

The Governor's expectation is that the State Library is building plans toward implementing the recommendations that the legislature has provided. Dahlgreen wanted Miller to give us the lay of the land as it relates to the business planning as an informational tool to think about what might be the budget requests for the State Library, and that Dahlgreen has been asked to move forward with the recommendations, even if there are portions of the recommendations that the Board does not like.

There are currently two projects - a single online portal for all four entities, and a series of recommendations to be implemented. Allyson Ford, from the COO's office, is leading the portal project.

The portal being discussed would allow access to all the collections at the State Library, State Law Library, Oregon Historical Society, and the Archives. We also need to be talking with the university libraries. These are very large issues, which are in the very early stages of discussion. Technically, there is a continuum of options for a portal ranging from shared search results from the four organizations, to a fully integrated ILS. The costs vary widely. We are trying to identify the business requirements for what all four of the organizations need.

Susan Allen, from the COO's office, is managing the projects to include participation from all four organizations. Dahlgreen has already begun some of the work on the transformation items that involve only the State Library. One specific item of note as it relates to transitioning the Federal Documents Repository to the State Archives - there are specific business and operational requirements of this program by the Superintendent of Documents in the Government Printing Office.

Conversations continue as to how to encourage all parties to continue to be engaged in the planning process to implement the recommendations as we build toward agency request budgets for the 2015-17 biennium.

Finally, Miller reported that they have been meeting with Labor once a month to provide updates.

Miao asked what the functional role of GRS will be. We anticipate that staff will be doing more outreach, providing training on the tools that we provide and selecting valuable resources that are not freely available. Miller mentioned that there are other ways that the State Library can expand business. The seven or so agency libraries may become the responsibility of the State Library. The libraries might not be physically combined, but the other libraries may serve as satellite locations. This would also allow for better outreach opportunities.

Miao asked if we would be a resource for not just state government agencies, but non-Salem based local governments.

Dahlgreen discussed the pilot project that GRS has with the Multnomah County Health Department. This is a very entrepreneurial project. Someone who works at the Multnomah County Health Department used to work for the state and was a heavy user of State Library services. GRS is piloting a project where OSL would provide the necessary databases and information retrieval for Health Department staff while charging a fee for service.

Miao asked if there was any discussion about having a flat, universal budget for the State Library, rather than a fee for service, that would allow OSL to provide any reference service in the state.

Miller said the mechanism that would make this possible would be a general fund appropriation. Ninety-three percent of it goes to K-12 education, public safety, corrections, and Medicaid. We did get a small general fund appropriation for Ready to Read. But this would probably not a very successful strategy for OSL.

The Historical Society charges money to use their services unless you live within Multnomah County or are a member. There was a lot of concern that we are taking a free access model to a fee access model. The Senator expects a conversation for funding to support free access.

Dahlgreen wants us to clarify the difference between public library use and state library use. We have a public building, where anyone can come in to use our resources. We have staff who are trained to work with state agencies. We haven't been mission-focused. We need to be focused on what we are supposed to do. We need to be more disciplined, doing activities because they are part of our mission.

We expect to report to the Legislature that we will redirect the money we will save from the activities we will discontinue, to pay for additional services that support the recommendations in the letter. There are three different budget stages in the budget process: the Agency Request Budget (submitted in August for small agencies), the Governor's Recommended Budget (released in December in non-election years), and the Legislatively Approved Budget (end of the Legislative session). The price list is set and published when agencies receive budget instruction in March. DAS includes the price list in the instructions. The price list is set on current services, and then policy option packages are included. OSL will submit this in January, possibly with a significant investment for the cost of the portal project. The State Law Library and the Archives are also assessment driven. The price list only collects revenue from state agencies. If we were to collect revenue from another source, we would use a policy option package, showing the revenue earned and what we will use it for. This is why a business plan will be necessary.

Miao is hearing Miller say that if we want to start a different way of doing business within GRS, separate from charging state agencies, the state won't fund the start-up costs. We would need to show proof of principle, before they would allow us to continue.

Dahlgreen said we have small, loyal, customer base in GRS. The sidelines are ways to make a little bit of money. The bigger issue is that we become the library for state agencies. Maybe instead of an assessment, we do a basic service package for the assessment, and then we charge more for heavy users.

Miao asked if there was any mention of Library Development services in the transformation report. Dahlgreen went through the report with the Board.

## **BOARD MEETING**

**Friday, December 20<sup>th</sup>:**

Board members present: Ebonee Bell, Aletha Bonebrake, Sam Hall, Ismoon Hunter-Morton, Ray Miao. Not present: Susan Hathaway-Marxer.

Guests present: Carol Dinges, Lebanon Public Library/LSTA Advisory Council.

Staff present: MaryKay Dahlgreen, Darci Hanning, Margie Harrison, Shawn Range, Jessica Rondema, Arlene Weible, Susan Westin.

Chair Aletha Bonebrake called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Miao commented that the minutes reflected the staff's very astute comments regarding the transformation. The minutes from the October 25, 2013 Board Meeting were approved.

### **REPORTS OF BOARD CHAIR AND TRUSTEES**

#### **Executive Committee Report**

The minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting on November 18, 2013 were included in the Board packet.

#### **Other Board Reports**

Hall reported on the campaign to raise money for the Salem Public Library to expand and renovate the children's room. They may meet their goal by the end of the year. They have received contributions from the Oregon Community Foundation and Collins Foundation, as well as individual gifts. They received very good press about their fundraising. The Ursula Le Guin event did not raise much money, but she gave a tremendous presentation with many questions and answers.

Hall visited Government Research Services. They talked primarily about the transformation and the staff's concerns about the direction we are heading. They are waiting patiently, although they are a bit puzzled as to how to constructively contribute.

Bell visited Library Development. She felt that there was a lot of uncertainty about the transformation and low morale among the staff. At the same time, they are interested in the reorganization, and are concerned that they should be starting on the aspects that can be taken care of now. For example, they are willing to assist GRS with cataloging, in preparation for sending the items to another organization. They also feel that the Center for the Book is not being best served by the State Library. They feel that a tight focus is better. They would like to be audited by the Board, to tell them on which items they should focus. They are excited about partnering with other organizations, for volunteer services, for example. LD is also thinking about a marketing campaign to market their services to patrons directly, such as Learning Express. They also discussed helping libraries become valued beyond databases and access. They made suggestions about the possibility about partnering with local businesses. There is a

lot of positive energy coming from this group. They have many good ideas and are looking for direction, focus, and new opportunities in training.

Hunter-Morton visited TBABS. They had just participated in a retreat where they visited and toured the Oregon Textbook and Media Center, which distributes student textbooks that are transcribed into Braille. This was followed by lunch and then sorting toys at the Salvation Army. TBABS talked about the BARD app, which allows patrons to download talking books. They talked about the need to engage the community to get the word out. They had a discussion about the idea of having a digital recording studio. This recording studio would allow them to create content for not much more money than the books cost.

Bonebrake also visited TBABS, and said that this sounds like a very positive idea. It would also give Robin many volunteers to manage. There are talented people in the community who are making offers. We could even rent the recording studio to others.

Hunter-Morton said they discussed the TBABS cassette collection and how easy it would be to transform it into a digital collection. They also talked about the twelve DVDs they have in their collection. It would be nice to have two or three per quarter.

Miao met with Library Administrative Services. Their feelings regarding the transformation seemed to echo the other teams. He discussed how we receive information when everything is in flux. We received our final portion of a bequest of \$278,000 from a patron of TBABS. He asked how we acknowledge and give thanks to the heirs. For any amount donated, Westin sends a letter of thanks. For amounts over \$100, Dahlgreen signs the letter. For donations over \$500, Dahlgreen gives them a call. The team talked about general morale, and that they are just doing their jobs, not knowing where we are going to end up. Some of them think they are the most at risk, because of enterprise-wide services. Everything administration does could be moving to DAS. Miao asked them if the union contract allows them to keep their jobs, but go over to DAS. Or would they need to find other employment. He thinks Sarah Miller should discuss this with the union, and then convey it to the staff. Basically, everyone is concerned about their job, not just what they are doing, but will they even have a job here? They want to be at the State Library. Doing the same job at another agency is not the same as at the State Library.

Miao shared an example of a packet that his library is now giving out to everyone, including every newborn. It is a marketing campaign, which tells you what each library does and what they feature. They advertise for the foundation and the friends of the library. These publications feature the events for kids, young adults, and adults, such as summer reading, program prizes, and fundraisers. There are always acknowledgements of the friends groups and the work of the foundation. It is a very impressive campaign. There are bookmarks with locations, hours, phone numbers, and pertinent information. Dahlgreen thinks this would be a fantastic idea for the State Library.

## **REPORTS OF THE STATE LIBRARIAN AND STAFF**

### **Plinkit Websites**

Darci Hanning, Technology Development Consultant in Library Development, gave a report on Plinkit websites. We are moving away from using the Plinkit tool, but not moving away from promoting web access for libraries. We have about fifty libraries still using Plinkit. It was

originally intended to enable the smallest libraries to have a web presence. After ten years, we are phasing out this tool.

Plinkit began as an LSTA grant in 2003, managed by Multnomah County Library. Ten libraries joined the pilot project. The goal was to have a ready-to-go website with the basic content and structure that could be easily replicated for individual libraries. In fall 2005, Plinkit was transitioned to the State Library, staffed by the Technology Development Consultant, Darci Hanning. A technical writer was hired to assist with creating a user manual. The program was launched in the spring 2006. The Plinkit Collaborative was formed in July 2006, which was a fee-based membership organization. At one point there were seven states active, while currently there are five (Illinois, Colorado, Texas, Michigan, and Oregon). The states have anywhere from 30 to 300 libraries using Plinkit. In Oregon, there are about 60 using it currently. A few libraries have stopped using Plinkit, preferring to use something else, including their city's website. This is a success, because using Plinkit has taught them what they need from website. It is a high-demand job for the State Library staff to continue: new libraries, new features, training, system support, etc.

The needs of the Plinkit Collaborative are changing. Some states are hosting the server and software themselves, while others are using a third party. The collaborative itself has been shrinking. We might be able to shift the focus of the collaborative. It is looking to have two different kinds of membership. Some states are interested in a third party vendor to replicate Plinkit, which would be the first tier membership. Others would like to host their own platform, using different software, which would be the second tier membership.

In Oregon, city and county IT departments are stepping up to provide assistance for libraries, library staff is becoming more capable with regard to technology, and library-specific website providers are more common and affordable.

The collaborative would like to develop a transition plan, to find a better way to provide a service that better meets the needs of libraries and enables State Library staff to do other things. Hanning is looking at affordable alternatives to meet libraries needs. We may be able to provide some level of financial support during the transition. Ideally, this will reduce the dependency on State Library staff, as libraries take more ownership of their website. They will also have access to new features that we haven't been able to take advantage of. The State Library will have staff and funding to provide and coordinate technology training throughout the state, and provide support for technology projects that will benefit the entire state.

Dahlgreen said that when Hanning started at the State Library eight years ago, she was thrown into working with Plinkit. Dahlgreen praised Hanning for her work and hopes to now be able to use her more effectively. She also said that discontinuing support of Plinkit took people by surprise. Hanning has done a phenomenal job of explaining this transition to libraries and the library community.

Hanning said that she has enjoyed working with Plinkit, and it has been amazingly successful. The best part for her has been working with the libraries in Oregon.

Bonebrake was impressed that we are taking the time to develop a transition plan, rather than simply saying it is out of our hands.

## Activities Since the Last Meeting

A number of Board members have expressed an interest in Board training. Rondema and Dahlgreen have been talking about this in terms of improving Board orientation. Dahlgreen came across United for Libraries, which is the friends and trustees arm of the American Library Association. We have purchased a membership to United for Libraries for the Oregon State Library Board of Trustees. This will give Board members access to resources and training. She will bring the login information to the February meeting.

Each Board member was provided with a copy of *Complete Library Trustee Handbook*. It has very good information in it which will be valuable to library board members. She will be working with Bonebrake throughout the year to see if the Board can do some of the training together and have discussions.

Dahlgreen has put together a list of the recent activities of OSL that she would like to share with the Board. She attended the COSLA (Chief Officers of State Libraries Agencies) meeting in Savannah, GA. It was the organization's 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary. They were working on strategic planning. The discussions centered on how state libraries fit in to the national library scene, what are our responsibilities, our strengths, and what should we be spending our energy on. The winter COSLA meeting will be at ALA midwinter in Philadelphia, which Dahlgreen will attend. She is part of the library statistics working group for COSLA that works with IMLS on public library statistics and research. She is also the COSLA liaison to the American Library Association. She also attended the Western Council of State Libraries meeting, which always meets in concert with COSLA.

In November, Westin and Dahlgreen attended the National Federation of the Blind Oregon's annual conference in Salem. Dahlgreen, Westin, and Dacia Johnson, Executive Director of the Commission for the Blind, discussed what is going on in state government. The Commission is involved in the transformation that the Governor is making for the workforce development. The commission does vocational rehabilitation and professional development.

Dahlgreen worked with OLA President Penny Hummel to create an Oregon library wish list for an Oregon Community Foundation potential donor, based on some discussions she has had with Library Development, and things the library community has discussed. Miao asked to receive a copy of the wish list.

Dahlgreen appointed the implementation team for the Statewide Cooperative Reference Project (Answerland) and started discussions with Portland Community College Library about potentially becoming the fiscal agent for the project. Beginning July 2014, Multnomah County Library will no longer be the fiscal agent.

We have had two lectures recently: one from Charles Johnson about his book, *Standing at the Water's Edge: Bob Straub's Battle for the Soul of Oregon*, and one from Bill Sullivan about his book, *D.B. Cooper & the Exploding Whale: Folk Heroes of the Northwest*. These were the last lectures of our lecture series. The Center for the Book has been working on Oregon Reads 2014 for a year so we will be having Kim Stafford speaking at the State Library in April for National Poetry Month. We will also be doing an exhibit of William Stafford materials, under the auspices of Center for the Book.

The Wellness Committee held an apple and pear tasting event and dart tournament.

GRS received training from the Employee Assistance Program on working with difficult patrons and customer service. There has been some concern about difficult patrons in the reference room, since we are a public building. We also had the Oregon State Police present a training for all staff on violence in the workplace and active shooters. The new lieutenant on the mall has been coming to different agencies to give these extremely valuable trainings.

Westin and Dahlgreen were invited to attend the annual Public Library Director's meeting, which is an independent group of library directors that OLA Public Library Division convened this year. It was held at the Hillsboro Public Library. They were warmly welcomed, and they gave an update on the State Library Transformation. There were fifty directors present and they are considering meeting twice a year.

Dahlgreen had a meeting with the director of SMART (Start Making a Reader Today), who are currently reinventing themselves. Ten years ago there was a lot of jealousy about this program with other organizations. Dahlgreen had a very good discussion with Chris Otis, the executive director. Dahlgreen will probably attend one of their meetings to talk about libraries and how we can partner.

Dahlgreen contacted John Cole, director of the Center for the Book in Library of Congress. He said what we have been directed to do with this program is fine. There are many states that have their Center for the Book with the humanities council. Dahlgreen then contacted Adam Davis, director of Oregon Humanities, about moving the Center for the Book. Davis has spoken with his board, and they are interested. Dahlgreen wanted our Board to know that this is the direction she is moving and would like to receive their blessing to move ahead. We would keep the Intellectual Freedom Clearing House and the Oregon Authors website at the State Library. We would need to work with another organization to deal with the Poetry collection, which is also part of the Center for the Book. Janet Webster, from the Guin Library for OSU in Newport, and Chantal Strobel from Deschutes Public Library and Library Foundation, are on the Board of Oregon Humanities. Both of them have an understanding of what the Center for the Book is all about and have had discussions with Katie Anderson. We have not been able to give this program the attention that it deserves. Oregon Humanities is interested in the interplay between books and people. They are looking into doing an adult letters program as a partner to the Letters about Literature program. The Board gave Dahlgreen permission to move ahead with this.

Hunter-Morton wanted to know what will be done with the Oregon Poetry Collection. She has some ideas, so she will talk with Katie Anderson. It is a partnership with the Oregon Poetry Association.

Dahlgreen attended the IMLS Library Statistics Working Group, as a COSLA representative. She noted that the IMLS research staff is very impressive. They are creating research briefs, such as one on small and rural libraries. They take large studies from the U.S. Department of Education and other organizations and analyze the data as it relates to libraries. Dahlgreen will send the Board members a link to the briefs.

The OSL Annual Holiday Potluck was held on Tuesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, which was quite entertaining. Jey Wann creates a parody song, sung by a group of staff. Renata Pilotto was the emcee and organizer. It was a very nice time.

## **OPEN FORUM**

Anne Morter, Chairman of the Board or Directors of the Ione Library District, called in to speak to the Board. Ione had decided not to apply for the Ready to Read Grant, because they have only been a district for one year. They looked at the materials and thought it was too complicated and that they did not have enough information. After the deadline, Katie Anderson from the State Library called to encourage them to apply for the grant. She explained the appeals process, and they decided to submit the application.

Anderson added that after she discussed the grant process with Ione, they began to work on the application right away, following up with a few questions.

Dahlgreen encouraged them, as a new library district, to contact Library Development at the State Library. Morter said they have been in touch, and received assistance in setting up their website.

Miao had a question about whether they want to increase activity for the summer reading program or increase comprehension. Anderson will contact Morter about this.

---

Elizabeth Tice appeared before the Board, representing the Willamette Valley Genealogical Society. They have a letter to submit to the Board. They want to address the Board regarding two issues. One relates to public access to the Oregon State Library's historic and genealogical collections. At some point in the past, librarians actively collected genealogy books, using taxpayer money. The library has a unique collection that very few libraries have, including books from all over the country. There are over 220 volumes of the Massachusetts vital records, a complete set of Pennsylvania archives, early records of Connecticut, New Jersey, and many more. Many books have been donated with the knowledge that they will be available to the public, free of charge. Some are signed by the author or descendant, especially family histories. Many have been digitized and are now available on the internet, but they are no substitute for original records.

Tice showed the Plymouth Colony Records, which were just recently used by very happy patrons, reading about their ancestors. This set dates back to 1857. Looking through this is not an experience you can get on the internet. If this was moved to Oregon Historical Society, they would need to pay to look at this book. Another example is the Report of the Adjutant General from 1865. The patron was ecstatic to look at this and discovered two family members that had served together in the Civil War. This was a donation from one state to another.

Tice wanted to make the point that the Board members are the trustees of these books, and they should, in the opinion of WVGS, should remain here.

The other issue Tice mentioned has to do with our mission statement and functions of the library. The mission does not mention books, nor does it mention collecting, preserving, or making

historical and cultural materials accessible to Oregonians. WVGS believes it should be part of the State Library's mission.

Hunter-Morton asked how one gets funding as a genealogy association.

Tice said that their organization is unique because of the partnership. They have built a large collection and have continued to donate materials to the library. Part of our agreement is that WVGS provides volunteers to be available in the reference room, helping with genealogy

Hunter-Morton asked about Salem Public library or a local history room as an option? Tice said that Salem Public Library does not have any space for their collection.

Hunter-Morton suggested they contact Geoff Wexler at the Oregon Historical Society. Tice said they have connected, but are waiting to see what will happen. The expense here includes the building, some staff, not a lot of cataloging; they provide the volunteers. Their opinion is that the best place for the collection is at the State Library. It is understandable that state agency assessment shouldn't pay for this. But she feels that it could be general fund money, or other ways to do this other than moving everything to the Oregon Historical Society.

Bonebrake commented that having Tice speak with the Board has been very valuable, to hear from the users, supporters, and volunteers, getting a sense of how beneficial this partnership has been. This has been a unique, symbiotic relationship. They are not being ignored in this whole process. The State Library is looking at how to best keep things accessible and supportable.

Hall commented that as a Board, they are being given directives about the direction in which the library moves and how to spend the money. This is coming from the Legislature, so he feels that they are the ones to be convinced.

Tice replied that they have done some campaigning at the Legislature as well, but felt that the Board should know that people are still enjoying free access to materials and to the reference room. She said they understand that their society is collateral damage in this process, and they will find another place or do something different. But regarding the access for Oregonians and maintaining the collection, they would hate to see something happen to it.

Miao confirmed that WVGS's main concern is to keep the collection intact, but where it resides is secondary. And that their other concern is to have free access with someone who can facilitate the access to the materials.

Tice does not know if the Oregon Historical Society has room for their collection. And they charge for access, while these items were purchased with taxpayer money.

Bonebrake said that the issue of access is very much on the table.

Miao asked if the Oregon Historical Society could accommodate the collection, provide access and assistance, would there be any objections?

Tice said no, but their society would be hurt. They are more concerned with the collection. But she mentioned that the WVGS volunteers would be willing to help maintain the collection here, and put in more hours in the reference room, but they would not be willing to volunteer in Portland.

---

Krist Obrist, director of the Monmouth Public Library, appeared before the Board. She was hired in August 2004 as the children's librarian, so she knows the importance of the Ready to Read grant. On May 1, 2013, she was named interim director, and was appointed director on July 1<sup>st</sup>, while still wearing both hats. She has been learning her new job and recruiting for a new children's librarian.

She asked Ferol Weyand and Katie Anderson if she could copy and paste last year's grant, to submit as a placeholder until she had a children's librarian on board. At that point, that person could move forward with filling out the grant application with his or her programming needs. She was in contact with Anderson two days before the deadline. She prepared the packet, but realized she failed to get it into the mail. She hopes that her oversight does not hinder her library, the children's librarian, and the community.

Obrist says they now have hired a wonderful children's librarian.

Miao asked if they were going to leave it up to the new staff member to choose which program to pursue. Obrist wanted to let her decide so she could work under her terms with regard to programming.

Anderson will treat this as a change to the grant activities. She will also provide coaching to the new children's librarian about outcome-based evaluations and Ready to Read to walk her through the process.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Appeal of Staff Decisions on Ready to Read Grant Awards**

Bonebrake felt that the issue is very clear regarding the appeal of staff decisions and that they each had very understandable stories. Westin said that Anderson verified that this is the first time these organizations have submitted an appeal.

**Hall made a motion to grant the Ready to Read appeals to Ione Public Library and Monmouth Public Library. Bell seconded the motion. The motion passed with one opposition by Hunter-Morton.**

Miao encouraged Ione Public Library to focus when they work with Anderson. This is an opportunity to relearn what summer reading programs are about. They need to have some measurements about what they will accomplish.

Bonebrake commented that staff members in Library Development are there to help libraries.

Anderson noted that libraries are going through a coaching period for outcome-based evaluations. She has been working one-on-one with the 31 libraries that were completely off base. There is a system in place currently. Ione's grant has some improvement, but they had enough that they were able to be approved. Miao was glad here about the strong coaching component.

Hunter-Morton questioned the Board's decision to give exceptions for late grant applications.

Bonebrake explained that there is a special legislative appropriation given to us to raise the level of reading for all the children in the state. When a library appeals with a plausible reason, we take that very seriously. If an organization came a second time, we would say no. It has also been the Board's habit to allow them to participate in this program that is not competitive.

Dahlgreen said that with LSTA grants, we are very serious about deadlines.

Anderson also said she was very willing talk with Hunter-Morton about the grants.

Bonebrake apologized for not asking for discussion before the vote about granting the Ready to Read appeals.

### **Post-Transaction Review of Agency Head Financial Transactions**

Hathaway-Marxer, as the Vice chair, receives the reports all year of travel and expenses, etc. She double-checks them to make sure that she agreed with the tallying. Hathaway-Marxer called Bonebrake, knowing she could not make it to the meeting today, and said that she approves of the financial transactions and made the motion that they be approved. **Bonebrake made the motion as Hathaway-Marxer's proxy that the agency head financial transactions be approved. Hall seconded the motion.** Miao asked about the small purchase order transaction system (SPOTS) purchase card, which is a Visa card. Three people in the agency have these cards. Dahlgreen does not have a SPOTS card. **Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Election to Board Advisory Councils**

Miao found it difficult to vote just based on what the candidates have written. Westin explained that when the call goes out, asking if anyone is interested, they are asked to write a short biography and information about their interests and skills.

Dahlgreen said that everyone on the ballot would be an asset. It is just a matter of thinking back to who is currently on the councils and what expertise is available. We try to do a geographic distribution, as well. Dahlgreen said since these are all excellent candidates, she would err on the side of geographic distribution. Perhaps it would help to ask very specific questions of these candidates for future elections.

The Board voted for members to fill the Oregon State Library Advisory Council vacancies. The results are as follows:

TBABS

Reading Disabled Position: **Mike Tobias**

LSTA

Academic Library Representative: **Serenity Ibsen**

Information Technology Representative: **Blake Galbreath**

Library User Representative: **Corliss Marsh**

Public Library Representative: **Terri Washburn**

Underserved/Underrepresented Persons Representative: **Jacqueline Murphy**

Hunter-Morton thought that the library user representative would be a library user that she knows using the public library, rather than someone who has been on boards and foundations.

Dahlgreen commented that it is very difficult to recruit library users. When this position opens again next October, she will ask the staff to work with Hunter-Morton.

There was a discussion of the Board's role in the reorganization of the State Library and their role as a policy making Board.

Bonebrake referred to the request of the GRS Advisory Council to retain the current membership, given the time of transition and the deep knowledge base that is required to work this through.

**Miao made a motion to retain the current membership of the GRS Advisory Council. Hall seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Statewide Database License Proposal**

Carol Dinges from Lebanon Public Library approached the Board representing the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee of the LSTA Advisory Council. The chair, Jane Nichols, did a very good job summarizing what the committee came up with. She explained the committee's process, which was almost more important than the final result, since they learned so much from it. They spent about the same amount of time preparing the RFP as they did evaluating the proposals that were submitted. They felt that what they asked for was critical. The biggest issue was that different libraries have different needs and there is no "one size fits all." They broke it into four specific categories: general periodicals, academic journals, general reference such as encyclopedias, and general reference as contemporary issues. They thought that by breaking it into categories and allow companies to apply in all four categories, or any one, this would be the best way to find products that were best suited for each type of library.

The Department of Administrative Services (DAS) understands the RFP process, keeping it legal and fair. Two representatives did an outstanding job of leading them through the process. Within each category they looked at specific categories like the system environment such as online compatibility with web browser, operating systems, etc. Another was the system interface: ADA accessible, translatable into other common languages, consistent links, etc. Did they provide training and service? Finally, they looked at the system content itself, which was rated highly. What kinds of materials were available and were they full text?

They spent a great deal of time determining what would be required and what would be highly desirable. The committee goes through the written proposals, eliminating some immediately, while inviting others to continue. Each member of the advisory committee spent a great deal of time reviewing each of these items and rating them. It was time-consuming but very worthwhile. Then they met to have discussions before submitting their numbers for each of the items. DAS took the numbers and based on the percentages agreed upon before hand and the price, they determined the highest rated.

The academic library community was disappointed that EBSCO was not the successful proposer, since their content is much more valuable to their constituents.

The committee was made up of a good balance of people from K-12, public, academic, and special libraries.

Dinges feels that they have a very good product. Due to the proposed price the committee recommends that the Board pay the full cost with LSTA funds.

Nichols summarized the recommendations regarding the K-12 general reference product that we will consider if there is money remaining. Also, they plan to work with the university libraries to see if there can be a subsidy or work through Orbis Cascade Alliance, for another product. The goal is to reach all libraries,

Bonebrake asked if there was the opportunity to let out these categories separately. Yes, because they may have gotten a better price. The same winner resulted from the separate categories and the composite.

Weible clarified that at the stage where the companies were in different categories were different. When the rankings were done based on the evaluation only, the top three were very close in every category. There were clear winners. They had to get to a place where there are more distinct winners. They were advised to do another evaluation based on rolling up the categories.

Westin commented that the price came later. If they set price parameters at the beginning, they would not have gotten all the potential applicants.

Dahlgreen said they didn't look at a limit because we could have used a subsidy model. Dahlgreen's limit in her mind was their current spending. They haven't negotiated with Gale, so we don't know yet how much extra will be left. The contract length still needs to be negotiated.

**Hall made a motion for approval to have the State Library will move forward with negotiating a contract with The Gale Group, Inc. for the Statewide Database Licensing Program (SDLP) (Recommendation 1.a.) and that the State Library not pursue a subsidy model for this procurement (Recommendation 1.b.). Miao seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Bell asked what the academic libraries will do for databases. They will have access to the statewide databases and will purchase additional databases to serve their constituents which many public libraries do as well.

Recommendation 1.c. asks that SDLAC support a separate procurement for a general encyclopedia product for the K-12 library community, working with the State Library to explore funding options. Hall would like to ask the committee to follow through on this item.

Dahlgreen clarified that the LSTA Advisory Council recommends that the SDLAC more forward looking at the general encyclopedia. They recommended that the committee not move forward exploring a way to provide more database support to academic libraries. They recommend that

the discussion with Orbis Cascade Alliance be tabled until May 2014. The State Librarian recommends that the SDLAC proceed with both discussions, so they can look at options now.

Weible offered her perspective, explaining that the council made the recommendation to table the academic issue as a way of communicating their priorities. They believe that the general encyclopedia for K-12 is a higher priority. Most academic libraries are already paying for Ebsco, but the majority of K-12 schools will go without if they cannot get an encyclopedia option.

**Hall moved to accept the recommendation of the State Librarian to pursue options for the general encyclopedia for K-12 and support for databases for the academic libraries at the same time, knowing that K-12 may emerge as the priority. Bell seconded the motion.**

Miao felt that the Board should state their priority (K-12 versus academic library community) for the benefit of the LSTA Advisory Council.

Dahlgreen is not advocating stating which is more important. She would like them to look at both options and report back. Dahlgreen doesn't think the Board should say which is a higher priority overall.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Bonebrake thanked Carol Dinges and Arlene Weible. They have done an astonishing job. Dahlgreen gave kudos to Weible for taking this on after being thrown into it.

## **PLANS FOR NEXT MEETING**

The next Board meeting is scheduled on February 21<sup>st</sup> at Concordia University.

Remaining 2014 Board meetings:

- April 16<sup>th</sup> at the Oregon State Library in Salem due to the OLA conference
- June 20<sup>th</sup> in Monroe in Benton County
- August 15<sup>th</sup> at the Driftwood Public Library in Lincoln City
- October 17<sup>th</sup> in the Oregon State Library in Salem
- December 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> at the University of Portland

The meeting adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- TBABS Endowment discussion will be added to the February Board Meeting agenda.
- Look into public announcement and recognition for TBABS donations.
- Dahlgreen will bring the login information for United for Libraries to the February Board meeting, giving the Board members access to resources and training.
- Dahlgreen will send the Board links to the research briefs from the IMLS Library Statistics Working Group.