A Report on Findings from the Public Library System Redesign Survey

March 2018
This Public Library System Redesign Survey Report was prepared by:

Linda and Jeffrey Russell, Co-Directors
tel (608) 274-4482
RCI@RussellConsultingInc.com
www.RussellConsultingInc.com

1134 Winston Drive • Madison, WI 53711-3161
March 2018
Table of Contents

Section 1: Purpose and Background

A. The Purpose of the Public Library System Redesign Survey
B. Survey Design
C. Response from Public Libraries

Section 2: Demographics

What is the size of your service population?
What is your library system?

Section 3: Survey Questions and Responses

1. Overall Satisfaction with Your Library System
3. How Important is the Goal of Service Equity?
5. How important are these services to your library?
6. What would be the best strategy to fund these library support services - assuming that there are no additional state funds available?
7. Recognizing the diversity of needs and circumstances of Wisconsin’s libraries, what would be the ideal way to ensure that your library has a voice in the array of services it receives and how it receives them?
8. What, from your perspective, would be the ideal governing body to help ensure services are provided to meet your library’s needs?
9. What other factors should be considered when designing a governance model such that your library’s needs are met along with the needs of libraries that may have different needs?
10. Administration: How might an ideal model for serving libraries be organized such that it acknowledges and responds to the need for regional/local collaboration; services and support?
11. Regional Connections: What do you feel are the best ways to develop and maintain connections between libraries and the staff that provide services to libraries, as well as the connections between individual libraries within a region?
12. What is your greatest hope for a new design for regional or statewide services to support your library?
13. What is your greatest fear for such a design?

Section 4: Appendices

Appendix A – Actions for Improving Your Current Library System
Appendix B – Explanation of Equity Score Rating
Appendix C – Actions to Achieve Public Library Equity
Section 1: Purpose and Background

A. The Purpose of the Public Library System Redesign Survey

The Public Library System Redesign (PLSR) survey is part of a larger state-wide initiative to strengthen the array of support services to Wisconsin’s public libraries. The PLSR Steering Committee contracted with Russell Consulting, Inc. (RCI) to conduct a broad assessment of public library needs, perceptions, and expectations in respect to their current library systems that provide them support services and what an ideal system might look like. This assessment included RCI conducting three focus groups (reported separately) and an online survey of all Wisconsin public libraries.

The results from both the focus groups and the public library survey will be used by the PLSR Steering Committee and other key stakeholders to guide their decision making as they consider the final design recommendations for the future of public library support services in Wisconsin.

B. Survey Design

RCI met with the PLSR Steering Committee to explore the array of issues that they wanted to investigate through the public library survey. Based upon these broad issues, RCI developed and shared an initial draft with the PLSR Steering Committee. Integrating feedback from the Steering Committee, RCI developed the online survey and deployed it to all Wisconsin public libraries on February 14th, 2018.

C. Response from Public Libraries

An e-mail invitation to the PLSR survey was distributed to all 383 public libraries in Wisconsin. Of this number, 312 libraries submitted complete or partial surveys for a response rate of 81%.
Section 2: Demographics

The survey asked all respondents to identify their library, the size of their service population, and their current library system.

This section of the survey report summarizes the respondents by library size and system.

### Demographics

#### What is the size of your service population?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,999</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-4,999</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,000</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,999</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,999</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and above</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-49,999</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of all 312 survey respondents.

#### What is your library system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library System</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianhead Federated</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Library</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnefox Library</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges Library</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Valley</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding Rivers</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library System</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waters</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Wisconsin</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outagamie Waupaca</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshores</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County Federated</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet Federated</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitowoc-Calumet</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha County</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>312</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of all 312 survey respondents.*
Section 3: Survey Questions and Responses

This section of the survey presents the responses to the core survey questions. For many of the 10-point questions one or more additional follow-along open-ended questions were asked – mostly to either explain respondents’ rating on the 10-point scale or to identify what could be done to raise their rating. These follow-along question responses are included as appendices to this report.

Note: Not all libraries answered all survey questions. As a result, the number of respondents (N) for the 10-scaled questions will often reflect a lower number than the 312 libraries who responded at least in part to the survey.

All open-ended comments in this report are the verbatim responses offered by respondents (with slight edits for typos, punctuation, capitalization, etc.) and are listed alphabetically to assist with identifying themes.

1. Overall Satisfaction with Your Library System

What is the single most important action that your system could take to move your score closer to a ten?

- See Appendix A for all responses.
3. **How Important is the Goal of Service Equity?**

![Histogram of All Responses](image)

*Mean = 8.96, Std. Dev. = 1.46, N = 287*

On the following 10-point scale, how important is the goal of service equity to you and your library?

- Scale: 1 = Not important to 10 = Very important

*Please explain. Why did you rate library service quality equity with the score that you did?*

- See Appendix B for all responses.

*You rated service quality equity an importance level of 7 or higher. What are your ideas for the ways in which the State of Wisconsin could help achieve this service equity goal?*

- See Appendix C for all responses.
5. **How important are these services to your library?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Nice to have but not a high priority</th>
<th>Not a priority/Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating resource sharing/inter-library loan (ILL)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row %</strong></td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the integrated library system (ILS)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row %</strong></td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting for libraries</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education for public library staff and trustees</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection coordination, purchasing and management of electronic collections; digitization projects</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Library</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. What would be the best strategy to fund these library support services - assuming that there are no additional state funds available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee for Service (Libraries get only what they pay for)</th>
<th>A Mix of State/Local Funding</th>
<th>Full State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating resource sharing/inter-library loan (ILL)</td>
<td>Count: 22, Row %: 7.8%</td>
<td>117, 41.6%</td>
<td>142, 50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the integrated library system (ILS)</td>
<td>Count: 41, Row %: 14.6%</td>
<td>141, 50.4%</td>
<td>98, 35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting for libraries</td>
<td>Count: 83, Row %: 29.7%</td>
<td>112, 40.1%</td>
<td>84, 30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education for public library staff and trustees</td>
<td>Count: 67, Row %: 24.0%</td>
<td>143, 51.3%</td>
<td>69, 24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery among member libraries and with other regional systems</td>
<td>Count: 27, Row %: 9.6%</td>
<td>112, 40.0%</td>
<td>141, 50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Count: 64, Row %: 23.0%</td>
<td>145, 52.2%</td>
<td>69, 24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection coordination, purchasing and management of electronic</td>
<td>Count: 82, Row %: 29.5%</td>
<td>149, 53.6%</td>
<td>47, 16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Library</td>
<td>Count: 119, Row %: 44.2%</td>
<td>93, 34.5%</td>
<td>57, 21.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Recognizing the diversity of needs and circumstances of Wisconsin's libraries, what would be the ideal way to ensure that your library has a voice in the array of services it receives and how it receives them?

1. A committee of public library directors/personnel that can provide feedback and help mold policies that are favorable for libraries and their patrons. This committee would either have geographic areas to meet and options for people to attend remotely.
2. A consultant that would visit each library to assess needs by looking at numbers, talking to staff, talking to patrons, etc. and then compiling that data for each library.
3. A direct or representative way of communicating our needs and a vote in the decision-making processes that affect services to our library.
4. A library system can explain the services, cost, and whether the service would be of benefit to a particular library.
5. A person or team assigned to connect with/consult with individual libraries. This team would represent the views of the libraries they represent to whatever over-arching agency they report to. They would represent all the opinions on any topic discussed, and work to find a consensus point. I’m looking for some way for the small libraries to have as big a voice in decisions as large libraries when the decisions affect all of them.
equally. It’s hard to balance the financial investments of large libraries against the selection of services that all will use but are easier for large communities to access.

6. A representative body that reflects the variety of libraries proportionally with members elected by their peers would be an improvement. The representatives would need some allowance for the time spent on governing during their term. Currently, participation is disproportionate in most areas due to the larger libraries having a budget and staff that has the luxury to represent their interests.

7. A representative from the state who would consult with individual libraries on a one-to-one basis, so that a true understanding of the different needs across regions of the state and size of populations and libraries is better understood.

8. A representative who is a director or trustee at a library approximately the same size as ours contributing to making decisions about services.

9. A seat at the table would be essential. In the South Central Library System, libraries are geographically grouped into “clusters”. Each cluster has an elected representative who answers to the Administrative Council on behalf of cluster members. This works quite well.

10. A small library like me needs a representative republic, such as allowing the library system I am a part of to voice my concerns on a state level.

11. A voting system with one vote per library to prevent larger libraries from taking control over all decisions.

12. Active engagement in the decision-making process. Local opportunity for involvement.

13. Advocacy from our local library system.

14. All Director meetings: we have a choice. Surveys are sent out, good communication is essential, and given a chance to give feedback. Invitations for our library or another library in our county to represent us should be given for nearly all committees.

15. All libraries get 1 vote.

16. Allowed to give opinions on surveys such as this one; attendance at regional meetings to be aware of the smaller libraries’ voices in the services they can receive and give.

17. Allowing libraries to vote.

18. Always offer online participation at meetings and decision making.

19. An equitable structure that ensures input from all types of libraries with strong communication links.

20. Any workable governance structure needs to take into account the wide variety of libraries in the state by both size and geography. I like to think Directors will be involved in decision-making, policy guidance and overall governance. To be honest, for small and mid-size libraries, finding the time and resources to keep up with and be involved in change and management is hard.

21. As a member of the CE/Consulting team, I feel that having governance bodies made up of small, medium and large public library representatives with each body focused on the area of service is the best way to go.

22. Assure that each library has one vote, this may seem simplistic but that ensures we have a voice.

23. At least one representative from each county and at least one representative from our library system.

24. At membership meetings, like Director’s Council. Direct input to system staff. Membership on representative boards and committees.
25. Avoid large systems. There should be no system larger than any of the existing systems.

26. Be able to vote on offered service options on a combined 1 “vote” per library and 1 “vote” per government spending. Since I don’t have the time to be involved, I am fine with committees determining the major choices. Having feedback submitted to the governing body, be seen by all members, and be openly ranked by other libraries for priority in response. If my library is the only one with an issue, perhaps it is a low priority or non-issue in the whole scheme.

27. Be active in committees with libraries in the system to keep a voice as to what is needed in your library in comparison with other libraries.

28. Because of the system my library is associated with they have put into place the ability to have a voice in the array of services and how it is received. One that I find works for me for the most part.

29. Being in a larger system, the way we currently ensure that we have a voice is to attend the meetings, ask questions as they arise and in the worst case scenario on comment on the annual report. Also participating on committees.

30. Breaking the libraries down based on their service area/budget/circulation into groups that are administered as a group to best address the issues at each level would be great. Lumping small and large libraries together into one service group sometimes does not address the needs of each group adequately. The needs are very different for a small rural library versus a large city library.

31. Calculate the amount of funding available to each library and offer a menu of services from which libraries could choose.

32. Committees.

33. Committees and mandatory feedback. Offer choices and flexibility.

34. Committees and meetings to express our opinions and concerns.

35. Communication is obviously vital. Knowing that a service is available and then how to get it if I need it. Maybe narrowing choices by library size since smaller libraries may not need everything that a larger library might.

36. Communication with my system office, which in turn communicates with the state and other parties.

37. Communication with our library, list of offerings that are available.

38. Communication, survey polls.

39. Continue the APL meetings and communicate through our system to the state.

40. Continue to have representation from all kinds of libraries on the various committees that make the recommendations to those in state government making the financial decisions that affect libraries.

41. Coordinating with the library system.

42. Creating a representational model that is not divided by arbitrary lines like counties.

43. Current practices the Winnefox has in place would provide a good model to ensure that all libraries have a voice: regular meetings of diverse committees/groups and all directors, a variety of communication methods to keep member directors informed as things happen: listserv, extranet, newsletter, email, etc.

44. Currently our system works for us, we tell them what services we want to add or reduce. If systems were to be eliminated, would libraries have a vote in what is sent down at the state level? I think the best way to ENSURE YOUR LIBRARY HAS A VOICE, is to let us keep some authority in what our systems are providing us. That is a huge concern if the system
doesn’t “work” for the libraries but rather for the state. A Major concern of mine with the proposed “hub” model, is the lack of advocacy by system boards. If there are no library systems, there would be less boards to advocate at the state level for local library needs.

45. Currently our voice is heard at our consortium level when the Director’s meet. Statewide those who are able do contact State Legislators, but I depend on my System staff to do that for me since I am not able to. In the future with a possible Statewide system then we need good representatives of Library able to speak for all of us and take into consideration the small to large Libraries that are throughout the state. I actually see in the future we will have less local say and it will be more dictated to the Libraries. Just because of limited resources and time.

46. Decisions for libraries should not be based solely on population. Make sure the northern part of the state has a strong voice and is heard.

47. Democracy. Electing representatives of currently-practicing library professionals from across the state to represent our voices. Positions perhaps based on size of library or geography or some combination of both. People serving in these positions must meet with their constituency at regular intervals to ensure they are hearing our thoughts and needs and report back to a central group (like DPI) to make decisions.

48. Depending on structure I would guess we would have regional meetings. At first, I would think this would have to be a regular meeting, but I would think online would work. I would assume a face to face at least once a year would be needed for smaller regional meetings. With elected representatives for wider state meetings.

49. Director meetings, input via voting on decisions and policies.

50. Directors and systems meetings and voicing our opinions there.

51. Directors’ from the member libraries participate in decision making as well as representatives from the participating counties on an overseeing board. All member libraries would have the same voting rights and vote weight regardless of size.

52. Discussions with local libraries, local representation in decisions, ask/ poll/ survey each library.

53. Don’t ask small libraries to travel for meetings. Come to us once in a while. For me to travel to Madison, for example, it could mean closing the library for the day.

54. Don’t change what we have is the most obvious. If every library gets to vote on support services, our little library is going to get out-voted every time in favor of what bigger libraries consider important and we are going to end up paying for services we don’t want or need. This already happens occasionally in our 53-library system, but if we had to vote with over 400 libraries, it would be a total disaster. As far as services go, keep libraries in voting/ service districts. It would be ideal if there were certain service categories laid out and each library could look at the services provided in each and the cost of each and choose which one they want to sign up for. IF each category could also be arranged by physical location that would be great too. Especially if we are re-routing courier.

55. Don’t know.

56. Each director would be involved in the decision-making process.

57. Education. Inform libraries about what the issues are at the state level.

58. Either go by size/ service population or split the state into regions which then report to the system admin group.

59. Equal representation for all libraries on a governance board.

60. Equal representation in system decision making.
61. Equal voting or percentage voting based on population size/service size.
62. Equitable access to services is important for rural libraries. I think that it is vital that small libraries are represented within the DPI and the legislature through paid advocates.
63. Establish regional governing councils with library representation, possibly with weighted voting to reflect library size. Somehow must keep in mind libraries of all sizes, too often it’s small versus large with less consideration for those in the "middle".
64. Every 1 or 2 years sign up for the services needed by each library.
65. Every library has one single vote on any item that pertains to the libraries.
66. Every library’s vote on an issue is counted as a vote and is not weighted depending on the population served. If this does not happen, then the bigger libraries will have more control over the smaller libraries’ issues.
67. Every member library of a system has one vote and majority rules. Each system has one vote and majority rules.
68. Exactly as we are functioning now.
69. For the library to be a member of a regional library system; one that is responsive to its members’ needs.
70. For us it would be important to have a fair representation on the governing body for small libraries from poor rural areas.
71. Give smaller libraries a bigger voice as to their needs.
72. Give us options because what might work for a larger library will not work for us. It cannot be only one option to serve everyone.
73. Give us, individually, an opportunity to weigh in, as with this survey. Be sure that all library sizes and all geographical areas of the state are represented on any decision-making body or committee.
74. Give voting rights to each library, no matter how small.
75. Good communication is key - meetings, emails, phone calls, etc. what’s working, what needs working on, questions with the services, etc.
76. Governance by service population. Basic rules of conduct that apply to all libraries. Then depending on the size of the library, governance for each level. An annual meeting for all libraries of the same size for input and discussion. Or if that would be too many directors, a representative from each region.
77. Governance should remain with our local Library Board and administration, who know our patrons and community and know what services will be used. The county system that we are in right now is one of Milwaukee’s best examples of shared services. We can participate in a consortium while maintaining local autonomy. We work hard to fundraise to improve our facility and to offer more materials, programming and technology.
78. Have a board of directors within regions of the states. Committees within a region would have elected representatives that would bring ideas, vote for concepts etc. with the board being responsible for making sure those concepts are communicated to the libraries within that region.
79. Have a public library consultant on the state level create and monitor a blog for public librarians that they could use to make suggestions, ask questions, etc. without filling up the inbox.
80. Have a representative from each system.
81. Having a board member represent certain libraries.
82. Having a sit-down style discussion would be the most beneficial for each library to voice their suggestions and opinions. I understand that this method may not be the most ideal for many libraries because it may involve travel time and extended stays out of town if necessary. However, having dedicated speaking time for each member library would ensure voices are heard.

83. Having meetings in a way that smaller-staffed libraries can just as easily attend (some form of online access??).

84. Having smaller to mid-size library systems ensures that my library does have a voice.

85. Having surveys such as this, that allows small libraries with a limited number of employees to have a voice without attending meetings.

86. Having system staff who are solely dedicated to providing system services to all system members equally.

87. Having/continuing to have leadership that knows its individual libraries, can navigate available options for services, and works with its libraries to identify those that are the best fit.

88. Hmm... I'm honestly not sure. The only thing I can think of is voting at the library to system level and then the system relaying it onto the state. Or some sort of polling based on library size because a little rural library will need different things than a large urban library.

89. I am happy with the current governance model.

90. I am not in favor of PLSR.

91. I appreciate that my current consortium and system implement a one library-one vote strategy, regardless of institution size.

92. I believe it must go thru the system, they would have greater knowledge of issue that each of smaller libraries would have. Systems understand each of their library’s situation better than the state could.

93. I believe that the best way to ensure libraries have a voice, and that this voice is heard adequately and accurately, is to maintain a regional system network. Keeping the systems small and local is a way that will ensure that there is local accountability. I find great value that the system staff and system director are aware of my library, my community, and how the libraries in my system relate and differ from one another. It allows us to work as a unit but also stand out as individuals. I am impressed at the level at which our system director can advocate for our region and can accurately summarize to others what our needs are. I believe having this local system staff is key to successfully maintaining our voice in library services.

94. I don't know.

95. I feel county representation would be best. Each county, no matter the population.

96. I feel Winnefox Library System does a fine job giving our libraries information

97. I have a voice at our system level. I can attend meetings physically and online. I would hope that a similar method for making decisions would be used. Information about specific services with price tags. Why this service or change in service is needed and how it will benefit our library in serving our patrons/customers.

98. I have faith in the current model of library systems, as exemplified by my library system, Bridges. I feel that we have a model of excellence that we could share to other member libraries. We have regular meetings, conversations and discussions and I always feel that our concerns are being heard and that we are being recognized.

99. I have no idea! Give each library a pool of money and they can pay for the services they want and within that service group determine how they receive it??? For example,
give each library the same amount of $ for continuing education. Each library then decides how to spend that money, but it can only be spent on continuing ed. They may decide to put it towards a cooperative continuing ed group, classes taught at the university or a group of libraries could join to bring in a program of interest on a one time basis. As part of a cooperative ed group they would be represented within that group. So maybe you couldn't give each library the same amount of money. Maybe make it per staff person.

100. I have no idea.

101. I just have to say, based on the last page, libraries should never be totally dependent on Fee for Service, because there are too many tiny local libraries that would be able to provide nothing at that level, but their patrons/constituents are still Wisconsin taxpayers. Now, to answer this question, I would say it's surveys like this that allow a voice for what we need and how we need them delivered. (And I greatly appreciate this!)

102. I like having a regional library system that understands & listens to its members; represents the system on a state level and acts as a conduit for information between state & libraries. The regional system must be adequately funded for this to be successful and small enough for libraries to have a voice.

103. I like the Director's Council system of meetings in nearby Eau Claire (every other month). Good chance to network, discuss issues, and hear about trends.

104. I like the Director's Counsel. It is a chance for all libraries in an area to discuss needs and desires. However, I don't think that votes should be weighted by size. One library. One vote.

105. I ran out of space for my reply. In brief, I believe that Winnefox's various structures, starting at the county level and moving up through progressively larger groupings of Directors and library staff, works very well to allow libraries to have a voice. Our structures include: county librarian advisory councils (5-9 directors plus system staff), the ILS / technology steering committee (9 directors plus system staff); All-ILS meetings (30-35 Directors plus library and system staff meeting 3-4 times per year); and the system annual meeting (nearly all 30-member libraries represented plus system staff meeting in Jan or Feb each year). These structures allow people to share in the size and venue in which they feel most comfortable. The system board carries ultimate authority on policy and budget with all counties represented. I don't believe there is one "ideal" model for giving libraries voice. Ours works here.

106. I really like the way our system is currently set up. Directors have a voice to the consortium which has a voice to the state level. I know we have an amazing team that leads our consortium and they provide quality services for all of our libraries.

107. I think a redefinition of what core library services are has to take place first. This survey is an example of how we keep trying to fit an old service model into a new framework. The Resource Library, we'd all agree does not do back up reference for other libraries. It does perhaps a professional level of research direct to non-residents, but not with their local library as intermediary. With that said, once core services are redefined we make sure all libraries have that level of service from the state. Then we parse out by size what other services are provided by state dollars to different sized libraries. To govern that, there would be (call it 3) levels and governance for each. Small, Medium, and Large libraries. One size does not fit all and nor should it.

108. I think the most important thing is making sure that the wide variety of libraries are represented equally - small and large, rural and urban, etc.

109. I think the most important way is to make sure that Library Systems do not get too big. Look at what happened down in Illinois. I've worked long enough to have experienced
being absorbed into a larger organization and then becoming invisible. I also worry that trying to find consensus among even larger groups will become more difficult. We already have some significant diversity just among our 2-county system, what will happen if we become bigger? I don't want to sound completely negative, but I do worry that our situation, which is exemplary, may be negatively impacted by the results of PLSR (and I've worked in three different systems, so I am able to make comparison).

110. I think the system leadership has a good handle on resources of member libraries and could consult with them and speak on their behalf.

111. I think the system we have now works well.

112. I think we should have identified a base of services that is provided to libraries. That helps to provide equity. Beyond that libraries could work together to pay for services as a consortium. If it isn't something you want, you don't participate, so there needs to be some flexibility here (example, with services like Hoopla, the system has to agree to participate, it can't be just one library, or as it is now one library could choose to use it but all the other libraries could also and thereby deplete yours funds before your patrons even use it, which has prevented some libraries from doing things because not everyone chooses to participate, so we have to free up the statutes a bit to allow libraries more freedom to serve their patrons).

113. I would want to be included in any regional/state talks about the services available, or at the very least be able to share my ideas with a system representative who could then express my needs at the state level.

114. Ideal: right-sized library systems in which library directors have direct input into system budget choices. In our system, each library has a strong voice in the services provided. Because it is right-sized in terms of number of libraries and geographic area, directors can easily attend monthly meetings, exchange ideas, and develop understandings of each library's needs. Collaborative problem-solving results in service choices, and cost apportionment formulas, that everyone can agree on. Library systems have citizen boards which provide accountability; our director's group reports to the system board at monthly meetings so they are aware of how well the system is fulfilling its role. In science or business, a study like this would have started by examining what is working well in our current model and explored how to replicate that across the state. For unknown reasons, PLSR has not taken this basic and critical step.

115. Ideally, allowing each individual library representation with the governing body. However, that is not practical (because of sheer numbers). Therefore, having representatives from different sized libraries as part of the governing body would be the next best thing. Each representative could be "assigned" a group of similar sized libraries that they represent. Those representatives could be charged with collecting information from their prospective library group and being the voice for that group.

116. If each county had a designated library director to represent the collective needs of the individual libraries and share the individual concerns/needs of libraries in that county with a larger governing body, such as a library system board. I believe this is already being done in our library system with an advisory council. And, if each director meets regularly with the system board to voice concerns and express requests and ideas/opinions of what services to receive and how. Again, this is something that is already in place within our current library system and I think it is a good practice to continue. Representation to the state from the public library system is also crucial to ensure open communication and stable funding at a state level.

117. If your new model would incorporate the Wisconsin Public Library Standards, I believe that the diversity of needs and circumstances of Wisconsin's libraries would be addressed, as it is tiered to reflect the diversity of Wisconsin's libraries.
118. In a state-wide model, or even regional to some extent, it is not feasible for everyone to have an equal voice. Libraries would be represented by size, perhaps, but we understand that decisions will be made that we would have to accept and adapt.

119. In a very small library, we would need the extra funding to pay someone to help at the Library while the director is dealing with additional administrative duties. I think the directors of the small libraries would like a say but there isn't money, time or extra staff to get involved with issues that don't directly relate to the daily business of the library.

120. Individual and Consortium input.

121. Individual libraries give info to regional selected or elected representatives.

122. Inter-system meetings for system directors & library directors.

123. It is best to have a committee of librarians/directors and supporters. the staff and patrons are the best voice to meet the libraries needs.

124. It is essential that library directors have direct input into the services offered and how the libraries receive them. Currently in our system, library directors and system staff meet monthly to discuss current services and issues, share ideas and concerns, and make decisions about the future of library services in our communities. All libraries have a voice. These interactions lead to the development of relationships and trust, increased communication and a successful collaboration.

125. It is much harder to achieve “all in” when systems grow. Bigger isn’t better -- not necessarily cost-effective or efficient. One of the strengths of the Bridges Library System is that library directors and the system staff and system director get together monthly and have face-to-face conversations. Relationships are built, and directors are very supportive of each other. This camaraderie could get lost if a system was too large. Each of the 24 directors in Waukesha County and Jefferson County has a vote. Advocacy is critical.

126. It would be nice to have a committee in each library system with members from each member library to regularly review services, etc. Obviously, small libraries would have 1 rep each, and then prorated based on population of the library’s home city. Skype and other online meeting forums could be used. Many small libraries are left out of the loop because they are often more rural and farther away from the headquarters of the library system. Technology needs to be utilized better to overcome these distances and allow smaller/rural libraries to participate fully.

127. It would be nice to have localized meetings to attend and discuss ideas. I would prefer to see a regionalized model as trying to make state-wide decisions for all libraries would slow down the process tremendously. It would be nice to have a dual model which allows one vote per library for policy/service decisions and Rule of 13 model for decisions with cost associations to implement based on library size.

128. It’s hard to say. I thought we’d see an example of this throughout the PLSR process and I do think that the effort to keep everyone informed has been there. But I also think that the larger or better funded systems have been heard more than the systems that consist of small libraries with one or two-person staffs, which means we can’t get people to tons of meetings and two day stays and things that interfere with running our actual libraries. Rather than just taking surveys (which is where those of us who can’t get out of the library often enough to serve on the committees and boards are relegated), perhaps there should be voting options through email so that libraries each get the opportunity to submit one vote on a topic.

129. It’s important that we have some kind of personal connection to make our voice heard. One of the benefits of the current governance system is that we personally know the system staff, which acts effectively with both local libraries and the state structure. The
risk of a change is making a structure that feels too big for libraries to believe they have an effective voice. What’s the ideal way? Maybe some sort of trusted local or regional council of libraries, reporting and advising a state council of libraries that directly interacts with those people or the organization providing services. Feedback on services and transparent communication should be built in and may be one of the hardest parts to get right.

130. Keep strong Library systems, maybe not exactly as they are but very similar. We have a very strong system I know that not all of them are but maybe Winnefox could be a model for what one should look like.

131. Keep us in the loop i.e.: surveys :).

132. Keep us updated on the process, organize libraries by service population and allow us to meet with each other to discuss options and concerns with peers that are in a similar position, make sure we have a local representative that is able to receive feedback from libraries and update us on changes.

133. Library directors need to have the opportunity to provide feedback to the System regularly. System directors then communicate with the state.

134. Library staff member, Library Board member, or Friend of the Library serve on a committee.

135. Library system membership in a top-performing system (which is achieved by conforming to standards).

136. Local control is critical. Waukesha County (WC) is a prime example. Yes, there are many similarities in terms of demographics in WC, but there is a huge difference between the various communities which make up WC. I strongly believe a public library should reflect the community it is in, as it is those municipal taxpayers funding a majority of that library and its services. One vote should equal one voice. If you do not have a seat at the table, if you do not have a vote, if you are not truly represented for your differences, you will not receive what you need, just some version that has been decided at a level that cannot represent you, because you no longer have a voice.

137. Local control is the best way to ensure this, hands down. In a scenario where there may be less local control, then adequate representation in the decision-making process.

138. Local listening sessions, surveys.

139. Locally controlled municipal library board governance as is currently in place in Wisconsin is the best way to ensure the needs of each diverse community are met. One large statewide library bureaucracy governing more library services than is currently governed by state statutes and DPI would not be conducive to “outward facing” libraries currently advocated by the PLA. Additional services that are fiscally most suitable to state-wide contract pricing should be paid for by the state and made available to all residents. Expansion of statewide digital resources similar to the Badgerlink model would be welcomed.

140. Maintain system integrity so that small libraries are heard and recognized on a localized platform. In turn, the system would be representing all of the libraries in the system at the state level.

141. Make opportunities equal in voting and funding for services.

142. Make sure that my library has a way to provide feedback (voting membership, for example) as well as intentional representation for libraries of various sizes and locations to ensure that statewide interests are met.
143. Making sure libraries of all sizes have a voice. The smallest libraries don’t always have the funding or willingness to let a representative be involved in committees and boards outside their libraries. This may be an area the state could provide funds and direction.

144. Making sure the reorganization doesn’t make the new systems so big that they lose the personal and specific regional service our current system allows.

145. Making sure there are representatives of libraries of all sizes on the governing body, creating committees to discuss issues, and continued surveys.

146. Making sure there are small rural libraries well represented on decision-making boards.

147. Managing libraries of the same size and needs.

148. Meetings throughout the state with library members. If the current system design changes, it would be optimal that no participant need to travel across the state to have a voice in the array of potential services. While electronic distance meeting might seem to bridge the very real geographic gap, they are not as collaborative as actual face-to-face meetings.

149. Meetings to discuss any changes or needs.

150. Membership on governing boards and advisory boards.

151. Might be an additional annual conference day where libraries are given the “ballot” questions ahead of time to study, talk with staff and boards and then at the conference there’s discussion of issues and a vote on questions on the ballot. Non-attending libraries could submit absentee ballots. Some questions could be weighted by service population.

152. Monthly meetings of library directors and system staff (we do this now in my library system, and it is invaluable); continue to have systems overseen by a library system board that is as representative as possible of member libraries; open communication between system staff and member library staff; some mechanism for libraries to report regularly on their satisfaction with system services (like we do with our annual report to DPI now, only something that would be more enforceable or actionable but not possibly detrimental to libraries that report dissatisfaction with system services).

153. Monthly or quarterly meetings of some sort, allowing voting for major decisions, and allowing different options to meet the different needs of libraries.

154. More representation on decision-making boards.

155. Multi-level voting. Libraries each get a vote with in their system and then the systems each get a vote with in the state?

156. Need to be given information about changes in the system’s governance. Extra assistance would not go repeatedly to the same institutions and that size or amount of services of the institution would not matter.


158. Not sure.

159. Notification of meetings, questionnaires sent out of what is coming available on a secure line.

160. One library – one vote – Otherwise the largest libraries wield more power in the decision-making process. Larger libraries can hire for positions that the small library depends on the system for support.

161. One library = one vote

162. One library one voice in decision making, thus making each library an equal share of decision.
163. One library one vote (US Senate) and population size equals more votes (US Representatives) Library director (Senate) and Library board members (Representatives- appointed by their own library boards to reflect population size- and include term limits).

164. One library, one vote!

165. One library, one vote. Local system belonging to a larger system.

166. One voice, one vote.

167. One vote per library on important issues. Size should not convey more votes.

168. Open communication and transparency. Often information is not shared with member libraries and discussion is not allowed to take place.

169. Opt-in options, regional meetings

170. Our current Bridges system functions well We meet regularly and have excellent communication in both directions - library to system, and system to library.

171. Our current system is working very well

172. Participation in system-wide meetings where decisions are made; opportunities for open, civil discussion.

173. Perhaps face-to-face meetings at WLA or WAPL, minimally, annually. Listservs and Google communities. Voting mechanisms based on size of library? Forums for libraries to unite based on similar needs. Representatives from regions.

174. Perhaps in a consortium of small libraries. A "union" of sorts, but not as dramatic. An opportunity for small libraries to voice their opinion together or for a single small library to submit concerns/ideas to a larger group of small libraries that would then take the matter to the system level, or even above that depending on what body would end up governing the systems in a redesign. We have small libraries section of WLA, but is that group a voice for small libraries or just a comfort for them?

175. Planning committees on the front side of changes and a feedback mechanism for poor performance after projects are implemented.

176. Point of contact has excellent communication skills at the admin level.

177. Provide a basic pot of money for all libraries -- could be based on per capita with a not-fewer -than -so-many dollars delimiter. Let libraries buy the services they need. Let libraries vote with their dollars.

178. Provide a menu for us to choose from.

179. Receive a vote and opportunity to comment on upcoming projects and services.

180. Regional councils.

181. Regional experts that would serve as representatives to larger statewide committees.

182. Regional meetings of all libraries in the "system"; Local County Library Meetings; State meetings with legislative committees and legislators.

183. Regional meetings of Directors as we have now. Each library has one vote. If there is a hierarchy, have representative from the group go to state level of Directors. Directors of library should vote on representative, because they may not want their system Director if that person is not understanding of the range of libraries sizes.

184. Regional meetings on these issues would allow libraries to have a say. Perhaps some meetings with similar sized libraries. Annual questionnaires about services and their effectiveness might give all libraries a voice much like our current annual system evaluations.

185. Regional representation.
186. Regional systems with a vote for population/size of library if the library is of a certain volume. Bigger libraries would get move votes at the table--but all libraries would get a vote. Perhaps a kind of Library Congress.

187. Regular regional meetings.

188. Representation by vote or in person.

189. Representation in a regional committee with weighted voting authority.

190. Representation on a council that determines the services and how we get the services.

191. Representation through the ILS committee and other system governance. Opportunities/invitations to participate in regional/statewide councils.

192. Representative voting - member libraries in a system can vote and then representative from the system has a voice for statewide decisions. Some sort of algorithm that includes geographic service area, population, number of libraries. Smaller systems and less populated geographic areas need to be represented.

193. Representative you could contact that would be understanding of your needs.

194. Representatives from each size and type (municipal, joint, county, tribal, etc.) of public library must be represented on any statewide or regional governing body. The needs of libraries and library staff differ greatly depending upon size and available resources.

195. Reps from libraries across the state vouching for what is important to them.

196. SCLS uses a mixed voting system that requires both most libraries AND a weighted majority by size/contribution.

197. Serving on advisory committees and ensuring communication "trees" include all libraries. Even if your library isn't represented on a committee, ensuring you have a liaison is important Regular communication - quarterly in-person meetings would be ideal.

198. Since my library has representation in our system, and our library directors meet regularly to discuss services, practices, and policies, I think our current structure works very well for governance. It combines local control with the strength of the system to bargain with vendors, make purchases, etc. It's not so big that it can't be responsive to our individual library needs.

199. SMALL LIBRARIES.

200. Small regional groups still seem like the best way for an individual library to have a voice in what and how they receive services. The larger the group, the easier it is to disregard the voices of the small and poor.

201. Small/rural libraries cannot afford to send staff to statewide meetings and they typically do not have staffing levels that allow for core staff to be out of the library regularly. These libraries rely on their system to best represent their needs in processes like this, but some systems also cannot afford to actively participate. Often those participating come from better funded libraries and systems, where seemingly small changes that could greatly benefit services are discounted as “too simple”. If diverse representation is crucial to this process, it is equally important that persons selected to represent our library understand the needs/circumstances and advocate for them, regardless of their own personal risk/reward. Small/rural libraries should have an equal voice, if not larger voice (there are more rural libraries than urban/suburban libraries) in this process, and currently, I do not see that. This is a major flaw in the overall PLSR process.

202. Some governing body that we have a representative on.

203. Some kind of governing committee with a specific contact for each library.

204. Some sort of voting or way to opt in or out...I'm really not sure.
205. Somehow strike a balance of one library: one vote and a weighted system.
206. Statewide voting method developed across libraries so each library (municipality, Board...) has a voice.
207. Strong library system management that responds to library customers.
208. Surveys like this one, talking with our system, and going to legislative day.
209. Surveys or regional discussions with the library directors/board, not just the system staff. I believe it would be helpful to explain the variety of what systems offer, because those with fewer services at this time may not realize the world of options.
210. Surveys, representation from each smaller system to the larger "system".
211. Surveys:) Voting with other directors at County meetings or annual system meetings.
212. System coordinated meetings of libraries from the member libraries is a vital component for member libraries to communicate their needs not only to the system, but to each other.
213. Systems should have member libraries do a majority vote for types of services.
214. Taking the time to ask the individual library what will work or not work for them in their community. Not putting the needs of larger libraries before those of the small libraries.
215. That at least one member from each library - including small libraries always be brought to the table when changes are going to be made.
216. The ability to vote on things.
217. The best way for us is to have a voice in every discussion but being a small library, we do not have the staff to attend every meeting. Being in a system library is what works for us, we are being heard and supported by great people.
218. The current system with governing bodies within a library system allows for individual libraries to gather and work together yet allowing for individual autonomy.
219. The libraries and systems need to advocate for us.
220. The one library, one vote in regional systems. We need to be cautious that larger libraries don't control all the decisions.
221. The System Board/Committee structure works well for getting business done, reviewing and upgrading services. Keeping this component would be important in ensuring my library has a voice in services.
222. The System system seems to be working well.
223. The way that SCLS libraries are currently organized seems to work.
224. There has to be complete transparency and frequent communication. The leaders/managers of the service providers need to be responsive to all inquiries. The methods by which decisions are made needs to be clear to all involved.
225. There needs to be representative system in place. SCLS has a cluster structure that works very well. Each cluster of libraries elects representatives for a variety of committees: delivery, technology, administrative council. The same type of system could be formed state wide. This provides a method of communication both ways (system to cluster, cluster to system) and allows the system to get feedback (voting by cluster reps).
226. There should be approximately six regional areas run by administrators that either work for the state or are autonomous (hired by an elected group of librarians). Either way an advisory board made up of library directors from each region should provide input to those administrators with some level accountability such as the current system effectiveness statement.
227. This is a challenge. What would be the ideal way? Local or system representation.

228. This is a difficult to impossible question to answer without knowing what kind of replacement is being recommended. Making sure my library has representation at all relevant levels is critical and making sure that feedback is in a forum and format that can fit into a busy library schedule is also important, whether that is in-person meetings, via email or virtual meetings, or any other form of communication.

229. This one is tough to answer, so I would simply suggest opportunities for feedback, polls or voting for strongly desired services and needs, and ongoing assessment and flexibility in offerings.

230. Those libraries that are used the most per capita should have a greater say.

231. Through a regional system where member libraries’ needs can be heard and then acted on appropriately.

232. Through regional or county governance. Stretching governance to a singular statewide system seems unrealistic as I believe that understanding what could improve a library and its services is best understood by those close to a library. Also, because of local funding primarily coming from local counties and cities, the arguments for how to support a library now and the future best come from those near a library.

233. To be asked!

234. To make sure our regional system advocates for its membership.

235. Transparency about what services are offered around the state. Library directors need to know what projects regional system and DPI are working on. Mechanism for feedback needs to be an annual event through surveys and listening sessions across the state.

236. Using a check list of all possible services available across the state would allow libraries to request those services most needed and desired by local entities. There would be some elements which might not be feasible because only one or two libraries in a system of 40 libraries desire those items. But the majority of the libraries would have the ability to request/demand/optionally fund what they feel is most important to them. (Yes, it would be a long checklist).

237. Various and ongoing open and communication and feedback loops need to be established. The needs will vary depending on the region of the state. It's easy for Milwaukee County directors to get together; but, not so easy for members of the Indianhead Federated System. I think it's important to position the member libraries as the customer and the systems as the service "vendor." While leadership is important at all levels, I sometimes get the impression that system directors forget this. It is not for the system to decide what services are needed, it is the members who should decide what services are needed and how they should be prioritized. System directors can lead by facilitating the discussions.

238. Voting on issues such as budgets, staffing levels, service cost increases and shared resources that acknowledges the inequities of funding between heavily and sparsely populated areas, as well as economically advantaged and disadvantaged areas. Perhaps something that carries two types of vote, 1 library one vote and weighted voting.

239. Voting rights and a shared governance model.

240. Voting, meetings.

241. We need equal voting rights to large libraries.
242. We would like to be connected to libraries in our population area that service similar populations.

243. We would still need a liaison between local libraries and DPI/State. This is currently the System Director, but this could be regional or a sub-section of DPI in some cases. Maybe each county within a region has a point person(s) to work with DPI and attends LDAC meetings each month.

244. Weighted votes by size of library. For example, many of the small libraries together may have enough votes as a large library so there would be representation.

245. Weighted Voting on system level on services according to success benchmarks tallied on annual report.

246. What we do now in Winding Rivers Library System with our Network Advisory Committee. We all meet and vote on items that we need to have a voice in.

247. While the word “centralized” has been discussed a lot during this study, for the systems to remain strong I feel the director of the system needs to stay with the members of each system. That allows individual members a chance to control their needs.

248. Winding Rivers has a Network Advisory Committee. Each library has a voice and NAC meets every other month. We discuss issues and come to agreements. I think it is a very good model for the rest of the systems to look at. The small libraries are not overshadowed by the larger ones in this type of decision making.

249. Working through our system, i.e. Winnefox Library System meets with the various member libraries. We have the opportunity to discuss issues and concerns that, they, in turn, would be able to pass on to the “powers that be.”

250. Working with my library system.

251. You would need to look at the Government. Have local, regional and state.

8. What, from your perspective, would be the ideal governing body to help ensure services are provided to meet your library’s needs?

   1. A board made up of a variety of representatives from different areas and sized libraries.

   2. A board of trustees drawn from system libraries rather than system appointed.

   3. A board or governing body that is equally represented, and politically neutral in its makeup. For example, Milwaukee always has a Milwaukee Alderperson on the MCFLS board. That is blatantly political, and the practice needs to stop.

   4. A board with one representative from each system.

   5. A board? Again, difficult to predict. Maybe a board constructed of representatives from ‘similar’ libraries. So ‘similar’ libraries (by demographics or population size for example) are lumped and meet once a year and assign or rotate roles as the representative. The rep can be responsible for soliciting feedback from members and disseminating information. Basically, a middle management board.

   6. A citizen board of people from around the library system (like it is now), except: It would be mandatory for system trustees to receive orientation and ongoing training to ensure trustees know what their expectations of staff ought to be, so they are able to hold system staff accountable. Also, the statute needs to define what makes a good library system, and to quantify that with key performance indicators (KPI) for measuring systems’ effort and effectiveness. Some examples of KPI might be “all library system trustees receive orientation,” or “system board meets monthly.” If it would be too cumbersome to need to change the statute every time we need a new KPI, perhaps the statute could say something like, “library systems must meet standards as determined by administrative
rules,” which would give DPI the ability (and flexibility) to adjust KPI while preserving DPI’s authority to enforce expectations of library systems.

7. A citizen board that draws from local communities. A County or regional layer to the overall structure can be a part of it, but definitely should not replace citizens from local communities representing. A citizen board that draws from local communities provides THE BEST OVERSIGHT & ADVOCACY. For reasons that mystify, the PLSR process seems to have forgotten just how critical local relationships are in terms of building support for local public libraries. An ideal governing body in a large state like Wisconsin, with the expanse and density challenges, cannot just be one body. The structure needs to have multiple layers in order to truly function for the greater good.

8. A council made up of the directors from the libraries in the system.

9. A county (or area) library committee that would meet regularly (perhaps 4 times per year) and make recommendations to a regional group that would oversee the library system. The Library system board would have representatives from these county/area committees.

10. A county board for library services. Made up of local citizens, elected officials, and library directors.

11. A director’s council (faculty senate model) where all libraries had an equal voice.

12. A governing board that includes, not just citizens, but also rotating or elected library directors from the system. If elected, the directors should be elected by the other directors in the system. Those directors should have a vote on the board as well, not just serve in an advisory role.

13. A governing body that included representatives for the smallest of libraries, not just from an area’s largest population areas. It is difficult to trust county government to see to this...we need stable funding mandated for a greater good.

14. A local meeting opportunity for librarians to meet and discuss options and services. Keep things a local as possible.

15. A local regional library system staff, governed by a citizen appointed board (what is currently in place). This ensures local familiarity and control, but also accountability to the local citizens we represent. Because our funding comes in large part from local municipalities, it is critical that local citizens maintain a voice. The local system board, guided by local system staff ensures this.

16. A member board similar to a library trustee board overseeing the overall direction of the system; then a directors' council where representative from the member libraries can discuss and determine overall policy and direction.

17. A mix of local and system governance.

18. A mixed committee of local directors, system leaders, and also regional or state representatives

19. A mixture of library directors & board members and system staff. I have been out the "library world" for 7 years, so I don't feel confident that I know what the issues currently are. Therefore, I would have to rely on the opinions of more seasoned staff.

20. A public library system board, a director's council board, and an advisory council to both boards comprised of a variety of library directors from various sized service populations. All these boards are currently in effect within our current library system and I think it works really well in ensuring that every library has a voice.

21. A regional approach sounds about right. Fewer than 16 regions, but more than 1. I fear a single point of service would make it too hard to be heard at the local library level. So,
representative government from the regions, perhaps. Within the geographical regions, perhaps representatives for one each of the Grades 1,2 and 3 libraries. This ensures geographical coordination and addresses the fact that needs and wants are different for different sized libraries within those regions. If we have 6 regions, with 3 from each library grade, that’s 18 elected leaders to some kind of council at any given time. Perhaps there are issue-based seats to this council, as well, as library trends dictate. Term limits would be important.

22. A regional council of libraries grouped according to size.
23. A regional library system.
24. A similar model to what the South Central Library System currently has.
25. A small library like me needs a representative republic, such as allowing the library system I am a part of to voice my concerns to a state-level system.
26. A state contact for each library size group and regional representation from each region. Dealing with issues specific to each group of libraries. We travel for meetings anyway. Instead of systems covering just counties they would cover a specific size library. There would be less systems needed, and each group would be having their needs met.
27. A state library board.
28. A state wide body as well as local or regional bodies.
29. A statewide coalition that has regional offices across the state. An existing or new division of DPI.
30. A statewide commission or board comprised of representatives from each “tier” of library (rural, town, suburb, city, distant, remote, fringe, large, small, midsize, etc.).
31. A statewide governing body that meets quarterly and is drawn from all the systems.
32. Again, I’m not sure what would be best but as long as there was an avenue to communicate with people in our local region I would open to many different options.
33. Again, more information is needed about what kind of replacement is being proposed before I can really answer that. Pretty much same answer as above, but I would add that some form of governing body that isn’t too large in order to remain efficient would be helpful. The scheduling and access flexibility remains important.
34. Along with the committees there needs to be a device for individual libraries to address their concerns if they felt their needs were not being met by the elected representatives.
35. An elective council, with representation from all geographic regions.
36. An Executive Board representing all types of libraries, elected by members of those types of libraries; bylaws approved by members with statements of Inclusion and Ethics as foundational.
37. An ideal governing body would have a variety of voices - urban, suburban, rural - with directors, regional staff, DPI staff, maybe one elected official that truly wants to be at the table. Maybe a group of 8-10.
38. Annual meeting to discuss services, goals and concerns could be appropriate.
39. Another thing that I think would be hard to track. Perhaps periodical check ins or surveys to make sure that all is going well.
40. Appointed commission.
41. Are you asking about local or state governance? The majority of libraries are municipal. Our funding is local. Or if you are talking a state governance, maybe the system directors with feedback from their libraries. I don’t know if this is what you mean though.
42. As of right now, I believe the OWLS system provides a great governing body to help my library ensure services are meeting community needs. OWLS also provides a great resource for our Director and staff if we have any questions. A system "hub", like the offices at OWLS, provides great service and resources for our small-town library.

43. Assigned voting representatives PLUS an option for any library to attend virtually at any meeting. Structure: Small and medium sized libraries can band together to form sub-governing bodies which have an assigned representative that has equal voting power to large libraries. Costs: Since more effort is needed for small and medium libraries to reach consensus, then more funds should be allocated to ensure their sub-governing bodies can communicate easily before the assigned rep voices their concerns with the over-arching governing body.

44. At a library level, the Library Board. At the system level, the System Board.

45. Board of trustees with equal representation from all types and sizes of libraries.

46. Board of volunteers representing each library and library system.

47. Break us up into regions of roughly equal numbers of libraries/branches. Allow each area to select a representative on a rotating basis to be part of a management committee. Management committee meets monthly or bimonthly (probably by call). Annual meeting/conference call for all library directors, with every library having one vote on major issues and decisions.

48. Certainly, a governing body should allow for representation of all types of libraries and communities. This is hard to answer without ideas of what could has been considered.

49. Consortium input.

50. County Library Committee government.

51. Current model.

52. Current practices...a system director with support staff that ensure that our library, library staff, and our patrons to maintain the level of services our patrons and staff trust us to provide. ILS Support, Delivery support, Outreach support to help provide services relevant to our patrons I believe that systems that are (too) large cannot provide adequate services for library staff or patrons. For our library, a change in the status quo would probably mean a change in the high level of service and support and opportunities we receive from our system staff.

53. Director meetings.

54. Directors from member libraries on a director's council, with committees formed as needed for specific decisions, like technology issues. Committee members could be staff or library board members.

55. Division for Libraries and Technology or some other entity that exists within DPI.

56. DPI is not that body. A State Library Board with regional representation and all types and sizes of libraries brought to the table might be the answer, but it must have real power to make rules and changes.

57. DPI? I'm not sure what the other options are.

58. Each county would have a representation of at least half of its libraries. I would be strongly against any distribution of decisions made primarily because of a highly populated library.

59. Each library has a representative serving on a board. Each board member receives one vote that is equal to all other board members.
60. Each system holds directors meeting twice a year to go over what is being done in libraries and what can be done to enhance libraries.

61. Either at a local or regional level with statewide oversight/standards.

62. Either representatives from different regions or representing different sized libraries.

63. Equal representation from member library staff, member library board of trustees and system trustees.

64. Equal representation from small libraries with fewer resources (and a way to budget subs or other staff so a single librarian library can get away to participate in meetings.) to balance the input of the larger libraries on committees and boards.

65. Equal voice somehow.

66. Exactly as we are functioning now.

67. Fair representation from throughout the state. We range from the small Library on Madeline Island to the Large Milwaukee Public Library. How we do it at IFLS is good to have a share but sometimes the Larger Libraries do get a larger voice. But on the other hand, they also have more resources and specialists that smaller Libraries do not. We have currently our System Directors that all have special skills. Taking that group to advocate for us all would meet my needs and my Library needs.

68. Governance should be based on population and library use per capita.

69. Governing board, advisory board, regional boards with local representation.

70. Governing bodies should be selected from current member library’s staff (not necessarily limited to Directors), with only one person per library. If a library has multiple branches, they may only have one representative. Representatives should be comprised of library staff, not system staff. Only Directors within a system may vote for representatives.

71. Hard to visualize--maybe a few--not 16--regional library groups, each with a head and support staff, reporting to an official with state authority. Our consortia look sort of gerrymandered and might make more sense if they were geographically logical (like a square or circle with a center point to minimize distance needed to travel for the members to attend meetings).

72. Have a representative from our library system on the board.

73. Have an advisory board for the public library consultant to administer and make suggestions based on the comments they receive.

74. Have some sort of way of ensuring the service providers actually provide good services.

75. Having a governing body that covers a smaller geographic area is important.

76. Having an appointed board is good; however, there needs to be something more - some way to hold board members accountable to ensuring that the system is not only functional but strives for excellence. You must have a competent director who can act as a strong leader; however, if the board is not well-informed or not engaged in their role, it’s very easy for poor leadership to create a slippery slope. So, the director, the board, and possibly a third system of checks and balances to be sure everything is on track?

77. I am a new director and also new to public libraries. I am not sure how the current system in Wisconsin works, but I think a board consisting of not just geographical area representation but also library size representation would be crucial. A representative from my system, for example, may come from a larger urban library and his or her perspective on what services are provided may not match up with the needs of a smaller, rural library.

78. I am happy with the system we have.
79. I am not sure about an ideal - perhaps using the federal government model of representation, two governing councils, one based on size, the other with equal representation from all libraries. Considering the number of Wisconsin libraries, the council with equal representation would be very large - how would that work in reality??

80. I am very happy with the services that I receive from my library system. I have not problems with continuing that way.

81. I appreciate the current way our system makes decisions. I have a vote and can speak my mind. So, something similar would be ideal.

82. I believe regional systems that provides basic services would be efficient and cost effective. In Milwaukee, the essential services we need are delivery, ILS and related consulting, and ILL. A second tier of services includes cataloging (we do this under contract for the system now and could do it for a larger regional system), database negotiation (we sometimes do our own, but I’d prefer not to have my staff spending time on this and be able to depend on someone who can do this while representing our interests).

83. I believe that current governance structures work well.

84. I believe that the structure of a myriad of library systems ensures that the local needs of each library are met on a consortium level, where issues are addressed in a democratic manner.

85. I do think we need larger regional areas. In such a scenario I think you would have a baseline service provided, and because of a larger perspective of member libraries, less chance of funds being used to benefit only some libraries and not the whole membership. I think everyone can agree on the baseline of services: ILS, ILL and technology are the big three, with continuing education being next. Consulting should be a pay service.

86. I don’t believe a new governing body is needed.

87. I don’t feel that I can adequately answer this question without knowing how many libraries would be involved. Winnefox tends to operate on consensus building rather than one vote per library or weighted vote based on size. However, for any group much larger than this I think there’s going to need to be some sort of voting system in place. Any voting system will need to balance the voices of the larger libraries with those of the smaller libraries.

88. I don’t have any substantive complaints with the way our current system is set up.

89. I don’t know.

90. I don’t know.

91. I don’t know.

92. I don’t see an issue with the system body structure as we have it now, so I think using the system structure and modifying it from there would be preferable to starting from scratch.

93. I don’t understand the governing body thing.

94. I find it difficult to say, having a limited perspective of what alternatives might look like.

95. I have no idea.

96. I honestly think the current setup works well for us.

97. I like the idea of being part of a local system—like Indianhead Federated—I think this entity knows their region and is responsive to the needs of their member libraries.

98. I like the systems model but there should be more consistent definitions of core services and funding structures.
99. I like what we have now, but more funding is always an issue.

100. I prefer having a smaller to mid-size system of 24 libraries where the county and system boards know their library needs and wants. The system knows its libraries and the directors on an individual basis and can be reached the same day with questions and concerns.

101. I prefer the library system model which is localized and allows for discussion. I would like to see equity of services across all library systems though.

102. I really like the governance structure used by the South Central Library System as input is asked by everyone and the process seems to run smoothly.

103. I really like the support we currently have. Right now, if I have a problem or question, I can go to a website and see which specific IFLS staff member I should contact for that issue. I can call or email and get an answer that same day. Everyone I've worked with at IFLS is knowledgeable, accessible, and has a genuine desire to help. I honestly think the IFLS model of customer service among member libraries should be a benchmark for other systems.

104. I think a state level committee to ensure standards are being met and to enforce any noncompliance, but regional/local control of all other decisions.

105. I think a statewide structure is the way to go. It would help eliminate the equity gap between libraries/library systems. However, certain things will need to be regionalized, such as delivery and CE, which is fine.

106. I think our current system works very well. However, given the interest in collaboration and making services more efficient, I think there could simply be an additional layer of governance. Library Board, Library Director's Advisory Council, System Board, perhaps a Regional Board, and then a state body like DPI.

107. I think that the system directors should already be doing this.

108. I think the current governance with a system board works very well. Any board can have the trouble of dysfunction or uninterested members. Library systems need to recruit and train board members on their responsibilities.

109. I think the Indianhead Federal Library System is currently the best example for this.

110. I think the system that SCLS uses is the fairest way I've seen it done. We have clusters of libraries that are represented on committees and on big decisions there is a weighted vote when it comes to budgetary issues and a one library/one vote for other issues.

111. I think the system we have now works well.

112. I would like to see the governing body of our library be local to our area in order to understand our service population and what they want and need.

113. I would prefer to retain a system similar in size to Winding Rivers to directly provide our services. I feel larger systems don't provide the same personal attention that we have enjoyed with Winding Rivers.

114. I would use the representative/congressional model. Each region/library size elects a representative for a 3 year term. The assembly meets quarterly to discuss and take action. Meetings are public.

115. Ideal depends on the quality of leadership and what you are talking about. One that incorporates needs of members without stagnation and working only as far as the lowest common denominator can go.

116. If it becomes a single statewide system, then perhaps regional governing bodies or representatives from the different regions sitting upon one governing body.
If services move to a statewide model it would follow that governance would move this way too - a governing board should have representation for libraries of all sizes. Appointments should not be made at the state level but rather at regional levels.

If the outcome is that Wisconsin turns into one library system I feel there will need to be solid representation from all areas of Wisconsin in the model to best embody the diverse set of public libraries in Wisconsin.

If we stay with federated library systems, some kind of state governing or advisory council for them, made up of representatives of different size libraries and different regions of the state. To survey needs now and future, help prioritize on statewide level.

I'm not able to give a good answer on ideal governing body.

I'm not really sure. I think I would need to see some models and proposals.

I'm not sure how to answer this question. Systems are likely to remain even in a redesign. There may be fewer than before, but there will still be systems. I suppose the ideal governing body for my library would still be the system. But could the body that governs all of the systems provide a way to allow ideas/opinions/voice from small libraries to trickle down into all of the systems that have small libraries? Could a body above system level hold systems accountable for changes that small libraries want made?

I'm not sure I understand this question. The ideal governing body is a municipal, appointed citizen board (keep control local). Other than this, I think it is VERY important to keep individuals connected to the county/counties that my library (my fellow member libraries) resides in since there is of course legislation at the county level that affects my library. Recently there was a situation when the Town of Lisbon chose to not renew its contract with Village of Sussex for its joint library. If it weren't for Connie Meyer's relationship that she had development with several members of the County, I think that it would have been a disaster for the Pauline Haass Public Library. In fact, the library may have had to close. I'm not sure a regional individual could have pulled off what she did. Additionally, a County or System Board is also necessary.

In a discussion with colleagues on this subject, someone brought up the Waukesha County Act 150 Committee, which meets every few years to discuss county library services. It’s made up of a variety of stakeholders: library professionals, citizens, and government representatives. This is an effective mix of people with often very different needs and expectations of libraries and library services. The local component is essential, because, again, what one county or system or region needs may not be the same in another.

Individual systems as they are now.

Instead of system boards, the body that governs whatever replaces our current structure could be made up of representative library directors from libraries of various sizes, library trustees, and library patrons.

It could be by region, not necessarily by system. Find equity where less dense areas of the state still have a voice.

It depends on what PLSR is trying to do. If you want to manage services, then a central organization (like a DPI or something similar) would need to be in charge of each service and the provision of that service on a statewide level. If you want to maintain the system structure that you have, then you need to make sure that each system has the resources and funding it needs to make those services available to its libraries. The autonomy of the WI public library means that this is no simple task, and there’s no simple solution for it. The people working on PLSR have been doing a great job in trying to come up with solutions for these roadblocks but it’s hard to do that without knowing what the funding model will be.
129. It should be made up of both library representatives, like directors, and citizen representatives, like the system library boards but the citizen representatives need to be given a standard orientation to their roles so that all regional groups are working out of the same playbook and standards to work with so that they know what the goals and expectations are for providing library service to their service areas.

130. It would be at the local level with the Library Board and municipality.

131. It’s working okay now, with 2 Native members, 2 non-Native and one rep from the school.

132. It’s important to keep local non-library people involved in a Board of Trustees structure. Again, what works well in the current system structure is that we have local Trustees on the system board, which helps us feel committed to the decisions made at that level. Maybe a useful governance can be built on a combination of local or regional boards (along with the councils of directors/staff) that has members on statewide boards and councils. It seems effective when library directors advise boards, and, for governing legitimacy, boards direct the structure that provides services.

133. It’s important to me that we have a single governing body, not one for each type of service being provided. Because these are government funds and because I believe government can be held more accountable than private entities, a public-not-private body is needed. A board of stakeholders (citizens, librarians, municipal and county representatives) seems appropriate, with appointments made at the county or multi-county levels, not at the state level. Alternatively, each library system board could appoint one person not on their board. Governor-appointed boards, like the COLAND model, are to be avoided because politics can be at play. This governing body must have the power and the will to deliver meaningful consequences to effect change when libraries are not satisfied with service delivery. Currently, library systems must receive negative rating from 2/3 of their member library boards to appear on the Division’s radar; that bar is FAR too high.

134. Keep systems intact.

135. Larger Systems with more collaboration between them? For example, SWLS could be combined with WRLS.

136. Libraries from around the state form regional cluster groups that represent our diversity. Cluster groups discuss issues and make recommendations together based on how decisions would affect them. Each library would have a voice within their cluster, as long as they are able to participate. Use technology to advance participation. Clusters have representation who understand and advocate for the needs of their cluster. Library Boards are educated on why participation is crucial to meeting needs and encouraged to allow staff to participate. Funding for attendance costs. If systems are the driving force for change under PLSR models, libraries need an active voice in how systems are managed. Under-performing systems cannot be ignored by DPI and checks must be in place to ensure all systems are able to provide same services. System Board Trustees need education on changes and need to visit libraries they represent to understand needs/challenges.

137. Libraries vary by community needs, and I feel the only way to know what’s happening in a particular area is to have people in that area. We would need local individuals to build relationships with and understand the dynamics of local governance and community needs.

138. Libraries would not be best served by their municipality or their county. The governing body would need to be aware of the library’s essential mission and capabilities.

139. Library Directors and/or staff.

140. Library system as it is.
141. Library system.
142. Library systems currently have citizen boards which provide accountability. I believe it is important to have this type of oversight. These people come from communities throughout the system. They understand the needs of their citizens and the library services that are most valued. Whatever the model of service, I believe regional boards are essential.
143. Local and State.
144. Local Boards representing the communities in their service area.
145. Local Library System.
146. Local or system representation to ensure our library needs are meeting are wants and needs.
147. Local System Boards.
148. Local, municipal library board autonomy, supplemented by a statewide agency designed to secure funding for stateside digital resources and allocation of financial aids to sparse and distant library systems.
149. Make multiple meeting places - with the president of the "system" leading the meeting. Tally all votes. Prior to creating the "system" have lending rules, etc. already laid out with the idea that they can be changed in future meetings if necessary - by most votes.
150. Many states have a state library director, this person would oversee the "systems" and would help with decisions, however, they would not be able to make any one decision without a vote by the regional directors and a vote by every library in the state. One Library, One vote. I think the system of Regional Library Systems works well, this ensures local representation, however it has grown into borders that really don't work anymore. Regional hubs spaced more appropriately would be better for delivery especially.
151. Membership councils. Volunteer governing boards representing regions of the system.
152. Multiple-county based boards. None larger than currently exist.
153. Network Advisory Committee.
154. Not sure at this point.
155. Not sure of this question... Are we talking on a DPI level? or system? I like being governed by people who understand public libraries and their value to individuals and our communities. My library is more than the annual circulation count.
156. Not sure.
158. Not sure. I think as long as there is some way to have a voice.
159. Nothing is "ideal". Keeping in mind that "One size doesn't fit all". Enlarging or consolidating systems would not be ideal or necessarily good.
160. Obviously, what we already have is IDEAL. Smaller systems provide the best service when they are able to work together with larger networks and larger resources as needed.
161. Once again, I feel the Library System is the best.
162. One independent board across the state similar to WI Digital Library Consortium (except with citizens in the chairs).
163. One rep from each system.
164. One System Board with small committees.
165. One that is made up of 65% librarians, 25% educators, 5% healthcare advocates & 5% government reps in high places.
166. One that, as above, includes representation of libraries of all sizes and all areas of WI...and, hopefully, meets in a more central location than...Madison or Milwaukee.

167. Our current Bridges system functions well. See above. I have never felt that the needs of my library have been ignored, or that we haven't had opportunity to voice an opinion.

168. Our current library system director.

169. Our current setup works well.

170. Our library system does an outstanding job- it would be a good model for any governing body, with as much local control as possible.

171. Our library system.

172. Over the course of the two years I have been in Milltown, I have witnessed firsthand on a weekly (if not more) basis of the amazing support we currently get from our system (IFLS). What I have heard in various workshops, WLA conference, etc. is actually quite frightening as I know we get AMAZING support from our system and the expectation we have is high. I'm not sure that a larger body would be able to service Milltown with the high expectations we currently have. That being said, System.

173. Perhaps a committee of system administrators?

174. Possibly a "State library board" to oversee the work of various committees and employees.

175. Really not sure.

176. Regional boards or committees. Perhaps something similar to the House and Senate - where there is both weighted voting based on population and equal representation, regardless of library size.

177. Regional governance with regular input from directors in the region. Perhaps state-wide contracts for e-resources, technology, ILL, etc. in order to get better pricing.

178. Regional representatives, with multiple representatives from the different regions, of varying size libraries.

179. Regional reps reporting to state level or system level.

180. Regional reps within a system.

181. Regional service hubs (much like current systems) would be best able to respond to local needs. The varying requirements of WI areas--NW area vs Madison--necessitate a more local understanding and responsiveness to needs of libraries. There can certainly be a state level of governance to oversee regions so that equity of services is not sacrificed, but a closer relationship is required between the governing body and those governed.

182. Representation from all libraries.

183. Representation from all types and sizes of libraries with equal voice in voting.

184. Representation from each (predetermined) "like" entity be part of the governance structure.

185. Representation on the governing body reflecting the percentage of size of libraries in the state. Not sure if that makes sense - but my thoughts are if 65% of libraries are in communities of population less than 5,000, then 65% of governing board should be representatives of libraries from communities with population less than 5,000.

186. Representative board made up of small, medium and large libraries (already there is a class system in place for library size). Making decisions for the whole.

187. Representative from all areas/sizes of libraries including County representation.

188. Representative governance with a blend of appointees by size & geography.
189. Representative that will take my concerns and ideas to the governing agency.

190. Representatives from each geographical location.

191. Representatives from each size and type of public library must be represented on any statewide or regional governing body. This includes library directors, library trustees, and members of the public. Ideally the governing body would include elected officials to advocate for libraries in the statehouse.

192. Representatives from each system in the discussions, but each library being given equal say in the final decisions. (1 vote per library regardless of size or population.)

193. SCLS Library Directors and SCLS model.

194. See previous question. I do not believe in "change for change's sake." Instead of upending the apple cart for something completely untried, untested, and new, fix what is already broken. My library is served by my library system. I understand that other libraries are not. Consult with those that work to fix those that do not.

195. Separate committee for each service designated to be essential. Any library not receiving specified base service level gets funding priority over all other non-essential services until standard service level is met or exceeded.

196. Should be comprised of people already involved with libraries, but also adding representatives from local government, community, possibly other government agencies (i.e. human services, health dept, etc.).

197. Similar to how many ILS systems are governed now: a larger voting membership, and a smaller board of representatives that make day-to-day decisions and policy recommendations.

198. SMALL LIBRARIES.

199. Some kind of governance committee comprised of Library Directors from libraries of all sizes.

200. Some type of flow chart so that all involved are aware of protocol. Whatever is decided, there needs to be a breakdown of authority status.

201. Special purpose districts with 9-13 member Board. Board has fixed 'liaison' positions from key stakeholder and decision making entities. For example, a City Council liaison, or someone from the school board, etc.

202. State governed. Being in the big picture of what is happening in the context of all state libraries could be helpful. There needs to be one centralized unit for decisions and mandates for consistency.

203. State library at the helm, one system with regional offices/ outreach.

204. State of WI.

205. Statewide service providers and governance Regional subgroups for representing individual libraries to the state level, as needed Individual libraries.

206. System Board representing the service area.

207. System boards need to be eliminated. Having been the director of four library systems I can honestly say that boards are an ineffective way to run systems. The administrator either needs to be directly responsible to the state or to the libraries she/he serves (see above).

208. System reps maybe? a mix of rural & urban perspectives for sure, recruit recent retirees to consult [there's a lot of wisdom out there].

209. The body should also be transparent, forward-thinking, adequately staffed, responsive and represents all areas of the state. The governing body should be using an outside
consultant to collect feedback and present objective information to help update strategic plans.

210. The current system with governing bodies within a library system allows for individual libraries to gather and work together yet allowing for individual autonomy.

211. The governing body should have a mix of members. Directors, support staff, system staff and a state representative should all be included. It is very important that the majority of the governing body be made up of those that are using the services that are being paid for.

212. The governing body would have lots of people from small rural libraries.

213. The Library Board and director working with the library system.

214. The library system your public library belongs to or the state agency.

215. The local funding governmental body, such as a municipal common council.

216. The Public Library Development Team and our local library systems currently provide for our library’s needs wonderfully. Our systems help us with the consortia and our ability to lend and borrow so freely with other libraries, provide training, ILL services and assistance, and I hope that any redesign would never affect that negatively, but would only enhance what we already have.

217. The state.

218. There are a number of solid governance models that are successful. Personally, I prefer a shared governance model. At the core would be a governing council. All essential sub-councils would radiate from the core governing council. Sub-councils could include but not be limited to: Public services; information technologies; collection services; delivery services, etc.

219. There are probably better ideas for this, but a board made up of regional representatives from all size libraries and locations (rural, urban) would probably be the most fair to all. Each library would have a voice on a regional board that reports to the main governance body.

220. There should be oversight at a level higher than the regional systems -- something like COLAND but with more authority -- and perhaps standards for systems so they can be held accountable. The ideal governing body to help ensure services are provided to meet the needs of the residents of Eagle and adjacent communities is the library board and the Village of Eagle and Town of Eagle. Local control cannot be stressed enough.

221. This question is unclear.

222. Three divisions of libraries with 3 separate governing bodies. S,M,L sized libraries in their separate areas deciding on issues germane to them. Library Directors in each category would have a vote in that category’s governance. It has been difficult to find citizens and while they are mostly very well intentioned, they don’t understand the complexities of library work a lot of times. Secondly, the way things are currently with county appointments of citizens to system boards, the citizen appointee confuses their work as work that is directly received by the patrons from the library system. It’s sometimes indirectly at best, but really the market for systems as we have them is to serve the libraries and that gets lost on citizen appointees all too often. Perhaps for the medium and small libraries (due to the number of them) an at large election of peers is held to be the representative.

223. Three reps from each system, one from each Grade.

224. Tiny rural libraries must be represented.

225. Two houses for voting? One- small and large libraries. Second- Regional.
226. Two representatives per library system on the governing body, one from a large library and one from a small library.

227. We like the setup that we have now, local municipality and Milwaukee County governance.

228. We’re pretty happy with our current setup of the IFLS Board of Directors with reps from across the entire system and the Director’s Council with opportunities to discuss policies and procedures and opportunities.

229. Whether we are keeping our existing systems or creating one large system, I presume there will still be departments within the system. So, one of the departments would need to be support services.

230. While I like the ability for libraries to learn from members of all sizes, more progress is made when the member is more similar than different. This could mean tiering system members by population served and budget might be the best system for the future.

231. WVLS.

9. **What other factors should be considered when designing a governance model such that your library’s needs are met along with the needs of libraries that may have different needs?**

1. A mix of local and system governance.

2. A framework of focus areas and opportunities for libraries to select their areas of priority.

3. A governance model should include smaller units of governance, under a statewide board. System boards are good for this, but larger systems should be reduced in size. For every library’s needs to be partially ADDRESSED,* communication between library directors and system personnel must be easy, effective, and frequent. Having taught courses for new directors of small libraries, I have seen vast areas that they have no experience with or knowledge of. A library’s needs go far beyond an ILS, delivery, ILL, etc. Those provide materials and checkout abilities, but don’t make a library successfully serve its community. Success comes from exchanging ideas with other librarians & systems (innovation due to smaller units), mentorship from system staff, guidance and education tailored to each director’s skill gaps, trust and relationships that grow only with physical proximity and frequent interaction. *Locally-underfunded library’s needs cannot be MET; require minimum standards for system membership.

4. A list of all the needs of all the libraries should be made and used as factors in order to determine the model. Then get representation from the varying areas of the state so people have a voice.

5. A realistic view of how libraries operate, and their patron needs and wants.

6. A shortcoming of a county model would be the likely inflexibility of ‘moving’ to another county for support alternatives. Maybe allowing for a movement to an adjacent counties governance would allow a library an option if they feel that their needs are not being met in their current system. The alternative assumes a lot though as funding may get very complicated.

7. A voting structure that accounts for library size with votes on actual decisions.

8. Access to education about topics that impact libraries. I like Director’s Counsel, but that is every other month. Local librarians need a chance to get together more often and have presenters from our System who will help us understand and make informed decisions. Because of tight budgets and limited hours, it is difficult to get these things
organized. Webinars are great and fill a need, but I think having help in the rural areas means making small committee meetings happen more often.

9. Affordable funding, perhaps base it on local tax levy? term limits for all voting positions. meetings have a virtual option and can be attended by anyone. agendas and minutes are all open to the public.

10. Again, provide surveys that pertain to what is being considered.
11. Again, do not assume it is a one way works for all. Provide options.
12. Again, Weighted Voting on system level on services according to success benchmarks tallied on annual report: Per capita in expenditure categories measures including circulation, library visits, program attendance, public internet computer usage, wi-fi sessions, public computer internet use., Library website use, Maker Space Use. Similar benchmarks are used by Library Journal and Baker & Taylor in the Annual Star Library.

13. All factors should be considered: size, budget, impact.
14. All libraries have different wants and needs but things work right for us now and I hope that they will stay that way.
15. All libraries within the service area, represented by the System Board, should have a vote, be part of the committee governance.
17. Any model should allow a local library the flexibility it needs to experiment and adapt to changing demands. We all gain by giving local libraries try new things.
18. Are we aiming to move everyone up 20% or are we aiming to bring up those with less services to a more elevated "basic" level? Those are two different models. If we are elevating the basic level, then those who are already at a moderate level of service may not see new benefits.
19. As mentioned above, governance can't be tilted in favor of the larger libraries and will need to be balanced.
20. Availability of funding and resistance to library systems losing services they currently have.
21. Balance the needs of the small libraries with the larger libraries in the state.
22. Big vs. Little is a real thing in libraries, and sometimes, within systems. The lack of small/rural representation in the PLSR project has already created apprehension and some animosity of the process. The PLSR Steering Committee needs to ensure that ALL libraries matter, and that each library has a voice. Surveys like this are helpful, but at this point in the process, it is unlikely that responses will change the overall outcome. That being said, some small/rural libraries and systems do amazing things with the funds they are provided. They cooperate and collaborate across libraries and systems. They are extremely respectful of the funds they have. They do as much as they possibly can to provide outstanding library services to their communities. Don't overlook or discourage this work in favor processes found in larger or better funded systems simply to appease more people.
23. Budget differential between members. Overall cost changes brought on by realignment. Who will pick the system alignments?
24. Budget, circulation, computer usage but not programming.
25. Chapter 43 needs to specifically state the services provided by these regional entities and HOW those services will be provided. Far too much emphasis is placed on the individuality of each system. The truth is almost all libraries want the same thing, delivery
and an ILS. Although there is some uniqueness to each system it is insignificant compared to the services desired by the member libraries.

26. Committees divided by service population, population or librarian certification grade to exchange ideas with those in similar demographics/circumstances.

27. Communication and education along with local control.

28. Compromise is key. Also rolling membership in any governance structure is important.

29. Consideration of different needs of rural and urban communities. Governing body includes library staff, library system and DPI representation.

30. Cooperation and compromise will be important, and all parties will have to work toward the greater good of improved library service in Wisconsin.

31. Core services provided to everyone, like the Ohio model. Data infrastructure has always been free in Ohio, as well as a core set of electronic resources. Every library's services are at least at an established core level because the state provides it.

32. Cost, current services vs. a change in service based on these costs. I know what we receive from IFLS and I know it's amazing. I don't want to see those services diminished because they become cost prohibitive.

33. Cost. The DPI is doing a fine job overseeing libraries in Wisconsin.

34. County or regional representation with a strong mix of library professional knowledge. Libraries truly are unique in terms of business models, and to not have that expertise at the table EVERY TIME is counter-productive at best.

35. Decide how much money goes to each system, and let that system determine how the dollars will be used.

36. Don't make a blanket model - provide for flexibility. If a system and its members feel that are satisfied, then let them continue to operate as they are. Those design models should be local decisions, that like our libraries, reflect local community needs and desires.

37. Don't restrict libraries from doing their own thing, trying something new or serving the special needs of their community.

38. Due to the large number of committees in my consortium, many members know each other well. Newcomers can feel like outsiders. I have heard committee members bad-mouth a consortium member because the person complains frequently. It was totally inappropriate to allow such a tone in the discussion--felt like junior high school. Some format that maximizes the number of individual members being heard would be best. That's why I suggest representatives who survey their libraries and present the results as an outside and neutral middle point for discussions.

39. Ease of communication between parties Cost: don't make small libraries pay for things without showing them the benefit.

40. Education for the library directors/librarians to conduct SWAT or needs assessments on their own libraries so they are aware of what their needs are so those needs can be better translated to the governance.

41. Ensuring that there is representation from all sizes and urban and rural areas.

42. Equal access for all.

43. Equity of representation.

44. Equity of treatment for libraries is important, some form of regional or local support is important so that public libraries have a readily available resource to contact, and a governance model that is receptive, responsive, and respectful of a very diverse set of public libraries in Wisconsin.
45. Establishing tiers or levels of library services and the funding per capita that is required to meet those expectations. Having this would help libraries receive adequate funding from their municipalities. More equitable salary levels would be important in this since 60-70% of budgets are wages/benefit. A standard salary by region (maybe by county) would be helpful in making a case for raising wages.

46. Every library is important to its community, whether it is big or small. If all communities are to have equal services and resources, then each library should have one vote no matter its size.

47. Face to face interaction is important in expressing our libraries’ needs and in learning about the needs and concerns of others. It’s much easier to understand another library’s point of view or another community’s challenges when you can put a face with a name. Coming from a large system with both tiny and large libraries, ensuring that all voices are heard and considered is important.

48. Fair representation.

49. Fair representation for smaller libraries from poor communities.

50. Fairness so that everyone’s voice can be heard, while recognizing that larger and more well-funded libraries should not be penalized.

51. Feedback. How does the governing body hear from individual libraries? How does individual libraries know they were heard?

52. Fees for services would allow those libraries that want unique services to attain those services, while not financially burdening libraries that don’t want/need that service. A formal mechanism for addressing concerns should be present. Transparency should be mandated in system/vendor relationships and contracts.

53. Finances, region.

54. Finding a way to balance the diverse needs of the libraries in a system - from tiny one-person libraries to large ones.

55. First, library directors need to know the difference between personal preferences and actual community needs. Similar to branding for chain businesses, a certain level of standards and an amount of uniformity must exist in public libraries to meet customers’ expectations, as they use multiple libraries and compare the services. Once there is assurance that basic standards are met, being able to choose from a menu of services could ensure libraries’ unique needs are met, as well.

56. Flexibility.

57. Flexibility should be built in to any suggested policies or protocols, giving individual libraries the opportunity to best serve their own populations.

58. Geographic area City vs. rural.

59. Geographical factors.

60. Good leadership not only focuses on developing efficient processes that manage time and finances in an effective manner, but also considers challenging issues in a proactive, positive way that encourages problem solving within the community as a whole. An effective executive team will value accountability, legal and statutory compliance, budgeting, strategic planning and logistics alongside ways to improve technology, innovative services, educational standards and progressive trends in librarianship.

61. Governance can no longer be based on the archaic a one library, one vote model. There are only 16 resource libraries in the state and another dozen or so that are considered "large" libraries. However, there are hundreds of small libraries. Large and small libraries often have different needs, accept and expect change at different rates.
and have vastly different amounts of money available for projects. Votes should be based on population served or we will never move ahead as a state.

62. Grouping "like" entities together and having a representative from each be a part of the governance structure.

63. Have representation throughout the state.

64. Having all sizes of libraries represented at the discussion table. Also from all regions.

65. Having buy-in from all participating libraries acknowledging change, being able to follow state-wide decisions even if it is not the ideal choice locally and being ready to change further as needed.

66. How to bring in the school and special libraries into the process.

67. I am concerned that without some sort of required service standards, many smaller libraries will simply "opt out" in an effort to save money. How do we motivate all libraries to get on board with these changes? How do we convince them that investing in technology, continuing ed, etc. is as valuable as purchasing best-selling novels and DVDs for their patrons?

68. I am not certain that the current model of library system governance is helpful. Local government leaders seem to struggle with understanding basic concepts of library system services. Since public libraries are already responsive to their municipalities through their local library boards, I think that system governance should have less focus on public representation and be more focused on those who actually understand and use library system services: their member libraries. This is already true for ILS consortia, and I think a similar model could work for systems. Perhaps a blended system that includes library representatives as well as public representation could be considered.

69. I believe regions should be able to democratically elect their representatives to serve with others from across the state. To get representation from smaller libraries, which I think is a key to a successful model, some financial incentives might need to be included to allow library leaders to step away from their buildings for meetings. PLA leadership has just adopted a model like this that pays travel and room and board costs for a small/rural library representative who might find the financial costs too steep to be absorbed by their library.

70. I believe that the strength of Winnefox's advisory and governance structures is that relationships and trust are built from the county level up. County library directors build relationships with one another and nurture their own local advocacy with the support of system staff. Major changes (whether on shared ILS policies or purchase of a new software module) are only made after consultation and deliberation.

71. I do not want a state run model. I do not want to give up local control and relationships that were already forged by our library system on the local level.

72. I don't know.

73. I don't know for sure, but I know that I don't want this to be like our current government structure (congress) where nothing much gets done. Sorry that was super unhelpful, but I really don't know what would work.

74. I don't know, but please just understand that in some libraries that are understaffed and underfunded we barely have time to even read our e-mails or give any thought to surveys such as this, or procedure/policy changes...the smaller directors are doing loads of unique areas of work in addition to overseeing all other areas, whereas in other libraries there are people who are paid to sit and think about these things...to me it's mostly about TIME, and those of us who have less of it are inherently having less participation.
75. I don't know.

76. I think DPI needs to be given some teeth, and more of an ability to jump in and question things done by systems/regions, and maybe say no to some of the things systems spend money on. And be able to move funds around if necessary. It seems like DPI is handicapped a bit and I think they should be at least given the tools needed to adjust things when necessary.

77. I think location should be a considering factor. Hypothetically, if two larger systems are combining, it would be ideal for governing offices to be centrally located within the reach of all governed libraries. If that would mean having two smaller governing offices, that would work as well. Accessibility for libraries to use resources at the governing location would be key in providing support for member libraries.

78. I think the biggest thing would be that the little libraries do not get lost in some kind of weighted voting system related to population.

79. I think there should be fewer systems then there are, and stand-alone circulation systems should be eliminated. We are probably duplicating systems too often. If we combine circulation systems, it could help illuminate some unnecessary duplicated services and funds could possibly be moved to other areas of need.

80. I think we need to get over the fact that some systems might lose out on some things in order to get every system to a basic level of service. I'm honestly not that worried about whether one system would have to stop giving scholarships to attend conferences when my system can't even afford decent technology support, much less have extra money to give to its libraries for those things.

81. I would be concerned about losing the ability to network with the other directors and staff within my system if, for example, governance went straight from Library Boards to a Regional governing body. Because the needs in the different areas of the state are so different, it would be very important to keep those local experts and networks strong and connected.

82. I would miss the convenience of having Director's Council meetings in Eau Claire, but if it would be fairer to other libraries to have these meetings at other locations, I would understand and do the necessary travel.

83. I would suggest that there be a better process in place for libraries that are dissatisfied with the level of service they are receiving.

84. I'd mention two things. First, I think it's key that the governance structure builds in communication and feedback throughout the structure, rather than trying to add communication as an afterthought. Each part of the structure providing service should be working to include communication and feedback as a key element. Second, one problem today with the current structure is that there is no effective or meaningful way for a local library to express strong disagreement with a system. The statement at the end of the annual report (does the system provide effective leadership) doesn't work well because a) it's a once a year piece of communication and b) it rarely seems to make a difference/no action comes from it. This allows local libraries to make protest statements that they may not support and allows systems to ignore legitimate problems.

85. Ideally, at some level there would be an opportunity for libraries that serve less than 2,500 to have equal say.

86. If a smaller library does not have a sustainable budget to provide the services needed it should consider how they balance that consequence with some outside assistance but not as an equal to a sustainable system. The sustainable system can help provide assistance toward an equitable core service model, but beyond that it should not impact the sustainable system.
87. If all is quiet, all is well. If a small library asks for something, they probably really need it. Keep that in mind. Smaller libraries are most often painfully aware of funding and needs...so if you hear from us, we need help with something.

88. If services are to be eliminated, be sure to provide a format for discussion.

89. I'm not interested in having the government have all the say at the state level. I really appreciate that our current consortium director has a good sense of what the libraries need and how things work for the libraries at the ground level. Keeping those positions are important.

90. In addition to location, a governing body where no matter the size of the library, all have an equal vote.

91. Involve people of all ages.

92. It is essential that each library has control of its own finances and that each library is able to make choices that reflect the needs of its individual community. I noticed that this structure varies considerably from system to system, so the governance needs to be loose and not controlling.

93. It is vital that governance of/authority over library systems is not privatized. Also, preserving local control (by having library system boards) is very important.

94. It should be very individualized, which the systems can do. Otherwise, it would be a combination of population, amount of area covered, the existing individual governance, and other individual library issues.

95. It would be nice to have a group to consult at the DPI or other state source when a library has a rare or unusually difficult issue to deal with in maintaining equitable service.

96. It's hard enough to make a decision that is best for everyone in a 28 member library consortium. But, it is important for all to have a say. I think giving all libraries a vote is essential.

97. Knowledge of how library systems work; knowledge of IT services needed in libraries; use models from library systems that seem to work smoothly - in Wi or other states.

98. Let libraries purchase the services they need out of a state supplied pot of money distributed on a per capita basis by service area.

99. Level of services provided to the libraries and public, as well as the costs.

100. Libraries in rural communities have some different needs than urban communities--and different funding and resources. Urban areas have better access to technology and funding but may not be the only program in town. Rural communities may depend on their library for many things--but don't even know it exists because of a lack of ability to move the message out. Finally, part of the inequity stems from an inability to hire and pay librarians with training and mad skills what they are worth and get them into every library. Hiring a 'Library Director' part time for $10 an hour does not mean hiring a trained professional. And library boards will get what they pay for, in that case.

101. Library size, population, etc.

102. Local authority. Leaving some authority up to the library to decide what best suits their community's needs.

103. Local autonomy for local funding. Bring back the Maintenance of Effort requirement for municipalities. The ability of the state to pay for its mandates. Yes, the state currently invests 15.5 million in libraries but that is still not the level of payment required by Chapter 43, which the state has not been met for years and years.

104. Local funding, population statistics (income level, education, family size etc.) physical size of library.
105. Local funding, poverty levels, library goals and objectives, community needs and wants.
106. Local needs, deficits, and also strengths should be considered when forming a governance model. For example, Marquette County is working on its health rating, so a focus should be made on helping our communities increase awareness on health topics, unemployment issues, etc.
107. Local representation.
108. Location and population size.
109. Location of said libraries may be one of them.
110. Location, population, budget constraints.
111. Location, travel times and staffing issues all affect the ability of rural libraries to attend meetings and be involved in the decision-making process. We are often penalized and not heard simply because we can't be there.
112. Make sure to include all libraries/boards within a county so that everyone's voice is heard.
113. Make sure we are up-to-date on Act 31 for all libraries also.
114. Making the structure flexible enough to allow libraries to use the system effectively.
115. Meaningful governance that impacts all libraries in a positive direction regarding the ability to provide improved services at a level that can be consistent to users.
116. Methods of communication.
117. Methods to appeal, share information and to address the governing body will be necessary. Disparity of population, geographic distance from meeting locations, financial resources, technology access, expertise and time.
118. Models that can be flexible whether it is a big library or a little library.
119. More voice for individual libraries than system as would be the case if the System Board were drawn from libraries within the system.
120. Most importantly, keeping the individual personality of each library as it has developed to meet the needs of its community. Things such as whether or not to charge fines, etc.
121. Moving the meeting location around the state, allowing attendance remotely, fair voting.
122. Multi county library systems make it more difficult for directors to attend meetings and workshops, so keeping the systems smaller on the western and northern parts of the state would help in making it possible for more people to participate.
123. No idea.
124. No one size fits all will work. Different sized libraries have different challenges and different goals. If there were a budget for direct services from the state that all libraries get because we redefine what core services are, then that solves a bunch. Then separate budgets for S M L libraries are set aside for those libraries to work with each other to decide on their own what's important. We are far too regional and parochial. While Osceola and Algoma are on opposite sides of the state, you will not convince me that one small town's library is much different than the other's in regard to the challenges they have or the goals they have. The market sets the expectation and small towns expect certain things, suburbs expect others, and urban areas/county libraries with branches expect others.
125. None.
126. None come to mind.
127. Not really sure.
128. Not sure.
129. Not sure.
130. Obviously, distance and geography could impede a shared governance model in terms of in-person attendance at monthly meetings. A standard mid-state meeting location would be helpful, but not perfect for everyone.
131. One thing that I have a huge issue with is the way governance was handled for WPLC - 1 system / 1 vote - even after they tried to revise it they still didn’t fix it. Three of the Library Systems are putting in well over 50% of the million-dollar pool and yet they only have 3 of 16 votes or a mere 19% of the authority. That is wrong. They don’t even have 50% of the authority of the Steering Committee votes. If there is going to be money involved then the governance needs to be run similar to that of corporation with shareholders because after all, as I said before, we need to answer to our taxpayers.
132. Opportunities for individual libraries to weigh in, especially if they feel they are not being well represented.
133. People who work in the governing model should have an array of experience with different libraries: small, rural, large, city, etc. - so they know firsthand some of the issues different libraries face and what their needs may be.
134. Perhaps a system other than weighted voting; opportunities for open discussion; consideration of individual budgets; an appeals process; idea-sharing.
135. Perhaps a way to invoke a Special Interest Group status (as in WLA/ALA) to band together on specific issues? Not really sure.
136. Please consider the fact that local funding is drying up for libraries. With 0% increases over and over and staffing cuts having public libraries at the local level contribute or pay for services will be next to impossible moving forward.
137. Plenty of advance planning, and openness regarding any changes.
138. Population size, average age of population, is there a school close by.
139. Population size, rural isolation, budget, physical building size.
140. Possibly consider library service populations, registered library card holders, and tax bases.
141. Regional consideration for differences in services - not a one size fits all model. But still equal voting rights.
142. Regional systems allow libraries to provide collaborated services to a particular region of the state regardless of their size. Libraries also need to collaborate with libraries of similar size, unique populations, etc.
143. Representation by libraries of diverse size.
144. Representation from all libraries will be needed on committees and boards.
145. Representation is important, but even more important is a governance system that takes a lesson from Colorado libraries, who believe their role is to serve everyone in the state. Our governance structures need to incorporate similar principles that will guide the members of the decision-making bodies. The current dynamic within Wisconsin library systems seems to one of dogs trying to grab the biggest bone. The systems have become fiefdoms of directors, with the goal of fighting for what they have and not giving an inch.
146. Representation on geographical location, library size, city funding, county funding, and special needs populations should all be considered when creating a governing board.
147. Review current library system governance models and survey them for satisfaction and efficacy. Some follow one library, one vote models, others....? Perhaps a majority of library systems in the state have similar style governing bodies that meet the needs of their member libraries, and if so, this type of governance may have merit for whatever replacement is being proposed.

148. Safeguards for small libraries -- they need to be able to reflect their communities and not be bullied by big libraries with lots of patrons and more money.

149. Service population should be considered. There are so many small libraries in WI and they are awesome! but if we only go by one library, one voice we'll be largely focusing on basic services. Some of the small libraries in my region can't believe our library needs services like Internet filtering or downloadable/streaming audio/video or help with staff training on topics like homelessness and diversity.

150. Size of library, demographic of the area, economic impact -- is the area in decline or showing growth? How does the neighboring libraries impact the needs of the local library?

151. Size of library, service population, location (rural vs. city).

152. Size of library--that smaller libraries don't have access to money larger libraries have--and may not have professional services needed in their area--so library system should provide connections/contacts to rural libraries--larger libraries may already have these in their area.

153. Size of the governance model. Equitable representation. Unique local needs.

154. Size, populations, economics, etc.

155. Size, rural, urban, hours, staff, budget.

156. Size, unemployment lever/poverty level of area.

157. SMALL LIBRARIES.

158. Small libraries need to be represented as well as larger ones.

159. Small to mid-size library systems are where all individual libraries can be heard and then those systems go to bat at state level to help their libraries.

160. Smaller library systems are able to communicate with their individual participating libraries, to ensure each library's needs are met appropriately. The larger the governing body, the less personal it is, and the less chance there is of having the one-on-one contact that is needed on a regular basis. Libraries are run by humans, for the betterment of humanity, and the more we can keep the human element, the better.

161. Something along the line of Maintenance of Effort (MOE). I realize that model is perhaps outdated, but when it existed it forced ALL system library member municipalities to properly fund its public libraries - so that better funded system libraries (and its tax payers) were not being taken advantage of by municipalities unwilling to fund its public library at an acceptable level.

162. Something in which it isn't all about large budgets/ large libraries.

163. Survey to communities and directors.

164. Surveys sent periodically to local county/city/village officials and members from organizations that support youth about what they need in the community.

165. System borders are funny things. I feel like I can't collaborate with a library that is 15 minutes away because it's in a different system. A governance model that fosters and encourages collaboration across the state would be wonderful.
166. Systems are able to stand alone without any push from above (DPI or elsewhere) when the systems are not operating efficiently. Some sort of oversight at a state level would be nice; or, at least, a way that DPI could force a change when needed.

167. Take into consideration the size of the library. Some need more attention than others.

168. Talk to OWLS. The voting system works well.

169. That all have a voice and that we (state, systems, local libraries) try our hardest to find the commonalities of our needs and strive to meet those, and then see what we can do about the rest and do our best. Maybe a governance model could show that the needs met should vary from year to year, so that everyone’s needs have a rotating focus, so they’re all met on occasion, and in the meantime the libraries whose needs are not being focused upon either make due, or seek other sources and partnerships to meet their needs, decreasing their dependence on what the governance provides, if such alternate sources and partnerships are sustainable. Especially if those needs are compliant with an LSTA goal for funding, consulting, partnering, etc.

170. That each individual library is able to pick and choose services that fit within their budget and community needs. This way a burden is not placed unnecessarily on a library that doesn’t have the same need as other libraries. This type of model is currently in use with our library system and it allows larger libraries to have the services their communities demand while being conscious of smaller libraries that may be limited by the parameters of a smaller budget and cannot afford or have different needs than the larger libraries.

171. That is why the local and regional governance is very important.

172. That not as much can be done in a small library in comparison to a large library.

173. The budgets of the participating libraries.

174. The county or area library committee could address some of these issues and make recommendations to the system.

175. The governance model would need to include those with understanding of library sizes and their populations. Possibly, the body would be able to visit the different libraries on a regular basis to see with their own eyes what the needs of each are.

176. The governing body should meet at different locations throughout the state, so that they are not governing in a vacuum. Different sized libraries throughout the state.

177. The lack of unreliable internet access throughout the state. Is the infrastructure capable of delivering reliable service to every library?

178. The municipal library board to ensure autonomy. The regional system board (appointed citizens) for broader local governance. But the system board must be guided by local system staff. They are all things that currently exist and should continue. It’s possible that a state board (made up of a mix of citizens and library professionals) might help with some standardization ideas.

179. The number of small libraries as compared with the number of large urban libraries - proportional representation.

180. The size of library and budget.

181. The state must have a better way to have payments to libraries in different counties. County systems should have to support the libraries that are supporting their users. I believe the state needs to pay a larger share of the costs in having superb libraries, the law should be written in such a way that the loopholes that exist now are filled, and payment is made on a user basis, whether based upon address or home library.

182. The vote of each library be equal.
183. The wheel doesn't need to be reinvented. We're just looking into how we can make what we have, only bigger work. We just need to figure out what makes successful systems successful and how we can expand what they have to make it work on a larger scale. I realize if change is coming services are going to change with it.

184. There could be a service priority list or document that is used as a “constitution” and this is the tool to use when differing needs compete and need some kind of balancing.

185. There has to be some sort of accountability worked in. Perhaps there could be minimum standards.

186. There need to be both formal and informal ways for libraries to meet and discuss current topics of interest, and to convey their interests and concerns up the ladder. There needs to be a system in place to respond to input from the governance structure, so libraries know they are being heard.

187. There would need to be a “fair system” in how different libraries service overlapping patrons. Many patrons use more than one library, or even more than one library system.

188. Timely reviews - opting out should not be an option.

189. Transparency - posting all communications and agendas ahead of time, open meetings, and opportunities for input from members at all meetings.

190. Travels - distance to meetings.

191. Uncertain.

192. Various methods of communicating concerns and needs through committee membership and various means of input from the member libraries.

193. We feel that systems need to have sufficient power to enforce required standards so that equity of service is viable. This means that the system could --in some way --regulate libraries that fail to meet standards of service. It would also be good if there could be system-wide training for meeting standards that all new directors/administrators would complete to ensure that all local level librarians know the system expectations.

194. We need a group that is willing to look at the big picture and wants all Wisconsin citizens and libraries to succeed, not just the few or the most densely populated. I also want some racial and cultural diversity in governance or at a minimum, an acknowledgement that our state residents speak many languages and have a variety of skin tones. It would also be helpful to acknowledge that poverty (urban or rural) adds an extra challenge for individuals, families and communities possibly requiring more support (money, staff) to create equity.

195. Weighting in voting models to represent the various numbers/needs of different libraries.

196. Whatever the board is based on ... circulation, service population, or another factor ... the different needs should be identified and realized. People in Northern Wisconsin drive miles to a Library and have limited time and access while other in the state can walk around the corner to their Library. Needs should be identified and realization of how we can make each patron’s visit to the Library what they need.

197. When deciding policies without a financial impact, it should be one library, one vote. When making decisions that have a financial component, there should be a system in place so that libraries in wealthier communities are not made to directly pay for services that mostly benefit poorer communities. The communities themselves as a whole are not funding their libraries with the understanding that some of what they give the library will be taken to pay for services in other communities. That kind of tax redistribution needs to be at the state level, not at the individual library level.
198. While a citizen board is very democratic, they are not involved in the day to day activities of the system and often times are not engaged with their role outside of meeting attendance. By including library administration as members of the board, I would hope that would increase board engagement between meetings.

199. Who would appoint citizens to a board? How large would the board be? Where would the board meetings be held? How would representation of the citizens served be reflected on the board? Has PLSR looked at what works now in systems? County planning is also very important.

200. Wisconsin is primarily made up of smaller libraries. It seems too often that the needs/wants/whims of the few larger libraries win out over the needs of the many.

201. Wisconsin public libraries need a forward-thinking strategic plan - a shared vision for the future, based on a set of values and national library trends. All public libraries should receive a full report on the services provided in the various regional library system for the purpose of comparison. Transparency should be a priority. Well-structured surveys like this one can open the door to honest conversations and continued improvement.

202. You can’t make everyone happy. But I think if the system actually listens to all the libraries at the table, that goes a long way.

10. **Administration:** How might an ideal model for serving libraries be organized such that it acknowledges and responds to the need for regional/local collaboration; services and support?


2. #1. A Director and professionals to manage each area of support, much as it is now. 2. A Board of Paid Directors who oversee professionals who assist in the management of each department. A board of paid directors may help to create a natural system of checks and balances. Either way, the director(s) reports to the board of appointed volunteer trustees.

3. A board of system directors with an executive director.

4. A central body is necessary to facilitate distributing funds, and sharing information- however, more local control will result in better handling of amounts received.

5. A central model with regional or local hubs would provide the local familiarity that we are used to in the present 16 library system model while offering efficiencies of scale through a central office.

6. A governing body that serves over all of the library systems with a member from each system.

7. A librarian congress made up of all sizes and types of libraries--perhaps to be held virtually quarterly.

8. A library consultant to organize an annual meeting (WLA conference would be a good place), along with annual surveys, listening sessions and direct communication with individual libraries. Ongoing communication with a library or two within each region. (This could be the resource library or another library.)

9. A local director with adequate staff to provide outreach and support to the member libraries.

10. A regional board perhaps.

11. A regional system needs to small enough so that directors and the system staff and system director are easily able to meet for face-to-face discussions. A large consortium
does not make it easy for system directors or system staff to be responsive to the need for regional/local collaboration, services or support.

12. A regional system with sufficient scale to meet the needs of its membership. The system should design services to be scalable, so it’s can be affordable and meaning depending on the size of the organization.

13. A single entity responsible for providing consistent and high level of support across the diverse spectrum of libraries within our state with representation in each region. Advocating strongly for library cooperation and a consistent high end user experience.

14. A System Director would be hired by a Board comprised of member libraries.

15. A system similar to what the South Central Library System currently has.

16. A system that is made up of area libraries that are close to each other geographically, so they can share and collaborate and meet the needs of patrons who may frequent a variety of area libraries.

17. A team of system directors coming together quarterly to discuss concerns/ ideas from each system within the regions.

18. Adequate representation from that region.

19. Administration functions best with transparency and a high level of trust.

20. Advisory boards/ committees made of a good cross section of libraries, but still having the model of a director and consultants for the system.

21. All systems represented & all library sizes considered when making decisions.

22. All to respond to a small committee that share to a larger committee.

23. An ideal model for serving libraries is regions of same size (ish) libraries replace current systems. Then services as we are receiving them would continue with the focus of same size libraries.

24. As I stated before I think there should be elected representatives to discuss ideas, challenges and other items within a region.

25. As much as possible, leave current system administration in place. They have served our needs exceptionally well. I know we are very lucky in that regard. We are small geographically, but with huge population concentration. We have different challenges. We are already doing some regional collaboration (continuing education) and it works very well. There could be another layer of administration at the regional level - depending on what aspects of the final proposal get adopted.

26. Being a new director and not having a good sense of the workings, I really do not have any constructive feedback on this.

27. Can we query other states as to how they do this?

28. Central admin offices for all services with a CEO - type position leading.

29. Consideration of geography, population density. Perhaps regions could be assigned regardless of system boundaries.

30. County geographic region (awareness of a certain region’s requirements) service area (awareness of requirements depending on the size of a library) state.

31. Create a form for libraries to help identify the unique needs. The form could ask for population, size of library, whether the area is urban or rural, ethnicities (for collection development purposes), geographical locations that create special areas of interest, e.g., libraries close to Lake Superior develop collections with an emphasis on the lake, etc.
32. Current library system organization does very well for us. Bridges is well managed with strong and skilled staff. I know that other library systems in the state have had difficulties but I'm not sure that points to the concept of the library systems so much as implementation.

33. Currently, I think that the SEWI group is doing a good job of regional collaboration for things like continuing education. The Lakeshores, Kenosha, and Arrowhead systems are doing a good job of combining ILS services.

34. Deeper study and action to ensure regional connections are equally represented. Administration should represent the voice of regional areas, not dictate to them.

35. Developing and maintaining relationships is critical and requires physical proximity and small numbers. The current model of library systems is ideal for supporting this, if the systems are not too large. Receiving most services from a single provider allows for synergistic pursuits. Regional collaboration happens naturally when systems are right-sized and provide frequent opportunities for meeting in person. In a well-run system such as ours, new directors are enveloped in the fold, provided with mentorship and a support network of people who want to help them succeed. Trust, empathy, and a "float all boats" mentality develop. Innovation flourishes; the wheel gets refined rather than reinvented. The bar for great service rises. Even while busy within our own libraries, we collaborate and communicate effortlessly throughout the system. That's not going to happen in larger or virtual units of service provision; relationships cannot be nurtured, and communication becomes work.

36. Even though smaller libraries do have fewer resources than do larger libraries, the current system works remarkably well for us.

37. Exactly as we are functioning now.

38. Executive director, positions that cover the services provided (e.g. local area network, shared services).

39. Fewer small library systems.

40. Five to eight regions. I know that rural areas might benefit from being in a region with city libraries to have access to a greater collection, but I do not feel that city libraries would necessarily benefit from being in a region with lots of rural libraries. The needs and expectations of the patrons are different.

41. For success, a statewide system needs familiar faces near the libraries served. It is critical that the knowledge base be accessible throughout the state. Perhaps developing and facilitating topical groups or subcommittees such as a small libraries roundtable, a circulation services group or a programming and promotion listserv would help with communication. I think periodic regional meetings would be helpful in encouraging collaboration and making support feasible.

42. Frankly, I think it is a disappointing that these questions are being asked so late in the game – shouldn’t PLSR have asked these questions a year ago? For this one, you should ask our system people because they probably are the ideal model. It is essential that we can meet face-to-face and speak with our system staff, not just for regular meetings but for on-the-fly meetings too, when an urgent issue arises. Which leads me to another point. Shouldn’t there have been a more quantitative/qualitative survey done for the systems? With questions like - Which of these services does your system provide? Which of these services does your system excel at? Are there any services your system provides that is not listed? Etc., etc., etc. THIS survey is taking a long time (longer than it should) and I’m not sure how useful the information is going to be.

43. Frequent meetings between all the directors in the region and administration.
44. Geographic units based on proximity, perhaps using a CESA model. Governance with a board of representatives from all libraries in the area. Hire a CEO responsible that works for that board.

45. Gosh, this is hard to think of even when I’ve been in a workgroup and thinking about it for two years. This must be really difficult for people who haven’t been involved in the process. Perhaps a similar set-up to SRLAWW, where the system admins meet regularly to discuss issues relevant to the new model. Perhaps it even becomes part of SRLAWW.

46. Great leadership that cares about our libraries.

47. Have a localized hub that allows libraries to have a team within close proximity to them.

48. Have a representative from each statewide library system so the needs of each area are met.

49. Have both local gatherings / communication and wider ones less often, with mechanisms for sharing info between/among.

50. Have local people involved or employed, but also require that those people share and communicate with the local libraries. I feel that this is where there is a need - communicate! I have never asked by local members of committees, or non-local members, what my library's needs are or what support I could use.

51. Have local system staff in place to serve as community organization liaisons with individual libraries.

52. Having a board with members from individual library boards is important.

53. Having local individuals who meet monthly/regularly with library directors to discuss services and support. I can't stress that importance. The reason collaborations can work is that we have system staff who facilitate meetings, trainings, and events.

54. Having main centers, or hubs, spread out within distance needs that are equipped to meet the demands needed for the areas.

55. Having people in place that know the people of the libraries they are serving. Very much hands on even if that is through the use of technology.

56. Having system staff who are solely dedicated to providing system services to all system members equally.

57. However, a future structure is organized, administration should be spread around the state so that local libraries can continue to feel a connection to a local entity.

58. However, Winnefox is doing it now works.


60. I am honestly not sure. I'm sorry! That is massively unhelpful.

61. I am not sure how to answer this.

62. I am not sure what would work. however, the visits to outlying libraries by members of the library system located in an urban area have problems identifying the best ways of supporting the smaller libraries.

63. I believe that right-sizing our regional systems is essential. The staff to library ratios and geographic area need to be considered. Perhaps looking at current systems with a high level of satisfaction from member libraries could help determined what this ideal size would be.

64. I believe that the library systems work pretty efficiently right now and keep “like-minded” libraries in close contact with each other. However, I think there could be some type of redistricting or job sharing to balance out the membership/workload.
65. I believe that they system support staff could be administered more centrally, with several systems falling under the same administration.

66. I came from a private library system where there was little oversight, organization, or accountability. There was little collaboration. When I started working for a public library, I was instantly impressed by the local regional library system. The system staff were a valuable resource to consult with. They created organization amongst a large group of libraries, and ensured we had platforms to meet and discuss current issues. As a result, I feel comfortable collaborating with other libraries in the region. They know our libraries and communities, so they can best identify ways where we can help one another and work together. I believe that an ideal model maintains this local system staffing. I believe any attempt to consolidate systems or create a general pool of state library consultants will result in less familiarity with my library, resulting in a lesser quality of a response, and a longer response time.

67. I do not have an opinion yet.

68. I do not know.

69. I don't know. Difficult question, I will leave it up to those who have analyzed administrative systems in other states.

70. I don’t know. Unsure.

71. I don't believe there is a way. We attempted to merge three library systems and the hurdles proved to be too much and all the systems voted NO.

72. I don't have a good answer for this. I have worked with representative boards, made up of professional system staff, directors and community representatives. That is really the way we work now, with the same type of mixture.

73. I don't have enough experience to offer an opinion here.

74. I don't have time to give this question the amount of thought that it requires.

75. I don't know what other models exist.

76. I don't know what regional/local collaboration; services and support means and I think this is a hangover of the old model we need to shed to come up with the new model. Example: One ILS for the entire state. The technology exists where a hold is placed, and it checks the local location first, area radius next, regional radius next, then state level. There's no need for consortiums for this reason. Most services can be done via the web or if a specific service is needed regionally, those libraries can contract with each other for additional service the state does not provide.

77. I don't know.

78. I don't know.

79. I don't know.

80. I don't know.

81. I don't know.

82. I don't know.

83. I don't understand what you are looking for with this question.

84. I feel like the system I am in now does that; however, when looking at the geographic region size of some of the others, I can see how size can be unwieldy for this purpose. Systems really have to balance day-to-day operations with overall goals, plans, principles, etc.

85. I have already stated this, but it is very important that the regional administrator is not hired by a board that is more than likely out of touch with the member libraries. The
administrator either needs to be hired by the Public Library Development Team at DPI or by the libraries in the region (by a committee made up of library directors). The primary advantage of each administrator being hired by the state is continuity between the regional service areas and coordination with such services as delivery and ILS. The primary advantage of the administrator being hired by the libraries is accountability to them.

86. I like having a system administrator.
87. I like how our system is running they do a great job Winnefox.
88. I like our current model at Indianhead.
89. I like working with the Public Library Development Team. I like their range of experience and knowledge.
90. I must say that I don’t believe in an “ideal model.” If I know anything about system-based support services for public libraries in Wisconsin, it is that a variety of methods and models have evolved in different regions of the state that work well for those regions. The model within which I operate — being the Director of both the resource library and the system — has worked well here (although some have taken issue with that contention in the past). The smooth operation of model depends upon structures and people. Both Winnefox and Oshkosh Public Library have strong Assistant Directors who advocate for the interest of their organizations and who help the Director guard against conflicts of interest. The structures are good in theory, but they rely on the right people to make them work. I distrust idealizing a particular structure and trying to impose them upon the state.
91. I presently do not have a constructive suggestion for this.
92. I really like the idea of regional hubs of libraries that are required to get together to collaborate on projects. Getting together with other librarians is a real learning tool.
93. I see a need for Regional Leads/Directors to have strong connections to DPI, maybe even work for DPI or the state of Wisconsin. Those people will need to have strong relations with the governing body. The regional leads will likely manage a staff of some sort and coordinate services - delivery, continuing ed, ILL, technology. I see a need for these regional leads to connect with directors in their area at least twice a year.
94. I think a management team structure would be best. Each region would manage their region and work with other regional managers on shared budgeting, goals, and initiatives.
95. I think a regional breakdown, the way the model works now is still the best solution.
96. I think that the library system model that is already in place services this purpose. If you wish to extend this concept to ideality and go beyond the system boundaries, then the hubs you describe for ILL delivery could be used for regional collaboration, services and support.
97. I think that universal needs should be handled centrally with devolved responsibility to regional or local groups for other concerns. Everybody needs an ILS, everybody needs electronic resources, everyone needs training resources. Handle that centrally. Everybody needs computers, but you can’t install and repair hardware from the other end of the state, so perhaps handle procurement at the state level but maintenance should be regional. If something can be centralized effectively, it should be to achieve economies of scale.
98. I think the “special” localized service concept is overblown. Libraries do the same things across the state, with the main difference in the scale of operations. Milwaukee PL provides books, AV, digital resources, reference, wireless and programs for their patrons, same as Ellsworth PL. By diversifying future staff committees as well as citizen boards with
reps from different sized libraries and from different regions of the state, we should get fair representation on issues.

99. I think the way Indianhead Federated Library System is organized works very well for our system of libraries. There are always experts who are willing to answer questions and offer solutions to our questions.

100. I think we'll need a central administration (perhaps a strengthened, better-staffed DPI) to keep an eye on the big picture, advocate at the state level and act as convener to the various efforts around the state. Strong leadership with a knack for creating engaged, collaborative teams will be key. At a regional level, the same kind of leadership is needed, but with more of an eye toward serving specific parts of the state of specific topics. State budgets should be voted on by my regional representatives. All people should act within a code of conduct that outlines fair play that doesn't favor some libraries over others.

101. I think what IFLS and WVLS is a great example of sharing services and using resources efficiently, especially where specialization is needed. For overall Administration you need to have one or a small board in charge because if you try to have too many then nothing will get done. Many larger groups such as the Digital Library has used WILS to manage projects, but the final decision has to be on someone's shoulders.

102. I think you're going to need to pull from each region as well as someone knowledgeable of needs of different size libraries to have representatives of each.

103. I would like to see various levels for the different services provided to account for the needs of each. For example, continuing education could be handled at a statewide or two system level for that entire area; whereas ILS integration may need to be handled at a regionalized level. Statewide delivery and ILL could be handled statewide as well. I want to be careful to lose the ability to customize our ILS and services for the needs of our community.

104. I would look at the way that WiLS restructured over the past few years and see if that is adaptable.

105. I would look at WVLS. They are wonderful at serving and responding to the local and regional needs.

106. I'd love to have time to know what other libraries are doing without having to search and investigate their individual web pages. Could there be liaisons from regions whose job is to bring libraries together? Develop cross-library projects? Operate a bit more like an academic library does when it brings faculty together with libraries for research or use of collections or exhibits. Maybe the "job" of regional liaison could or should rotate every few years. Maybe it rotates systems or becomes so popular and well used that all systems eventually have liaisons that meet with each other specifically to help libraries collaborate with each other. (I apologize if this is already happening and I don't know about it).

107. Ideally long-term a single statewide ILS and/or Van delivery service minus the systems. Funding at the state level could also disappear and having local libraries be so dependent on a system to exist is counter intuitive.

108. Ideas should be shared from the bottom up rather than top down.

109. If a system reorg requires that IT or admin support is physically based more than a couple of hours away, that there are more local reps to support service calls and are familiar with regional eccentricities.
110. If systems combine, there will need to be a staff person who is assigned to talking to all the libraries in their system and to people at the state level. This would have to be their main duty if a system has several libraries in the system.

111. IFLS does a great job of helping us all out. Continue to follow that model.

112. I'm afraid I don't understand this question.

113. I'm happy with the present service model.

114. I'm sorry, I need more information on this question. (what services are being offered? what is the budget? are is the size of the region? how many people are in it?)

115. It would be great if certain services, resources or programs could be made available through cross system agreements/reciprocal arrangements, etc. This would require strong communication between systems and among members.

116. It's hard for me to imagine a structure that isn't similar to what's in place now. Statewide administration would not be sufficient - there would have to be “boots” in regional areas too.

117. Just like it is now. A system where a library can go for information and help.

118. Keep regions small.

119. Keep the same regions as the current systems, with representatives from each system/region (defining a region as an “old system”).

120. Keeping the model that is currently in place. If we combine systems, then the director will have even more responsibilities to more libraries than they currently service resulting in overworked and spread too thin to be an effective leader.

121. Libraries build relationships with their local system staff, and those relationships become important parts of their collaboration. Although it can be more efficient to provide centralized services through statewide specialists, I believe that in order to maintain public library buy-in you must also build in a regional system that allows for that relationship-building on a local level.

122. Libraries will negotiate collaboration themselves. KCLS and Arrowhead have already reached across boundaries to join the LLS SHARE catalog. We would continue to identify our own opportunities for enhanced service and act on those options. SEWI is a collaborative training consortium. We're already creating partnerships. We don't need systems or authorities to get this done.

123. Library directors & librarians need to be represented on the Library System Boards.

124. Library systems are organized regionally.

125. Library systems, as is.

126. Local representation.

127. Local representatives.

128. Look at Milwaukee County Federated Library System for a good example.

129. Make sure that each system has an administrative assistant to help keep track of details. Empower subgroups to meet and make recommendations.

130. Maybe a single headquarters that has 7 regional chief officers who recruit additional team members to represent each identified service area. The 7 teams would live and work geographically central to their regions and may be embedded within existing library facilities to increase building efficiencies. Members of each team would not necessarily work within the same community or building.

131. Maybe having more than one administrator in different regions would work well, with the administrators working together instead of alone.
132. Maybe regional centers?
133. Meetings with the directors, administration visits each library in its system every three years at least so that they can see the needs for collaboration, services, and support firsthand; systems or state finding ways to encourage collaboration (developing partnership rubrics, MOA templates, logic models so that collaborative partnering is a win-win for both parties and community needs are met, etc.).
134. Minimal administration. Decision-making as close to the individual library as possible.
135. More online conferences and classes.
136. No idea.
137. Not really sure - I have been pleased with my system support in this area. I have been lucky to receive great support, particularly with our Annual Report and legal questions.
138. Not sure.
139. Not sure but it seems like there are too many meetings where nothing gets accomplished. Why not sit there until a decision is made with a plan B and a date for accomplishing it. Let’s not become another government agency that only has meetings but accomplishes nothing. Someone has to have the audacity to be the leader.
140. Not sure I’m 100% understanding the question, but a variety of communication flows is likely to be helpful - upward, downward, lateral, multi-directional.
141. Not sure.
142. Not sure.
143. Not sure.
144. Not sure.
145. Occupational experience as library director’s requirement for library system administrators. Reduce the number of systems and establish them geographically, expanding systems that currently serve a limited number of counties.
146. One headquarters for ILL and ILS coordination/management. Cooperative purchasing of digital materials - eBooks, databases etc. out of this same office.
147. Online form and direct contact with individual libraries.
148. Our current model (OWLS) allows for a system head to provide the liaison between regional/local collaboration, and I believe that model works really well for us. Library heads know that we can approach our system leaders for answers and assistance. In addition, OWLS have various administrative positions that also provide support and services to member libraries. This works very well. I wouldn't change the model we have unless it was necessary.
149. OWLS as a model.
150. Perhaps a group of people from each library system who meet periodically.
151. Perhaps system alignment with state congressional districts would demonstrate the vital connection between democracy and libraries. Multi-county systems seem to work well-enough, provided their funding models do not conflict.
152. Perhaps the Southwest and Winding Rivers Systems could keep their autonomous directors' councils and then have quarterly meetings together including both, at least for a transitional period.
153. Possibly with regional offices that are geographically arranged rather than placed in the largest city in the region. (It may even work to place them in the largest city, but it seems like once again, the rural areas get left behind in that model).
154. Professional, well paid staff with director hired by governing board.

155. Proper representation from every geographical area.

156. Rather than our system staff wearing many hats ALL the time, they should be cross-trained, but with their main focus be consistent to one area of system services. This will help library staff know who to contact when issues arise. Each local/region should have an agreed upon manner of communicating immediate needs.

157. Regional and/or local offices (based on geographical demographics).

158. Regional areas would be best, and we could get by with a third of what we have now. If we have a baseline provided to libraries (sufficient bandwidth and technology support, base level of knowledge by the library staff, efficient delivery of resources/materials) then you can easily work together through technology (teleconferencing) plus quarterly get-togethers, regional support for logistics and coordination, knowledgeable staff can handle most items without relying on system staff (when questions come up, ask a neighboring library. I just answered questions about a feasibility study and capital campaign from a library north of us, not even in our system). Less system admin means more money spent on resources, that’s a better return on investment. We just need to have a proper training program for new staff.

159. Regional hubs for oversight and then local control.

160. Regional library system made up of individual libraries.

161. Regional support staff in various areas such a youth services, IT support (big one). A layer / level above system staff, these staff could coordinate services between systems. The SHARE catalog with 3 independent systems is kind of a start for this view but having support that isn’t directly tied to one system but rather the region could help.

162. Regional zones - similar to our system administration but only 3-4 zones.

163. Regular communication and transparency will be the key keeping some system staff in every region will help insure that local issues are not ignored.

164. Representation from each system, big and small.

165. Representatives from all areas are a part of the board.

166. Representatives from each area.

167. Representatives from each region?

168. Requiring standards of service unique to each region, location.

169. See previous question. Local control is everything. If you want to do some things run by the state (i.e. delivery), I can understand. But no one from my region of the state could begin to know what my compatriots in northern half of the state are going through and vice versa.

170. Services coordinated for regional collaboration while sharing resources throughout the state.

171. Similarly structured like the current model for systems, just scale it and go from 16 down to 3-4 regional systems.

172. Small scale how they do it at the national level, listening sessions, consultations with everyone and deadlines to get the needs in.

173. Small systems.

174. Specialized administration, similar to the Monarch Library System administration, may be ideal. IT, ILL, public information, database management, etc. are all crucial to have represented on a large scale administration.

175. State to library systems to libraries within that system.
176. Statewide head of governance and system directors are "branch managers."

177. Sufficient amount of regional/local expertise available to public libraries in order to best support libraries and staff. Virtual/remote and in-person contact and support. The overall administration model should include members from all areas of the state to best represent and support all areas of the state.

178. System Directors currently play an important role in facilitating regional collaboration, I feel that we will need some sort of "regional coordinator" to ensure that we are all working toward common goals, standards are being met, and we are helping each other whenever possible.

179. System headquarters should be located as centrally as possible in their system area. System staff should make an effort to visit system libraries on at least an annual basis and acquire an understanding of their individual needs/issues. Directors could be solicited for input from themselves, their staff & boards about possible collaboration projects, be it collection development, or bringing in an entertainer or educational programming.

180. Systems need to be kept at a manageable size so that they are not so small that they are duplicating services that could be combined, but they also are not so large that they no longer provide the personal service libraries require, especially those in smaller, rural areas. Some consolidation is inevitable, but systems must not become so large that they are impersonal and treat local libraries as just a number.

181. Systems should be mandated to allow conversation between members/representatives using already established system networks. (Systems should not be able to prohibit conversations between libraries/groups on system email.)

182. Systems that currently lack the basic level of services need to be the priority. This may mean they receive a greater share of funds to bring them up to the basic level and/or better funded library systems see some reduction in funding. This is a multi-year process and will require strong education and communication with a number of players (library staff, board, and system trustees; funding sources [municipality, county, state]; the public) so that all players understand why change is needed. In fact, if a strong campaign is put together, some municipalities and counties may be able to offset funding needs on local/regional levels. Administration of a model once this is accomplished is unknown, and if the process for bring all libraries to a minimum level is successful, may not be necessary. Equity issues make funding issues more pronounced, despite the fact that libraries and systems are already collaborating/sharing services.

183. Talk to WLA reps for this one, guys.

184. That is the million dollar question. I do not feel I have enough experience/ have enough knowledge of how funding is being distributed in order to answer this question.

185. That’s going to be very difficult if current relationships are torn apart and new groupings developed.

186. The administrator would meet with the county(area) groups regularly as well as visit the libraries in their system. The administrator would offer suggestions, opinions and solutions to libraries.

187. The combining of systems may be an option, although I know that is a huge undertaking as each system works differently. Possibly sharing of some services, i.e. remote tech support, courier, etc.

188. The current model works very well for us.

189. The current structure works well.
190. The current system divisions allow the staff of said system to get to know the library and through the staff the patrons of said library. This allows a better understanding of local needs and support to be extended to the diverse populations.

191. The library system serves in this capacity.

192. The model should allow for ongoing professional visits from governance staff so that on-site consulting would be available in a proactive manner. This would allow for concerns and needs to be discussed in direct relationship to the library’s needs. Being able to see how and where problems exist in real time is far more valuable than phone calls or emails.

193. There certainly is no "one size fits all" solution to this. I do think we could probably use a few less library systems, but I think we should be careful about bringing that number down too low and too soon. There have of course already been a few movements in this direction in recent years. I have to say that this particular question and several others should have been asked before the whole process got started.

194. There needs to be an overarching structure that attends to all of the needs: technology, ILS, CE, delivery, etc. Then each branch needs to be structured in the way that makes most sense for it- technology can more easily be state wide, while CE or consulting probably need smaller areas.

195. There would have to be standardization among all public libraries. We could reduce inefficiencies with best practices. There should be regional coordinators and support staff. This would be based on population, library use and poverty levels. Develop strategic plans for all systems. Encourage outside the box thinking. Risk tasking. Flexibility. Change management. The importance of failure. Understand that every library has unique needs, but collaboration and cooperation are essential for system success.

196. This is a question for Systems to answer. I know you want library's opinions, but I don't know the model used now. I think talking to Systems, you can find out the models that are working (best) and figure out ways of how to grow - include more libraries without removing (too many) services.

197. This is NOT an economy of scale issue, because way too much would be lost in terms of local understanding of citizen needs. The density versus expanse challenges bring this quickly into perspective-- what does or doesn't work for citizens in Milwaukee or Madison quite likely is not going to have the same impact on citizens in North Lake or Boulder Junction. One-size-fits-all should not be a part of this conversation, and if it is, should only be used to truly discern needs, which then get addressed separately and locally.

198. This is really challenging to respond without having a model of services or financial support for services to respond to. I can't answer how to administer something without knowing what that something is, ideal or not.

199. This is where the system model already works for us- the people who know your area are people who live in your area. They're the best ones to help with a lot of the individual needs in those libraries. The problem comes in when all the areas have needs, but not all of the areas have the funding to support those needs. Maybe regionalizing in areas that don't have 5 county coverage already would make sense, but on the west side of the state, regionalizing more might as well mean having one central admin. We already do local collaborations well- but again, we're limited to the resources in the area because the funding isn't there to -even collaboratively- do better.

200. Ummmm - isn't that what you are deciding over the course of this project?

201. Under a special agency or the library systems each library belong to.
202. Using suggestions from the library system, put together a committee with members of library boards, system members, and area directors and staff.

203. We already have the ideal model. If anything, we need more systems, not less.

204. We need to have several regional hubs (5, 6, &?) which should be based on delivery requirements. Such hubs should be staffed to address not only delivery, but technology issues, as well. Ideally, everyone served by a hub would share the same ILS, but that is a long-term goal. There should be a single System (Hub) Coordinator to assure that all Hubs offer the same services.

205. We really appreciate having local support. It's important for us to have local collaboration where we can meet in person to receive support and training/information as needed from our library system.

206. What we do now in WRLS.

207. With so much diversity, it will be really difficult to organize a model. Not a clue!

208. With the goal of providing services that are cost effective, efficient, responsive, and allow for local customization, I think a regional model would work. Our current system structure is an example of a regional model, but over time and for various reasons, the "regions" have become unequal in their capacity to serve. I think fewer regional units make sense and could be effective. Responsiveness and an effective governance structure will be keys to that success, as will a re-enforced mental model that the systems exist to serve the member libraries and the it is the public library directors - not the system directors - who should be prioritizing services.

11. **Regional Connections: What do you feel are the best ways to develop and maintain connections between libraries and the staff that provide services to libraries, as well as the connections between individual libraries within a region?**

1. A combination of meetings, trainings and conferences.
2. A top-notch communications system is imperative.
3. Actually meeting (face to face) and visiting one another's libraries would be amazing and probably lead to better collaboration.
4. Advisory groups made up of representatives from each library, as well as subcommittees that focus on specifics.
5. Again, frequent contact between all the directors in the region.
6. Again, I think the way our consortium is set up, we have a great example of staff that provides great service, they are willing to come out to our individual libraries to help train, provide support and anything that might be needed.
7. Again, I think we need to find out what works within Systems already to know the best ways to move forward.
8. An annual meeting to talk about services, goals, and concerns.
9. Annual or biannual 'mini'-conferences? Incorporating regional connection workshops in larger conferences (WLA and the like)? Or separate from conferences? Staff education opportunities open to each region?
10. Annual, centrally located regional conferences which include both speakers on library issues/trends...and an opportunity to share information, problems and solutions.
11. Any regional divisions need to remain small enough that members can get to know, and effectively communicate with, their peers. Systems also need to be large enough to have an impact politically.

12. As a new director, I was able to build relationships with the system staff through our interactions. Meeting the whole staff at my orientation, collaborating with them on starting a new program, and by them facilitating shared learning environments for directors to learn. Having consistent staff to hold these positions also enables these relationships to grow. We see them, regularly...in person.

13. As above, but perhaps a different group.

14. As much as I hate meetings, I would like to see more discussion in my own library system about the larger goals of library service and how to accomplish them collaboratively. We can get hung up in the minutia and forget the larger picture. When our value is measured by circulation it can create barriers between libraries instead of fostering a sense of collaboration. Now it is more like, don’t lose that patron to another library as you might lose the precious circ stat that goes with it.

15. At least one meeting per year. All libraries close and staff meet in a central location. Small group discussions - mix it up so staff from same library is not in same group. Mix tech with administration with youth programmers.

16. Being organized under a library system as we are now; more sharing and meeting times on a regular monthly basis.

17. Bringing the staff to the libraries periodically and requiring meet-ups either online or in person is crucial.

18. By leaving the library systems already in place intact and developing a superstructure like your HUBS to connect them in an efficient and timely manner.

19. Common job descriptions and titles at each regional level will help regional staff collaborate across the state. Common funding mechanisms will be key in creating equity between regions. from library to region, regular in-person meetings are important, perhaps whole regions once a year with smaller meetings, arranged by geography or library size, multiple times each year. Regional budgets should be voted on by all libraries in that region.

20. Communication.

21. Communication by e-mail, meetings and conferences.

22. Communication, Communication, Communication. Take advantage of technology. Digital meetings. In person meetings. Strategic planning with members. Encourage outside the box thinking. Risk tasking. The importance of failure. Understand that every library has unique needs, but collaboration and cooperation are essential for system success.

23. Communication, meetings, continuing education.

24. Communication, meetings, opportunities to work together on projects.

25. Communication. Weekly updates or reviews.

26. Connections between the regional staff. There are now many tools, in addition to in-person meetings, that allow people to connect and share information. Emails, phone calls, GoToMeeting, annual WLA conference opportunities at WLA and WAPL are all ways that staff can connect.

27. Continuing education.

29. Coordinated, organized, in-person meeting for library staff performing similar functions in their home libraries. For example, monthly director meetings, children’s librarian meetings, etc.

30. County-wide meetings are very effective now and I can imagine they could continue to be. Also provide a sense of continuity during the changes.

31. Develop and communicate policies that are understood and followed by member libraries. Meetings should be conducted following Robert’s Rule.

32. Direct communication available, staff attending regional council meetings, staff visiting regional libraries.

33. Effective and regular communication to all of the libraries. Facilitate meetings when needed and offer suggestions, solutions and opinions on issues the libraries have. Work to have the libraries work together on programs, services, etc. rather than individually.

34. Email, and onsite visits.

35. Encouraging connections based on functions seems to make the most sense. This can be accomplished by conferences, meetings, online forums, etc. Libraries belonging to specific counties will still need to stay connected in the ways they currently are.

36. Establishing committees for support and leadership for all service areas. Regular meetings with strategic plans.

37. Everyone needs to participate. We can’t have libraries that segregate themselves from the rest of the group. To preserve connections, perhaps merge underperforming systems with strong systems.

38. Exactly as we are functioning now.

39. Face to face is always the most beneficial but not always practical Online meetings.

40. Face to face meetings really are the best. Find a way to offer travel support so those in rural areas or far reaches of the state can participate.

41. Face to face meetings.

42. face to face meetings. at least quarterly. every other month may be better.

43. Face-to-face and online meetings for both general discussions and specific topics. Non-regional collaborations on specific topics may also be beneficial.

44. Face-to-face contact. Taking away the barriers that prevent interaction. Barriers such as time, $, staffing difficulties. Maybe the perception for the need of autonomy. With technology one would think that barriers are somewhat gone but technology also is a barrier.

45. Face-to-face conversations work best.

46. Face-to-face meetings and conferences. I know this will be harder and harder to maintain if the system structure changes, but much gets done when like-minded staff from all libraries are able to discuss things together that directly impact their libraries.

47. Face-to-face meetings on a regular schedule. I’ve found that meeting in person can accomplish much more than online “GoTo” meetings.

48. Field offices for some positions such as computer technicians or delivery drivers. Those employees would work with centralized administration if there are true localized service needs.

49. Frequent opportunities for networking. Our system-wide directors monthly meetings are ideal for hashing out ideas on policy, services to offer. Frequent updates via email, website, or other virtual means would also be helpful.
50. Frequent workshops and meetings that are held at Winding Rivers are an ideal model of how to foster networking between member libraries. And while meetings are often only for member libraries, WRLS frequently opens workshops to any libraries in surrounding systems who would like to attend.

51. Go To Meeting is easy and time saving. Email is an efficient means.

52. Good and caring leadership between the systems.

53. Google community and email communications as well as online go to meetings as many of us travel great distances to attend our quarterly meetings.

54. Group similarly sized libraries in collaborative and cooperative teams.

55. Have a meeting face to face to discuss issues.

56. Have small group meetings face to face.

57. Having a regional library system within a considerable driving distance from my library.

58. Having continuing education and various meetings where we can all come together on occasion.

59. Having meetings between library personnel and regional staff. What would also help is a clear understanding of what is to be provided. If the statutes clearly state what each regional entity is to provide and how they are to provide it then it will be clear what is to be expected.

60. Having monthly director meetings is a great way to keep individual libraries within a region connected. Once again having a system that is not too large where libraries can stay connected between administrators and other libraries.

61. Having regular meetings to discuss topics, workshops, and conferences.

62. Having regular meetings with the surrounding libraries in a system.

63. I appreciate the existing connection facilitated by the system. I think continuing to meet and interact as a regional group as is presently done is important.

64. I believe that we need dedicated communication person. Someone who is giving updates on a regular basis. I understand it is impossible to have them just do that one job, but I feel like communication is the key and if we bog people down with too many other responsibilities they cannot communicate what is actually happening. If also feel that if we are having a “regional office” that we need to not overwhelm them with too many projects that fall outside of their job descriptions. If you want someone to do connections and communication don’t also give them admin, tech, and other duties.

65. I believe the most effective way to maintain regional connections is having face to face meetings and conversation. Email works well, but I have seen some amazing work come out of local workgroups from my system and system director meetings. Our system is right sized in my opinion. It is large enough where there is a variety of ideas and experiences, but small enough where we can come to a consensus and know each other. I feel I have grown more as a library professional in the last four months than I did in the last 10 years in the private sector. This is 100% due to the meetings, deliberate mentorship, local consulting efforts, and collaboration with the libraries in my system.

66. I believe we currently share some services with one or two other systems, which seems to be working for our system.

67. I do not have an opinion yet.

68. I don’t have enough experience to offer an opinion here.

69. I don’t know better ways than current...simpler is always best!

70. I don’t know.
71. I don't know.

72. I don't know.

73. I don't know. I know I run into difficulties staying connected due to travel times, location and staffing, but I don't know how to fix it. No matter when or where you try to make connections, there are always issues and people who can't attend. I have a hard time finding time to have a staff meeting with the 5 of us here in Rib Lake.

74. I feel meetings that take place in person allow individuals to get to know others. Knowing a person from an adjoining library by voice only does not build a rapport or comradery that face to face events do.

75. I feel that it is very important for library staff to maintain strong connections with their neighboring/regional libraries. We may want to build in regularly scheduled regional networking and continuing ed opportunities upfront if we no longer have system-wide director meetings. I would like to see various committees such as best practices, youth services, and technology exploration meetings happening on a regular basis. We will also need to ensure that there is a plan in place for hiring new directors in a region- who is responsible for introducing them to their neighboring library staff? Who is training them and helping them connect to the greater library community?

76. I find that for local library directors and staff to feel trust and confidence in our system service providers, they need to see them face-to-face on occasion. IT staff visit their libraries in person. They attend continuing education opportunities with our coordinator present. System staff attend the system directors annual meeting. They are known to one another. Of course, the services themselves must be of high quality as well. System support services must work for the libraries -- save them time and money; help them provide better services to their patrons. Whatever structures are designed, they must foster quality service from staff who are known and trusted by the libraries they serve.

77. I hate to say meetings, but that's how we do it now. Working together on goals and projects brings library professionals together, whether library or system staff. I'm a big believer in strategic planning. Some kind of regional strategic planning process involving all libraries in area having a voice and getting on the same page for goals. Our system has gatherings in informal settings and that is helpful (retreat).

78. I like having a regional library system that understands & listens to its members; represents the system on a state level and acts as a conduit for information between state & libraries.

79. I like how it is now, regional director meetings and concerns being taken to the state level

80. I like our current practice of meeting as a group of county libraries once a month. Meetings with other libraries in our system happens a number of times a year - often about catalog issues, but at least once a year on other issues of importance to all.

81. I think continuous communication, meetings/summits are the best way to go. A mix of electronic and face-to-face?

82. I think each local library should have a service representative assigned to them. These service reps would have multiple libraries with whom they are responsible for servicing. They would be the first point of contact for each library when they have a question, need, or concern. Connections between the member libraries can be facilitate through regular meetings or gatherings. There could be user groups and affinity groups. WLA and division meetings and conferences could become a more important platform for bringing people together. I wonder if we could learn some lessons from the UW System and how those libraries work together.
83. I think it's important to have a name/face relationship with peers and that is doable only when distances between mentors, techies, support staff, etc. are reasonable. Sometimes smaller is better.

84. I think most libraries already reach out to others in their areas through collaborative programming and training.

85. I think regular meetings of library directors (quarterly) as well as other events where people see each other (conferences, CEs, events). We want to encourage more collaboration and discussion, not diminish it.

86. I think that holding regular in-person regional meetings for librarians and library directors will remain vital. If each service provider is given a bailiwick (even if that encompasses more than one service region), they can involve themselves in those meetings. I work in one library system but live in another. They are close enough to be commuted between, but I can attest to feeling like I don't even know who I'd approach to ask questions about certain services and projects that I've seen implemented less than an hour from my library.

87. I think that regular meetings including staff from different libraries would be a way to develop and maintain collections. Distance and time would be a factor in being able to meet efficiently on a regular basis.

88. I think that the monthly or bimonthly meetings that I have with the other libraries in my region does great things for fostering relationships and connections with them and for getting other perspectives and assistance with problems or issues.

89. I think the statewide email is helpful.

90. I think we do this especially well in SWLS. We work together on many things, reach out to our neighbors to lend a hand or ask for help, and really support each other in whatever way we can. The spirit in which we work is by remembering that the users are the most important part of the puzzle. We share a lot of patrons, and we therefore have those connections and care a lot about maintaining them. Sharing an ILS strengthens those bonds.

91. I truly feel that our current method of Director's meeting is very valuable. Our system staff also attend so they can become aware of any issues that have not been brought to their attention previously. These meetings have an agenda, but also have built in time for discussion, brainstorming, and networking.

92. I use IFLS as an example in this. We cover 10 counties which means a two-hour drive in each direction to reach the edges of our system. Looking at size, distance to travel and service population are good ways to decide on regions and where services are needed. I am not sure, but I do wonder if one or two county systems are efficient and best for those counties because at IFLS we have a lot of resources and ideas between the 53 Libraries. We don't always agree but we are respectful to each other.

93. I would keep the regional connection offices larger to service, communicate and keep connections.

94. I'd like to see the staff that provides the services to do more library visits. For a while, our system was holding regional meetings at a library location. This was good because the meetings had smaller numbers and I felt more heard.

95. If there are going to be shared ILS, ensure that a connecting software exists to connect the regions together that also allow standalone libraries to participate.

96. I'm happy with the present service model. It would be good to collaborate with neighboring service areas at least once a year. Maybe something for libraries north of HWY 29 . . . somewhere in our "neck of the woods".
97. I’m not sure we need to develop this way. It’s a holdover from where we are. I think if all libraries had to meet the requirement to attend X meetings per year at the state level or remotely via technology or just to attend the WLA conference, relationships of the right libraries would flourish and that doesn’t mean they are regional. My library may be more like Madison than it is Shawano, yet I’m closer to Shawano. Other times my library, because it’s a consolidated county library, is more like Shawano in that respect, but it’s not because of proximity in region it’s because of a specific thing that defines the library itself. Regionalism has held us back in my opinion. There’s no reason to tie ourselves together in artificial constructs like region. It’d be better tie libraries together out of purpose which could change depending on the issue.

98. In Green County we try to train together. We get our staffs together once a year and do a combined in-service. It makes it easier to pick up the phone and make that call to a colleague you need to talk to when you’ve met them in person already. I think WLA already does a good job at this by providing an annual conference and offering small group memberships.

99. In many cases, those connections are already established through the existing County Library Boards. A continued presence by service staff at County Library Board meetings, continuing education offerings, and staff visits to libraries and communities may help continue those existing regional groups and facilitate new connections in wider geographic regions. While it is a challenge to find the time to travel, face to face meet-ups with our neighboring libraries and service staff is important in developing and shaping the library community under any new organizational plan.

100. In person meetings and library visits to supplement regular phone/email communication.

101. In person meetings. I appreciate the Dane County Meetings and the South Central Library System Meetings for helping me connect with others.

102. In person meetups are essential but do not necessarily need to be frequent. Working on projects together seems much more productive to me that meetings.

103. In person system and regional meetings, listserv (not google community!).

104. Increased access to travel/training scholarships so more librarians can attend state conferences/meetings. Perhaps an annual or biannual regional mini-conference for networking & learning. Staff who provide services to libraries could substitute in libraries when regular library staff attend trainings/conferences.

105. In-person conferences are always best, but webinars, listservs, WLA membership and the like help immensely.

106. In-person connections are the best was to stay abreast of issues in my opinion. Without being able to know and work closely with a service organization and its staff would be useless.

107. In-person get-togethers, email updates, committees,

108. Interacting face to face, which is a huge challenge for smaller libraries.

109. Issues Briefings: with library directors from libraries in a given county or with library directors from certain size libraries in a given region.

110. It’s nice to have a regionalized library system to connect all the libraries in our geographic region. I would also love to see a set up similar to SRLAAW to allow similar-sized libraries across the state to meet periodically and share ideas as well. I would find that very beneficial.

111. I’ve been impressed with the relationship between the libraries in Columbia County. Directors meet bi-monthly and use the time as an opportunity to give updates regarding
112. I've found that face to face meetings work best to develop and maintain connections.
113. Keep staff local whenever possible.
114. Keep us updated to new and inventive things, law changes that affect us, etc.
115. Keeping systems small enough so that, for example, directors of every library in the system can meet regularly in person with each other and with system staff, without difficulty of distance.
116. Less important for most of the services we receive now from Systems. However, this is essential when it comes to technology support.
117. Liaisons.
118. Libraries with the same service population meet and discuss issues.
119. Libraries/systems are already good at accomplishing regional connections. Library/system staff cross borders for advice, inspiration, and collaborate together. Some libraries are not doing this, but my experience is that they struggle with budgets/staffing and are unable to attend meetings/serve on committees/etc. There is a lot of value in building and maintaining relationships within the statewide library community, but funding basic services is paramount. A level of uncertainty exists around whether the proposed CE/Consulting model will meet library needs as well as whether the plan is affordable and sustainable. Most system staff providing these services do a great job; there are some that do not. More information is needed on how individuals selected to fill roles will be selected, compensated, and reviewed. This model has large potential to change how we currently receive services but may need to be given a lower priority level within the overall scope of the project.
120. Library system administrators could give a 1-minute talk at system meetings (recorded or live) about what is working, what change is being discussed, and how to contact them with ideas.
121. Library systems are fundamental as small libraries often times have limited resources. When library directors meet on an ongoing basis in small groups across the state, with staff that support libraries, this encourages Big Picture thinking and the creation of ideas and solutions that are outside the narrow scope of more immediate local needs.
122. Library visits, money for additional staff so the directors can leave the library for additional training, etc.
123. Library visits.
124. Listservs that focus on specific departments or duties are helpful, but I prefer in-person meetings. Our Directors meet monthly in addition to networking at conferences.
125. Local, small library systems.
126. Lots of email info, some regional meetings, try to have staff visit each library or library system office to meet in person.
127. Lots of meetings.
128. Maintain availability through a flexible communication plan, that does not rely heavily on in-person meetings but does permit a system of sharing between libraries. In addition to this system to have a way to track and follow-up on action items.
129. Maybe a website with a forum to share information that includes periodic emails with highlights of new information.
130. Meeting at continuing education events seem to be the most helpful.
131. Meetings.

132. Meetings and continuing education opportunities are always great, but I think some informal meetings or panel discussions may be good too. We all learn a lot from each other for best practices or just opportunities to share something really exciting that we just learned.

133. Meetings and staff events.

134. Meetings together, online or in person.

135. Meetings, continuing education opportunities, library visits.

136. Monthly, or at a minimum quarterly, meetings of directors, staff, have county support including standards that libraries within that county must meet.

137. More collaborative training.

138. Moving meetings around to different communities, consultant visits to libraries, an easily accessed workshop calendar across the state.

139. N/A.

140. Newsletter sent online, but also in print, so it can be shared with everyone.

141. Not making the regions to large geographically, so that meetings can be attended without traveling for most of a day.

142. Not sure.

143. Nothing beats face to face meetings to develop relationships and connections among both system staff and individual libraries. Conferences and opportunities for collaboration can also help create connections.

144. On site visits and inter-library visits would be extremely helpful in this process. Because many libraries in Wisconsin are great distances apart, having annual or semi-annual meet-and-greets do not suffice for relationship creation. Mentoring is an excellent way to build relations between library staff, but it is not a regular, on-going activity for ALL librarians. Shared experiences should be emphasized for training so that different librarians know who has had similar experiences and knowledge to address issues which arise. The systems could coordinate this kind of activity.

145. Once a month, face to face, meetings.

146. Ongoing communication. I think our library system does this very well: There are monthly meetings of library directors and system director/staff; and system staff regularly set up trainings, workshops, and meet-ups for staff in various library departments. There are quarterly meetings of circulation supervisors, cataloging managers, reference managers, and so on. System staff also regularly visit all member libraries. It would likely be hard for system staff to know what libraries need without ongoing communication. To facilitate system staff really knowing their member library needs, perhaps it would be helpful to bring down the size of some systems, or to increase the number of staff (and of course, funding for that additional staff) for very large systems, or increase the travel budget for those system directors/staff that serve a very wide area, or to make sure all libraries have the AV equipment necessary for regular Skype or electronic meeting attendance.

147. Opportunities for staff other than directors to get together and network - trainings, focused discussions, system-wide gatherings.


149. Organized meetings/physical collaboration spaces.

150. Our APL group is a good example of how individual libraries work well with each other.
151. Our current system schedule of library director meetings every other month is very helpful for staying connected with what is happening at the system level and with librarian colleagues. Current models like this that are successful could be used within a new model that is developed. I feel that some type of occasional regional meeting would be necessary to stay connected.

152. Our library already tries to engage with libraries in other systems due to the nature of the geography and traffic patterns in our area. Our patrons don't care about system lines, and sometimes it makes sense to work with others outside your system. The way system membership is currently tied to county boundaries can hinder innovation, though. I believe that libraries should be able to join the system that makes sense for them based on their individual needs, and perhaps even contract for different services from different entities if necessary. There should be intentional planning on how to enable collaboration across system (regional, county, municipal, or whatever) lines. The boundaries that library systems operate in are arbitrary and not helpful to providing quality service to all Wisconsin residents, so we should try to make those boundaries as porous as possible.

153. Our library directors have met monthly for many years. These meetings facilitate growth, set priorities, develop camaraderie, air grievances. Also, the various staffs (circulation, reference, etc.) meet several times a year. Meetings form connections. Not a novel idea, but one that works.

154. Our Library System.

155. Our system is already collaborating with Bridges in continuing education. I could easily see more collaboration being done on a regional basis. Regular meetings of system library directors, regional continuing education, annual meetings of adult services librarians to discuss programming ideas, etc. Perhaps mini-cons for circ services and librarians in regions in addition to the state conferences.

156. Periodic meetings of a small group of similar libraries that review local issues. This would help refine topics for Director's Counsel. Also, the budget to send multiple members of staff to various meetings. Too often only one person represents the library and it would be nice to have everyone on staff hear the same message. Having budgets bolstered by the State would help very small, very rural libraries be competitive.

157. Personal (through face-to-face or email) connection.

158. Personal relationships. Opportunities to interact with and work with same individuals.

159. Phone conversations just to check in, organize quarterly meetings of staff/directors locally with one another for networking, moderator in an email group that ask engaging questions that people can reply all to - so they can share from their library.

160. Please also see #10. Right now, I have to know one phone number: our system office. Everything I need is there, including referral to the Division and highly skilled staffed. Developing and maintaining connections between service providers and libraries is best done by limiting the number of service providers. Contacting different providers for ILS, delivery, CE, consulting, ILL, and Technology, would make my job harder and remove "connections," i.e.: relationships. I have tried to consider this question from a point of view of what would be best if there WERE multiple service providers with potentially overlapping regions (which I'm not in favor of at this point), but I've never seen large unseen groups work well. People just don't ask those small questions or provide the little bits of information that add up to real education or positive change when they're not in close proximity or feel like a small cog.

161. Polling libraries on issues of concern through electronic submission rather than in person meetings would improve participation of less well funded libraries.

162. Quarterly meet ups, list-server, social media page (Fb?), etc.
163. Regional Connections seem pretty satisfactory as they are currently setup.
164. Regional face to face meetings and trainings.
165. Regional meet-ups and collaborative events and shared trainings where you can meet and interact. State wide conferences with some good mixers and ice breakers. We need to get to know each other and understand that we are all in this together.
166. Regional resource libraries could serve in the role of touch points for statewide services or several libraries from each region would also be a good idea.
167. Regional tech centers for support - ILS, general network, website design/consulting - makes tech more responsive at the local level.
168. Regional zones instead of systems.
169. Regions are a good size for collaboration. It provides a larger source for sharing ideas, plus puts a few more libraries of similar need together (mid to large size libraries, excluding Madison and Milwaukee as they are of a different size altogether). Regional meetings can get people out to different libraries in their region to see what’s going on. It’s easy to share ideas through technology (video conferencing, audio conferencing) thereby allowing larger areas of service. And quite honestly, having a larger regional area brings more ideas to the table. We are a small system, and in the short time we have been with a larger automation system, the new contacts made have been very helpful, it’s broadened the perspective of the librarians and made them realize it’s a big world with many useful ideas and possible collaborations out there.
170. Regular and face to face meetings are still the best way to accomplish both of these goals.
171. Regular communication via email, etc. in addition to in person meetings. Cooperative planning and programming, sharing personnel.
172. Regular in face meetings. Multiple tools used for communication.
173. Regular in-person meetings that move around the system are always helpful in letting people get to know one another among the libraries. Regular site visits by system staff for training and meeting with local boards helps the system staff and the individual library staff members develop and maintain connections.
174. Regular meetings.
175. Regular meetings and collaborations. Emphasis at the library system level on serving the library customers. Systems also need some independence, so they provide leadership and ideas.
176. Regular meetings and communication—again, similar to what the South Central Library System currently does.
177. Regular meetings and educational opportunities.
178. Regular meetings between library representatives as well as relevant continuing ed classes which offer opportunities to discuss current issues.
179. Regular meetings between reps from the service staff and reps from the library systems. Regular meetings within a region for library directors Match up “pen pals” who could be directors from a large & a small library who email each other once a week/every other week to just chat about services and discuss the differences so we all look at the whole with a new perspective.
180. Regular meetings so communication and availability are there for all libraries.
181. Regular meetings to compare notes and discuss issues and needs as well as successes.
182. Regular meetings, even if it’s with committees with regional representatives. If so, then there should be regional meetings as well. Some sort of attendance should be required to ensure that essential employees and local libraries are engaged.

183. Regular meetings, ideally monthly. And they must be in person – not Go-to-Meeting meetings. It’s the only true way to build relationships with individuals. You can get to know people through email and virtual meetings, but it won’t be the same. It is for this reason, systems/regions need to be thought through in terms of size. People are not going to want to attend meetings if they have to drive two hours to a meeting. Trust me I know – I already have to drive 45 minutes to an hour to get from my home to most meetings and now with Jefferson County being added on if a meeting is help in the southwestern most part of JeffCo, it can take me upwards to two hours to get there and I most likely will not attend a meeting in that location.

184. Regular meetings, visits to the libraries by staff to discuss needs. Trainings. Communication will be important.

185. Regular meetings, with each level (directors, youth services, adult services, etc.) An open dialogue that fosters regular discussions and airs concerns.

186. Regular meetings.

187. Regular meetings. Unifying projects.

188. Regular regional meetings either at county level or "CESA" level. Parties are good as are board game nights.

189. Regular required meetings.

190. Regular scheduled physical meetings, regular emails.

191. Regularly scheduled resource sharing meetings, Director meetings, visits with regional Director and general communicative reciprocal availability.

192. Regularly scheduled system meetings for libraries within the region. ‘In library’ visits and consultation with library system staff. System staff serve as liaison and curators of library programming within (and outside of) system, linking libraries to foster collaboration and sharing between libraries.

193. Remote access meetings, email, online sharing rather than in-person.

194. Representation from all the regions would be essential. Not knowing much about the issues that you have discussed over the past few years, I cannot give an intelligent suggestion.

195. Scheduled face-to face meetings on all levels.

196. Site visits and semiannual or annual regional meetings.

197. Some type of regular meeting or meetings for all libraries in the system to participate. WE are a standalone library not part of the consortium, so I think sometimes people forget about us.

198. Something similar to the group we have here in Bridges Library System, APL. Once a month the directors of each system library get together and discuss local issues that are of import to the group, the system's budget, and issues from individual libraries.

199. Sometimes particularly when it comes to the ILS I see that system staff have different priorities because they NEVER have to deal with the public. Maybe regional listening sessions with staff and patrons?

200. Somewhat regular meetings are the best way to develop and maintain networking connections between libraries and servicing staff. In addition, connections between regional libraries also benefit from somewhat-frequent meetings. These meetings could
be web-based if need be, as well as recorded to allow member libraries to access information and discussion that may have been missed. Conventions and conferences are a great way that we are currently working on this idea of connection and developing networks.

201. Staff in the region needs to be accessible and opportunities for networking need to be regular but also efficient and respectful of everyone’s time. Also, often our peers are outside of our regions as well so many of those are important.

202. Staff providing services and library staff need to be able to meet on a regular basis. They need to be able to develop relationships and trust. Therefore, the service area size, both in the number of libraries served and the geographic area covered are key components. This is why right-sizing our systems is so essential.

203. Strong inter-system communication and working toward territorial collaboration rather than competition. Staff at each system should/could be aware of services/programs/resources available other systems and refer libraries with specific needs to systems that can meet them. Sometimes there might have to be a charge for accessing what is desired - kind of like insurance’s tiers of cost for pharmaceuticals or “out of network” services.

204. Strong leadership and good communication.

205. System staff should stay connected with their member libraries. System staff could make library visits to chat with the staff and member library staff should hold regular meetings dedicated to collaborating with other libraries within their system.

206. System wide meetings, as is.

207. Systems staff should not be allowed to sanction (or not) services. They must uphold decisions made by member libraries through elected representatives. Open list serve communications are a must. We can learn so much from each other.

208. The geographic area cannot be too large in these networks.

209. The library directors in the Bridges Library System meet face-to-face at monthly APL meetings. These meetings are an essential component as to why the Bridges Library System works so well for the libraries and communities represented therein. There is no substitute for face-to-face.

210. The meetings that libraries within my system (OWLS) have every other month I feel have worked well in keeping us all connected to each other and with system staff. Regional offices could help with this.

211. The need to retain the regional personnel is paramount to success as an organization of any kind of Wisconsin state library system, librarians have told us the need to have someone they know locally to be able to help them is one of the most important things.
   1. Maintain regionality as much as possible, especially in the face to face areas: CE, IT, Admin, some consulting. 2. Regional Delivery hubs.

212. The system headquarters needs to be centrally geographically located, not in the biggest city. In rural WI we struggle for just access to other libraries within a region because of distance. Therein lies a different mindset - bigger is not necessarily better - more is not necessarily best - and service is key in thinking and innovative isn’t always what works for those we serve. The system I am in does this - shares everything - listen carefully - newest isn’t an instant knee jerk reaction to attain. Annual “retreats” for directors, paid WLA membership costs or stipend help for small rural libraries would be beneficial. Tech sources contracts done by systems with us locally if systems no longer want to support tech services.
213. The Wood County library board meetings are particularly helpful in discovering new ideas and comparing problems with our counterparts. This type of gathering (directors from regional libraries) might consider be held more often. It would be to the libraries advantage to share ideas and programs.

214. There could be meetings to bring like sized libraries together to discuss the challenges they face. But I also think it is important for different sized libraries to meet to discuss ideas and concepts. Geographic challenges would exist no matter the size of the library so it is important that they still communicate.

215. There could be user groups set up, though they would need to be meaningful and not a waste of time. Librarians often connect at continuing education events such as workshops and conferences. Winnefox holds an annual meeting for directors. They also hold 4-5 meetings throughout the year for ILS users, at which a lot of questions are asked, and ideas are exchanged.

216. There's really nothing wrong with the concept of systems, except that there are too many (we don't need 16 administrative offices in the state) and they don't offer equitable services. Even if the systems are larger, they provide a framework through which to develop relationships with other libraries and librarians.

217. Things like directors' council with discussion time afterward, meetings and listservs/discussions through email.

218. Through face-to-face meetings.

219. Unfortunately, more face to face meetings but who has time for that. Maybe doing more continuing education that combines getting to know each other within the lecture.

220. Unsure.

221. Unsure.

222. Use of something like Google communities.

223. Use technology and provide opportunities for face to face networking.

224. Various communication tools, events, workshops, visits to individual libraries are all ways to develop and maintain connections between libraries and staff providing the services to libraries. While technology can assist in many ways the best is still face-to-face, in-person contact.

225. Via email, email listservs, and possibly Facebook groups.

226. We enjoy our NFLS meetings, our AAC meetings for OWLSnet, the way NFLS & MCLS partner, the way Winnefox and OWLS partner for trainings, and enjoy catching up with library staff in our region during WLA conferences but realize we don't get to see everyone because some libraries and librarians can't afford them. I don't know how popular a Google Hangout would be, but I think some kind of connectivity online would also be a way to connect, yet don't know if someone at the state level could monitor that, as it could well be a full-time job. Maybe if each system director was made a monitor or had a representative, and that would make for some great connectivity between the directors and the libraries they represent, but only if it doesn't turn into a place to whine...

227. We have local county meetings 9 times a year, system meetings 1 per year, and ILS meetings 4-5 times a year. All of these really help us to stay strong and relevant.

228. We have very productive Library Director Advisory Committee meetings. I see a need for library directors in geographic regions to continue to meet for support and to communicate regional, administrative and governing information. Perhaps quarterly or
biannual sessions for regions. I do think face to face time at least twice a year is essential for success.

229. What is the definition of a region? Again, we favor the local county arrangement that has been in existence in Milwaukee County since 1980. We have the opportunity to make governing decisions/recommendations at LDAC meetings and MCFLS Board meetings, we can participate in contract negotiations for the member agreements, we have a system email network, we can staff at all levels to committee meetings, training sessions, programs, etc. Sometimes it is a challenge to maintain connections with the 14 other system members; we are skeptical what it would be like in a huge geographical region that is one fourth/third/half of the state.

230. What do we now in WRLS.

231. When I first started as director last year, a number of staff from our library system came to the library to orient me and establish a relationship. Now, we communicate mainly by email or phone. We also have regular All Directors meetings to maintain the connections between System staff and Library Directors. I think this system works well.

232. While we all have many avenues of communication with technology, having face to face interactions and investing time in building relationships I feel would be valuable.

233. With the advent of fairly new leadership, our library is fortunate to have a fantastic system that is very communicative and responsive to our needs. The practice of a combination of webinars and face to face meetings and continuing ed, email and phone calls provide healthy communication amongst libraries and the system.

234. WLA does some of this with its small and rural librarian's conference, WAPL, and the like—but these connections need to be made outside of a professional development pay to play forum, in small committees where ideas may be brought up and exchanged, and collaborative initiatives and programs—which may begin in one part of the state and sweep into other areas until the entire state has been “brought up to speed” It is difficult to find time to devote to such things however, when meetings frequently seem like spinning or reinventing the wheel.

12. What is your greatest hope for a new design for regional or statewide services to support your library?

1. #1. Regardless of location, patrons have access to the same services and materials across the state. 2. Cost sharing and collaboration create an environment where more funds are available to meet individual needs of communities. 3. Other public service entities/organizations around the state respect the model and do their best to find the same efficiencies in order to provide the most to citizens of the state.

2. A certainty that each library (regardless of service area or funding) is considered and represented when making decisions regarding regional and statewide services.

3. A clearly defined futuristic vision for Wisconsin public libraries and a road map how to get there.

4. A design that is not only sustainable but increases the usage and appreciation of public libraries. Perhaps even create more public libraries and job and career opportunities. I’d like to see more career opportunities for people of all backgrounds.

5. A fair model that offers at least the level of professional support that I currently receive from Winnefox that will allow my library the flexibility to maintain its individuality. My library will greatly suffer with a diminishing level of professional support.

6. A good infrastructure for the entire county.
7. A regional or even statewide library card (and patron database) that makes it easier and less staff-intensive to share materials (and track patrons’ contact information).
8. A statewide ILS which allows for local tweaking.
10. Affordable, equitable services for all libraries in the state of Wisconsin, regardless of size.
11. After participating in the focus group, my eyes were opened to the inequality experienced by other member libraries of other systems. I understand how this is unacceptable and my hope for them is that they are able to function better due to the end result of the PLSR process.
12. All Wisconsin residents (regardless of where their home library is located) have access to high quality library services.
13. An option to opt into a statewide catalog that allows libraries to share resource one-to-one without a bridge of a clearing house or third-party organization.
14. Appreciating the individuality of all libraries—in their similarities and differences.
15. Better communication and affordability.
16. Better cooperation, service and support.
17. Better efficiency for patrons, easier to share resources and information with other libraries so not everyone has to reinvent the wheel.
18. Better service to communities at an even better value.
19. Better services throughout the state and access to a wider catalog with ease.
20. Better sharing of resources.
21. Better support for those areas for which we need them—technology, IT, funding, and a single library card—this would require a multi-tiered funding system...which we have, but sometimes feels like it never actually trickles down with enough to hit the library.
22. Better, more efficient use of funds and materials. Less duplication of materials.
23. Central, streamlined technology services! Statewide automation system, central maintenance.
25. Continued excellent service without major cost increases; robust state support for the redesigned systems.
26. Costs will go down There will be one shared catalog across the state.
27. Create a patron’s library, with a driving force of literacy in variety of knowledge bases.
28. Cross county funding, better services for the patron.
29. Discovery ability among all the libraries in the region regardless of system affiliation.
30. Ease of ILL! The system in WI is ridiculous! Michigan isn’t tops in much, but their system for ordering items across the state and from universities is so much easier for the general patron.
31. Ease of lending/borrowing between systems.
32. Easier and equitable access for patrons with no additional cost for local libraries.
33. Easy access of items for patrons.
34. End redundant services. Become more efficient. Have one ILS system that is patron friendly and cost effective. Use cost savings to give people what they want. New library materials and up to date technology with well trained staff. More collaboration and partnership develop. Encourage community outreach activities.
35. Equal voice for all libraries, more consistency in services and procedures, and new positive connections.
36. Equality among all regions of the state!
37. Equitable funding, service and access for all Wisconsin public libraries.
38. Equitable service.
39. Equitable services across the state that feature high level services to libraries and their communities at the lowest possible and realistic cost.
40. Equitable services for all library patrons throughout the state.
41. Equity of access to services throughout the state.
42. Equity of services for all libraries and communities - removal of duplication of efforts when it comes to advocacy and staff development (for example) - more cost-effective measures for the same services - better communication and collaboration among libraries and across the state.
43. Every person in the state of Wisconsin will have equal access to library service no matter where they live, and that the quality of library service currently offered does not suffer as a result of a restructuring.
44. Everyone gets equitable, excellent service, regardless of their library's size or funding.
45. Excellent collaboration and communication.
46. Fewer systems - merge one and two county systems into systems with three or more counties.
47. Find efficiencies which then enable us to fund better services for the same amount of money.
48. Find some way for the different libraries/systems to come together amidst very different routines/roles/rules,... etc.
49. Firstly, thank you to all of you who have given of your time to really study and brainstorm changes to our state's library system. My greatest hope is that we do not blunder forth to reinvent a "wheel" (library system) that is already working.
50. FIXING THE STATUATORY FUNDING FORMULAS TO REFLECT THE CURRENT/FUTURE USAGE OF LIBRARIES SERVICES.
51. For our library to be given the opportunity to have technological support so that our community does not fall behind the rest of the state.
52. Funding needs to be increased for these types of services.
53. Greater ability to benefit from economies of scale for ILS, delivery, resource acquisition and availability. Greater consistency of services offered to patrons from library to library.
54. Greater access to services for libraries like mine - small and isolated.
55. Greatest hope is for those libraries that feel they are not being heard or having equal access to necessary library functions to help serve their patrons to the best of their ability.
56. Greatest hope: that we can see library system(s) that are responsive, innovative, and invest in their staff in order to maximize their services and resources offered to individual libraries to the benefit of all communities in the state.
57. Getting it done before the politicians step in.
58. Have someone at the state level whose main interest is in small public libraries.
59. I am not afraid of bigger library systems, certainly one county systems do not seem sustainable, but they need to be geographically reasonable in size (not too big) and have a combined staff to cover all the needs of the individual libraries.
60. I do hope that all libraries in the state would have access, if desired, to the same services regardless of their location or size.

61. I do not have a great hope for a new design. I want more money for my library, and all the other libraries in our system. Governance of our system is just fine the way it is.

62. I don’t have any great hopes that this new model will work any better than the current one. Perhaps services to rural libraries will improve, but I do not have any great hopes for the Milwaukee County region.

63. I hope NFLS will not have to pay Brown County for services as a Resource Library for services that are either not needed or utilized.

64. I hope partnership and cooperation is made easier. However, services are delivered in the new model, I hope that the design is not unnecessarily complex and political for the libraries. Services offered simply & seamlessly will allow libraries to do what they need to do.

65. I hope that any change that is instituted keeps in the forefront what I think is the most important factor in any conversation and that is customer service. Improving the experience for the patron should be in everyone’s mind in these decisions.

66. I hope that smaller, less funded libraries will receive access to all the e material and printed/audio material available in the state. I think this can be done, but distance would create a hardship.

67. I hope that the new design keeps in mind distance for member libraries to their regional location. Larger does not mean better. Wisconsin has lost so many services and personal contact in so many areas I would hate to see that happen with our library systems.

68. I hope that this doesn’t get too big to be able to meet the needs of our small library’s population. I would be happy to have close support that understands our area. We are a small library in a small village. Our patrons need us.

69. I hope that understanding that a new design will only be as good as the individuals working within it means that greater accountability and standards for service based on the needs of the communities the system is meant to serve will be the order of the day.

70. I hope that we can bring all libraries up to the amazing level of service that I’ve experienced in my 7 years with SCLS. A library system should provide support and resources and be a good listener. I feel some of the other systems just make things harder for their libraries, which ultimately hurts library patrons.

71. I hope that we will have adequate, supportive staff that have the freedom to encourage and advise us to keep finding innovative ways to serve our communities.

72. I hope the PLSR process results in all libraries receiving the level of excellent services my library receives from my library system.

73. I think everything is really good now.

74. I think some good ideas will come out of this, but I don’t think the current system is broke.

75. I want it to focus on the patron. It should be efficient with better service and sustainable without binding our hands or restricting us to antiquated service models in the future. While it needs to be efficient we shouldn’t put our services into too much of one basket which will run the risk that one bad budget year will destroy services across the state - it needs to be resilient and sustainable.

76. I would hope that the small/rural libraries will NOT be left more isolated as a result of this change.

77. I would like to see all the libraries be connected on a statewide level.
78. I would like to see greater involvement by the DPI, maybe oversight of Standards. I was talking to one of my colleagues who was telling me that his new director had just recently had them purge a huge number of unused cards from their ILS. It dramatically cut down their number of registered users, I can't recall the number, but it was over 10K. The director felt it was important to have a more factual representation of users and it made me wonder – how many other libraries are there misrepresenting their statistics, unintentionally or intentionally because they aren't purging old unused cards. What other statistics could/should be standardized the same way statewide? If we are doing state reports, should we be gathering our data with the same rules/methods and shouldn't the DPI/someone be overseeing this?

79. I would love to see our library involved in more inter-library services such as borrowing and loaning materials, increased access to online services, etc. It would be so great if our patrons had more access to technological support for e-books, etc. as well. Granted, that is generally up to the patron's home agency, it would also be nice to have services available to patrons if our library is unable to support additional technical services such as that.

80. If the whole point of this exercise is to increase and ensure equitable access, then I hope this process brings that result. It would be nice if that could happen without some libraries losing services. Building consultant services would be huge - when the state had these services it was so cost effective.

81. I'm hoping for a cost savings, better access to more materials, and possibly a faster turnaround for patron holds (ILLs).

82. I'm not sure what I would hope for. We are fairly content with how things are handled right now. We have a certain level of autonomy and the ability to tailor our services to our patrons, while still being part of a shared system. This is the ideal and my hope is that this would continue into the future.

83. I'm so excited about the possibility of being able to provide services and programs to our community we would never otherwise be capable of. I'm also excited about the idea of reduced costs of things at my library level. My small library can never order in bulk and get things at a much lower cost, primarily book processing materials, summer reading prizes and tote bags and such. It seems like if some of this stuff was purchased at a system level, and then sold at cost to the libraries, the small libraries could finally get bulk prices. Additionally, why replicate the 'shopping around' at every library when one person could be looking for the best quality at the best price for everyone.

84. I'm sorry, I have not thought much for a new design.

85. Improved access to expertise. As the systems get squeezed for money, try as they might, the services get stripped down to the essential (ILL and ILS management).

86. Improved overall image for libraries.

87. Improved service for all library users. I don't want to see service lowered for anyone.

88. Improved services for residents. Equal access.

89. In addition to equitable services, all libraries will be represented in media, in government, in a new light.

90. Increase collaboration and resources (marketing, ideas, programming, technology, consulting, etc.) among libraries.

91. Increased efficiency.

92. Increased equity in public libraries with services that support local communities.
93. Increased state revenue for public libraries in sparsely populated areas where libraries in a system are separated by great distances.

94. Increasing services at the local library—really the outer structure doesn’t finally matter if the end-user, the local library, can support its citizens better. For us, it means support for some areas we don’t do as well as we’d like and increasing our ability to innovate.

95. Individual libraries will maintain their independence for the most part, while seeing improvement & equality in services.

96. It is hard to have hope for a new design when funding for libraries has never been a top priority across the entire country, but we do hope that the State will increase its funding to systems to be in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 43.

97. It will make more resources more easily available.

98. It would be great if reorganization can mean that all residents in all regions will receive excellent guidance and support. As a community on a county and system border, I hear stories of patrons for whom service and support at their local system does not meet the same standards we try to provide our residents. I would hope that collaborative development of a statewide network would combine the best service and support that Wisconsin Libraries have to offer our residents and one another.

99. Just more communication and sharing of resources.

100. Leave the systems as they are but if change is going to be demanded in system structuring, then make sure that it is done in a way that we can maintain the awesome support that we get from our current system.

101. Less bureaucracy, full state support for core services like Internet, delivery, training, shared electronic resources. If you remove the cost of systems, you can reinvest the money into those core services provided directly from the state.

102. Less regionalism, less bureaucracy, more flexibility, and better core services paid for by the state. Reference is no longer a core service of libraries yet providing access to materials and digital connections/collections is. Sharing resources is something we do very well in this state, if we acknowledged it as a core service, I can only imagine we’d be even greater still. If we do this right, we can have funding better allocated and actually INNOVATE services rather than keep up with the jones. There are so many possibilities with technology that we squander because we’re too busy arguing about keeping what we perceive as important rather than looking at how important it will be in the future. $15.5M spent on 16 systems. If half went to infrastructure and half went to libraries directly based on a transparent formula, WOW! we could innovate.

103. Libraries will be offered tiered services that offer flexibility in services offered and budget monies needed.

104. Library patrons in Wisconsin will get better services at their local library.

105. Limited funding is used effectively to support valuable services.

106. Lower costs for more services.

107. More access, more availability, more efficiency, less duplication of services and therefore less waste of resources.

108. More efficient and professional service from regional systems.

109. More efficient services across the state, less duplication of effort, and more equitable service for our rural residents. Online services (OPAC or Discovery Layer, digital collections, databases, etc.) whose quality doesn’t depend on where you live or how skilled that one library system staff member happens to be. "Equity of service" means that services are raised to the highest quality across the state.
110. More efficient services times and quality services.

111. More equal services and support to libraries who may be located farther away from their library system headquarters than other libraries, and more equal services to libraries regardless of what library system they belong to. Will feel more engaged and valued in a library system we are a part of even though we do not pay for optional services; like shared catalog, or technology management.

112. More equitable system resources. System Board comprised of member libraries. Fewer library systems. Unified ILS and library cards for State.

113. More flexibility in helping the library with technology and making the system supported devices work well with the unsupported devices.

114. More for your money.

115. More funding and better communication. Also, good cooperation among all involved.

116. More funding from resources other than local government.

117. More funding-increase the % in the state statute.

118. More integrated resources, stronger together.

119. More interactions with libraries in neighboring systems, more marketing to advance the idea of what it means to the citizens of Wisconsin to be a part of a library system, and how the systems engage with each other to make all of them stronger advocates for people.

120. More resources and support for small libraries that are struggling to provide basic services.

121. More resources available for our community members and a feeling of being connected to others in the state. Strong IT support would be a huge part of this - having reliable internet access, up-to-date and well supported computers and devices available for use, and a fast, easy to navigate catalog.

122. More shared services/materials with a large area covered.

123. More support for all Wisconsin libraries in this time of adjusting from just supplying books to so many other important things the library has to offer!

124. My greatest hope for a new model assures that there is NO interruption of the services my library and system now provide.

125. My greatest hope is being a part of a well-organized System. Getting the most services for the lowest cost. I understand the need to share/merge services to potentially bring costs down, so I’m glad we’re looking into this possibility.

126. My greatest hope is for our vision to continue: “To honor our history, to learn of today, to inspire for tomorrow”. The ease of borrowing through our system’s shared ILS utilizing one card is something that would be great to see expand across system/service borders. There has been a great deal of time and effort put into the process and I’m looking forward to reviewing the committee reports.

127. My greatest hope is that a feasible way for all Wisconsin public libraries to have equitable services and support will be developed.

128. My greatest hope is that any changes that are made are done with substantial proof of statewide issues, not just local issues within a system. I hope that any changes that do occur ensure that local representation and local advocacy still exist. My greatest hope is that our local library system will still exist.

129. My greatest hope is that it doesn't happen.
130. My greatest hope is that my system and its staff remain where they are and function in the capacity they do now. Losing them would be a detriment to my library.

131. My greatest hope is that regions of this state that are doing without can be brought up to par with those of us who feel we have adequate resources and support.

132. My greatest hope is that the best library systems in the Midwest (I have worked in Wisconsin, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska) will be "empowered" by broad goals (increased equity and increased quality of services to libraries and patrons) and "incentives" to become more entrepreneurial; to identify centers of excellence and to increase their capacity to serve more libraries over greater geographic distances.

133. My greatest hope is that the outcome will provide accountability for our current system. There appears to be no accountability (i.e. guidelines, best practices, bidding processes, etc.). If there are, I don't know about it -- so many there is a lack of communication as well.

134. My greatest hope is that the smaller libraries will not be forgotten and still be able to provide high level of services or at least services that we currently offer to our patrons. To be able to keep our autonomy.

135. My greatest hope is that there will actually be change. That the services that libraries want will be provided in a much more effective manner. That there will be significant cost savings by eliminating administrators and those savings can be used to provide better delivery and ILS.

136. My greatest hope is that this Steering Committee of good smart people will soon be able to stop and look at the issue without the abundance of "process" of the past years. I hope PLSR will examine the unique reasons that individual libraries are not thriving. We're pointing at the system model but there's no evidence for that, just assumptions. Systems contain thriving libraries too, and those are not restricted by geographic factors or the funding their systems receive. I hope PLSR will investigate what's working in those systems/libraries and how that can be spread statewide. Some ideas coming from PLSR models may also be helpful, with refinement, but until that foundational work is done, applying new models is a fix to a problem that isn't truly understood and that may be remedied with less disruption. I hope the end product helps all libraries, instead of creating new losers.

137. My greatest hope is that we (libraries in Bridges Library System) will not lose what we have. We're very happy right now with our system staff and system director. I do not want change for the sake of change itself. Why fix something that isn't broken?

138. My greatest hope is that we can improve the services for smaller and more rural libraries while maintaining and/or improving the level of service that we currently enjoy in our system - and that the local expertise and "color" doesn’t get lost in a one-size-fits-all plan.

139. My greatest hope is that Wisconsin continues to provide the latest and greatest library services to its citizens. Compared to other states, Wisconsin has a progressive, up-to-date library system and I would hate to see it not stay that way.

140. My greatest hope is to maintain all the positive aspects of being a part of Winding Rivers, from the personal consulting attention to the C.E. opportunities to the manageable hold lists in our shared catalog, while benefiting from increased resources in areas such as IT support.

141. My hope is that a new design will provide everyone in Wisconsin with equal access to public libraries, regardless of economic prosperity and distance.
142. My hope is that systems will be able to offer a stable, robust set of services, resources and support for their member libraries. Less disparity, more cross collaboration so that we can all get what we need.

143. My hope is the powers that be understand the benefit that a library can offer its population and will fully support a status quo or an increase in funding to allow staff to continue to provide much needed and desired services.

144. No loss of services to patrons.

145. Once the design is implemented, funding will be saved (libraries will be able to operate on a smaller budget) and services will be more far reaching.

146. One Card across the state, with appropriate robust technologies that support this model.

147. One ILS for the state - one card works across the entire state - this is equity of service, ILS paid by the state. Freeing up libraries of all sizes to concentrate on collections, programming, staffing, for their service populations.

148. One integrated digital catalog.

149. One library system with access across systems. All libraries in the state receiving public funds would participate in the integrated library automation system implemented in their library system. State funds would be allocated as an incentive for these libraries to make the transition to an ILS.

150. One that allows for both a state-wide library card for patrons...and yet allows individual libraries to make decisions and retain practices and policies that best suit the needs of their own communities.

151. Our greatest hope for a new design is for our WI libraries that are struggling with funding or to remain open will have the ability to grow their services and programs.

152. Our greatest hope would be for all libraries in the State to receive equal access to the same resources for the patrons they serve and for all member libraries to receive equal system staff services and support. Neighboring systems could consider merging ILS’s and sharing the cost of resources in order to fund other system projects.

153. Our high standard of services will be maintained, patron services will flourish Fees will not increase Our system director and support staff remain and services maintained or enhanced.

154. Our state dollars can be better spent by becoming more efficient and use current technologies to streamline some services, resulting in better service for more state residents.

155. Patrons will be able to get the best service each library is able to provide.

156. Provide the needed support each individual library and community needs.

157. Providing a better and more efficient user experience without additional cost.

158. Reallocation of monies to services decided on by member libraries. If member libraries vote and decide that a position or service at the system level is no longer relevant, this should be part of an annual review of system services.

159. Re-balancing of statewide library system support, through additional funding, so that the neediest areas have the same quality library support as the wealthiest.

160. Same great service, smaller price tag.

161. Seeing the level of service across the state be equitable and maintained. Patrons in rural Grant County would have the same access to databases, learning tools, fast ILL delivery, etc. as people in Appleton or Madison. Our system would have the resources to support libraries so that they could function easier- provide effective technology support and
innovation, provide real and effective ILS maintenance, provide real and meaningful resources that could revolutionize services in this part of the state. That there is a greater recognition and appreciation for the innovation that takes place in a small library out of necessity- and that some of those ideas would work well on a larger scale too.

162. Service is so equitable that patrons don’t even need to know about our library systems - it’s more like McDonalds - the same everywhere.

163. Sharing of programs and services that work for them.

164. Simplified work flow on all processes would be wonderful. Library cards that allow for easier checkouts of ILL materials, faster use of cataloging features (to find records, etc.), and other features that a more integrated state-wide process would be an immense time saver and would improve services to patrons who must travel across regions for work.

165. Single ILS and standard level of services.

166. Some way to include small standalone libraries. We are important too.

167. Someone will be a leader and get things moving. Great cooks don’t begin with a great recipe, they experiment until things go right. Let’s go for it, see what works, and fix the glitches.

168. Statewide library cards.

169. Strengthened statewide support.

170. Stronger system support and secured funding.

171. That every library has support and is provided with great service to meet their patrons needs.

172. That a greater range of voices will provide a strong basis for library services to all types of libraries and their patrons.

173. That all libraries could get what we have at Indianhead.

174. That all libraries in Wisconsin will have access to print and e-resources and materials that they need. All libraries will have the technology needed to support their communities. That costs to individual libraries will go down as our Operating Budgets grow tighter and tighter.

175. That any new system will be increasingly cost-effective/sustainable, and highly efficient such that technology and services are optimized according to individual libraries’/communities’ needs.

176. That by integrating the smallest systems into larger ones and finding efficiencies there will be a cost-savings, along with service equity, that will allow the savings to be spent on new initiatives such as statewide Hoopla and other electronic resources.

177. That charging between counties will disappear. That we may enhance not take away services to patrons across the state. That libraries will flourish for the future generations.

178. That each library would be able to determine local policy for circulation, staff, hours, library boards, everything really. That we would be visible, and our needs considered.

179. That everyone can have what we have in Winnefox.

180. That I can continue to increasingly say, “Yes, I can do that,” or “I can help you solve that problem,” to my patrons.

181. That it actually works and doesn’t cost a lot more and no more one county systems.

182. That it advances and improves the services our patrons currently receive.

183. That it brings service equity, or closer service equity, to our state.
184. That it includes a statewide promotional campaign about Wisconsin libraries.
185. That it is an improvement and not a step backwards.
186. That it is as productive and supportive as the system we have now.
187. That it is as wonderful as I have now or better if that is possible. That statewide service doesn’t destroy jobs. That this study and all that is put on the table is listened to and not ignored when the time for change comes.
188. That it will be like what we have through the Winnefox System. That we can have other systems working together with our system to cut cost.
189. That it will only increase the great service we now get from our library system.
190. That it will work well for all libraries. Changes made for the better of the whole.
191. That libraries will get fantastic service with less cost and more funds can be allocated to local library service.
192. That more money will be allocated to systems.
193. That my library will be able to offer greater access for its patrons.
194. That my library would have 5 day a week delivery, that we would get better support staff to help us, that we would have the ability to share and receive materials from all libraries in Wisconsin, and that we would have more resources available to us.
195. That my library would have access to the same or better services for the same or less money.
196. That my small library will obtain many new resources and people to call upon for issues, concerns, help, guidance, etc. I think that my system is amazing, and I can’t see needing to go outside of it for help at this time, but one can never have to many resources or people at their disposal to turn to. Being a new director was scary but having members of the DPI and other librarians share their knowledge and help was so amazing.
197. That not much changes because our system does a great job of meeting the needs of my library.
198. That once implemented we will be able to run each library with a certain amount of autonomy and still maintain the extremely high level of customer services we currently have without a lot of government financial waste and inefficiency.
199. That other library systems might see improved services.
200. That our patrons will be able to get materials faster and we’ll have better apps, websites to reach our patrons outside the library.
201. That our system administration will be too far away and distant. I love what we have going on now at IFLS. I will miss these individual people, as well. Experience and the human connection means something.
202. That patrons of small libraries do not switch to large libraries due to services they can provide that the smaller libraries cannot.
203. That redundancy is addressed and that any "savings" are invested back into the system. That coordinated activities statewide empower and strengthen the efforts of member libraries.
204. That robust library services are available to every state resident regardless of location. Small, rural libraries need strong regional & state resources to overcome lack of support services, technology and public transportation within their service areas. Collaboration between libraries of all sizes will increase based on similar community interests, collections, etc.
205. That SCLS libraries do not lose any existing services, and that existing services will not cost more. (I notice that I am not hoping for any positive results here; just hoping for no negative results.)

206. That service is more efficiently delivered and expanded with combined resources.

207. That services are equalized for the better and that small libraries with few resources are able to provide the same services as large ones.

208. That services will be more uniform for all public libraries in the state.

209. That small libraries, without the means of larger libraries, will be buoyed up.

210. That something comes out of this long process, i.e. that enabling legislation actually gets passed. That a redesign will make formerly -known-as-systems more responsive to members’ needs.

211. That system services can become more streamlined and efficient in order to provide more libraries access to important services.

212. That the changes are well thought out, achievable by everyone in the public library field, and that the changes are perceived to be a good thing by politicians and citizens.

213. That the community-level structuring of library services will not be changed from the patron’s point of view but that the services provided will be delivered from a different, more efficient level.

214. That the current service received will not diminish.

215. That the design will result in better support of libraries from regional and state services.

216. That the excellent communication and tangible support I receive from IFLS would continue.

217. That the excellent service we get from IFLS is able to continue and maybe even more time for technology training.

218. That the libraries not getting the amazing support and services we get are brought up to a level in which they can provide better service to their patrons.

219. That the new design would be similar to how things work in the Winnefox system. It works well. There is a lot of support, encouragement, help, training, and contact.

220. That the new system DOES NO HARM!

221. That the state decides to leave the high functioning systems alone, and instead looks at how to better serve the less functioning library systems. We have systems where 65% of their libraries have a budget under $200,000. These small libraries can’t be expected to do the things a larger funded library can do and shouldn’t be expected too. Maybe instead better service would come from redesigning those systems into branches of larger libraries (or another variable of that).

222. That the state-wide system provides the same amount of support and services for ALL libraries in the state that Bridges Library System provides to its member libraries.

223. That the voices of small libraries are heard and considered.

224. That there will be no notable change in services and ideally a notable improvement in services from the patron perspective.

225. That this will allow up to better serve our patrons & to make libraries of all sizes feel that they have an adequate voice in decisions that are being made.

226. That those who don’t have great service get better service and those who have great service get better service. If we are not growing, we are doing nothing. We need to show that the money that is spent is worthwhile and being used to better the lives of everyone in Wisconsin.
227. That we can enhance services to our patrons and create a network of library colleagues across the state to learn from while expand sharing resources.

228. That we can leverage economies of scale for electronic resources and services like ILL and Delivery to provide a more robust menu of options for patrons in every corner of the state. I can’t do everything that I want to do, ultimately because of a lack of financial resources and knowledge. If we can shift some of those responsibilities and costs around, hopefully I can increase the resources that I can dedicate in those areas. I hope that as we’re considering new staffing models to accompany these new service models, that we’ll consider finding ways to incorporate staff into more places than just system offices or resource libraries.

229. That we can not only improve the services that we offer to patrons, but we can increase their awareness of just what the library has to offer in the 21st century. We need be able to offer practical yet entertaining programs to all ages. We need to have the resources to plan and implement new program initiatives. When I try to do it by myself, flying by the seat of my pants, we can come off as looking silly and people don’t want to come back. We can’t afford to alienate patrons.

230. That we can really be innovative, progressive, high tech, and be viewed as truly an essential service by the public. That there can be a brand or marketing effort that makes the statewide library system the best thing since sliced bread and it is something people can point to and understand as to what it offers to them. This would need a marketing machine behind it.

231. That we don’t look to change for its own sake. That someone takes a look at what is working right now, and working well, in at least a couple of systems in the state, before making drastic changes for all. I am very hopeful that a statewide portal will be instituted as a result of the project, and that statewide delivery can be improved. There is a lot of good that can come out this. I guess it’s up to the Steering Committee to pick those gems out of the service models and for those in charge of the process further along to make them into reality.

232. That we don’t lose the amazing access and service we have at IFLS.

233. That we don’t lose what we already have. What is so sad and so disturbing about the PLSR process is no assessment was undertaken at the start to determine what is currently working and what is currently not working. Without that, the process has been truly flawed.

234. That we don’t mess it up.

235. That we have a robust statewide level of resources that benefit library patrons at equitable levels, that funds are spent on resources that can be leveraged so that we get the best value for our state dollar, that funds aren’t spent frivolously, that delivery/technology/ILS are provided by state dollars with some local support, that because we are efficient/effective with our dollars we have more funds put in to electronic resources, and that when we do go to the state at some point to ask for more it’s not because we are static and just want more to do what we are doing, but because we are so integrated with our communities and providing such a high level of service that it makes perfect sense to continue to support something that is effectively providing resources to the people of Wisconsin.

236. That we have fewer systems that are providing high quality services for member libraries. That MPL and other representative libraries are tapped to serve as resource libraries to ensure that library directors - not system directors - are leading in the state. I hope the cost of our core services goes down so savings can be redirected to programs or to create equity-I hope small libraries in all parts of the state can offer the same resources.
and services available in most large libraries. I hope the new design eliminates losers, even if it means some systems/libraries need to slow their growth. I hope we become more collaborative, less competitive, stop fighting over pennies and sending money across various jurisdictional lines. I hope we develop a culture of Wisconsin libraries serving Wisconsin residents - and not just our local residents - especially where state funding is concerned.

237. That we keep what is working in our library system and enhance it with more support for all libraries.

238. That we will be able to offer a greater level of services to our patrons.

239. That we will not lose any aspects of our excellent support from the South Central Library System.

240. That we would have a stable source of reliable funding. Repeatedly asking county supervisors for an increase in our 70% funding is unsustainable and a waste of time and resources. Continually basing funding on items circulated seems antiquated.

241. That what we have currently is at least maintained, but GREATEST would be for our support, services, and collaborative efforts to be even more enhanced by a new design.

242. That whatever plan is put into place recognizes local funding issues that exist and lead to libraries becoming more independent, so they could stand on their own if system funding no longer exists.

243. That you won't break what isn't broken.

244. The new design will enhance and continue to support public libraries as well as have a vision for the future with changes that adapt to the culture.

245. The redesign should bring Wisconsin closer to a union catalog with more seamless borrowing for our users while maintaining the unique character of all the libraries across the state. The realization of this hope is grounded in librarian training, technology delivery and collections. Also, providing a constant voice at the state legislature would be ideal so we can be proactive in legislation. One last hope, the redesign will bring peace and harmony to library land.

246. The state funding will be shared more equally throughout the state.

247. There needs to be something that brings life back to communities that are facing economic downturn; where their small town is losing businesses and younger families are moving away. Something we can do to make a small rural library vital and a place where people want to come.

248. Timely responsiveness.

249. To elevate community libraries to be seen as essential services like water, electric, etc.

250. To help our library be more equitable to like-sized libraries across the state of WI.

251. To keep Indianhead's high level of service while expanding the services offered in other regions.

252. To maintain and improve most of the services we now have. Continued in-kind financial support, increased advocacy at the local, regional, state and federal levels for our library, good technical support,

253. We provide new and relevant services to our patrons and that libraries would be a thriving piece of the community.

254. We will be able to serve our patrons and area community and provide the services they request. A program that will be affordable for all libraries, especially smaller libraries.

255. What works right now is still in place.
256. While I'm very happy with the support system we have with Winnefox I would love a more direct connection with libraries throughout the state. Accessing all materials simply and directly through a shared statewide catalog, would be great for our patrons and for us. I would hope that by reducing some redundancies in the multiple systems we could bring our system fees down and be able to use that money to improve our collection and the services and programs we offer to our patrons.

257. With a tiny budget we need to be able to survive. We need support from the state for technology.

258. Your talking to a library that feels we meet the needs of our patron pretty well. Obviously, there are a few things that can be done on a statewide basis. But let libraries serve their community.

13. What is your greatest fear for such a design?

1. #1) Corruption (I don't fear this for WI public libraries, but think it is our country's largest threat) 2) Lack of communication 3) Lack of trust. Loss overall for our public libraries without any substantial gains.

2. #1. The design will be cost prohibitive to maintain our current services, which are amazing through our system.

3. #1. This project will not accomplish the goal of providing equity in library services across the state. 2. This project will increase expenses while decreasing service. 3. Small/rural libraries will not be heard and will lose their voice in future statewide library movements.

4. A belief that greater centralization and a one-size-fits-all is what service equity means will replace the good things that we already have.

5. A loss in already meager funding for small libraries.

6. A muddled mess and loss of expertise and experience among staff.

7. Additions fees for services, loss of some services.

8. Affordability.

9. All this work and discussion and everything will remain the same.

10. As a class II library director, my greatest fear would be the potential closing of small town libraries in the interests of "consolidation". Libraries are wonderful democratic fertile community crossroads melting pots that offer community members a safe place of inquiry and exploration. Life would be a desert without them.

11. As a library that has been fortunate with the great service provided by our library system, I fear we will be losing something important that we don't realize that we rely upon.

12. As a smaller library, I fear we would have less input into policies and services.

13. As I've stated before, "change for change's sake" is my fear. Completely upending everything simply because some problems are not being addressed. I could not do my job and the library could not function without the input and expertise of my library system.

14. Bad feelings caused by job changes.

15. Being forced to charge fines! Distant managing of local policies. Losing our individual integrity.

16. Can't think of any.

17. Change that interferes with our present level of service.

18. Changing the boundaries for each system.
20. Communication, diminishing support of small rural libraries, overlooking everyone’s voice and budget problems.
22. Costs and limited services due to our location and size.
23. Damage to local autonomy and control of public libraries.
24. Disparity between libraries, incivility over differences, loss of service quality, loss of effectiveness due to an ever-larger service area.
25. Even though I think our system would benefit from a larger model, I am skeptical that voices will be less distinct in a meeting with 45 library directors as opposed to 25. Decision making can be cumbersome in that environment.
26. Falling to the lowest common denominator of service - ours is pretty high at present.
27. Fear of our System being dissolved and merged with another.
28. Fewer systems covering more area resulting in a diluted service.
29. Folks already think the library is obsolete in some ways. That the library might be run as a kiosk, virtually, or like a Wal-Mart or fast food restaurant. The argument more state support will mean need for less trained and educated staff—when actually the converse will likely become true. Libraries are busy—and with the ability to offer more, will only need more help, more space, and better technology, materials, programs, and the like to provide to the community each library serves. Availability of good product means the need to have the ability to provide and teach how to use the product. A library is an empty shell without people, a computer in a room, a book storage facility, and a place with no answers. It becomes Google. Getting lucky is not how I like my research. The people’s university is not a computer—but a thoughtful library.
30. Getting lost in the big picture of too much information that may not be relevant to me.
31. Greater cost and/or less services provided by systems to local libraries.
32. Greatest fear is that the small to mid-size system I am in will be dismissed for a larger system. Where I as a small library will not be heard or helped with such a manner as I receive now. Our patrons benefit from the excellent service that our system provides our library.
33. Greatest fear: that we get caught up in the redesign process and trying to re-invent the wheel, only to a) see no improvement. b) waste time, energy, and funds c) lose transparency d) lose the input of individual libraries.
34. Here are my fears, in no particular order: 1. System governance could be privatized 2. My high-functioning library system could lose funding or staffing. 3. My system staff, who are so skilled at doing very important work, could lose their jobs. 4. The legislature just awarded an additional $1.5 million in library system funding at the same time we’re looking for efficiencies -- I don’t imagine that looks good to lawmakers. 5. Hundreds of public employees (including me) have poured so much time and taxpayer money into this project. But if proposed changes erode local control, the odds of elected officials supporting those changes is nil. So, I worry that hundreds of hours of precious library staff time have been wasted because PLSR did not start with what was wrong and aim to fix it, but rather picked apart the whole system.
35. Higher cost or less control.
36. I am afraid that depending on the timing of this project and report, that libraries could become politicized like the train was eight years ago and do damage to all of us. I fear an overly strong emphasis on “resource libraries,” when I have found many of those
libraries in smaller systems to be ways to obtain money without necessarily redistributing that as services (other than larger collections) to the other members. Our existing system structure has worked well, in most cases, to mediate between large, medium, and small libraries.

37. I am fearful libraries will lose more local control of their own libraries. I am also in a pretty good system, so I wouldn’t want to lose the services we get. I do realize you have to give some to get some.

38. I don’t have any fears for a structure that focuses on service.

39. I don’t have many fears about a new design. I trust the PLSR process. Change is difficult, but we are living in a new reality. My greatest concern overall is local funding for libraries and the stress on communities due to a lack of state financial support.

40. I don’t like to use "FEAR." It demeans. These are CONCERNS. -investment of time and money in PLSR may cause people to feel action must follow, regardless -data that models are based on is not of decision-making quality - a move to larger, possibly overlapping, geographic regions of service and administration will lead to a decrease in local control, thus less financial support and grassroots advocacy - lack of support for changes resulting in schisms in the library community, reflect poorly on the process and libraries, and be disruptive -loss of intellectual capital as system staff leave due to proposed lower pay and uncertainty - future support is endangered by implying to legislators (very few of whom held office when the move to study systems took place; all of whom just gave systems $1.5M ) that systems are "broken" - conflict of interest between the project coordination role and service provider selection - degradation of library services statewide

41. I don’t want to lose the unique character of individual libraries so that the experience feels homogeneous at all. Also, the ILS has to be easy to navigate, fast, and better than what we currently have. I fear that "bigger" can become more complicated, more issues to deal with, and easier to hack. Tied in with the ILS, delivery time needs to be fast.

42. I fear that a change will be made that will diminish the quality of services offered, resulting in loss of use, loss of funding, and the closing of libraries.

43. I fear that our small local library would no longer have a say in how we manage our collection, i.e. retaining the ability to have local hold items where items go only to our library users. I also fear that we will not be allowed to make decisions for our own libraries.

44. I fear that without a solid funding component, there will be in-fighting over limited funds. I fear that systems will experience a continued dwindling in their ability to deliver services, resources and support to member libraries.

45. I feel that the South Central Library System provides a high standard of service to its libraries and their customers. My greatest fear is reduction in the quality, variety and level of service to our library and patrons.

46. I have 2 fears. First, that reorganization will centralize services to such a degree that support, and collaboration will lose the personal touch they currently have. The level of trust I have in the skills, knowledge and intent of my local consultants is an essential part of my support system in managing my Library. Knowing who to reach out to for support, recommendations and suggestions is important. Secondly, I fear that the level and continuity of service that trustees, directors, staff and patrons will have under reorganization will be reduced from existing levels in some regions in order to provide equitable service across the state.

47. I have a LOT of fears. I’m worried that the shared services which my system worked so hard to coordinate will be lost if our system is dissolved or merged. I’m worried about county funding – our funding formula is a thing of beauty and Connie worked hard to put
together, but it needs to be cultivated and that can’t be done from afar. I’m worried that a group of people have bought into the “big is better” idea. My municipality did a merger study as did WCFLS – both came to the same conclusion – merging wasn’t really going to save much money and could reduce quality of services. Mostly though, I fear that the lack of transparency has given me very little faith in the PLSR process. I do not think in the end there will be a plan that will be beneficial to the Pewaukee Public Library.

48. I have NEVER had a positive experience with central control. I believe local control in all areas, including libraries works best. I am concerned that the state will remove library systems that work well, only to find out that they will function at a lower level afterwards, and that the less funded, rural libraries will not have any changes in their services. I don’t want our state to move to a “socialist” type of library governance. Whoever holds the purse strings controls the outcome, so I am concerned that your new model moves funding away from library systems only to supposedly give more to the “poor” libraries, and in reality, keep the extra funds to pay for the new governing organization, i.e. Someone has to run this new model, and who is going to pay for it, and who is going to lose?

49. I have two fears: One, that we will see more of the same. The changes won’t be enough to instigate any real improvement or equity of service. That rural areas will continue to get lost and priced out of services and these communities will eventually lose the most important asset they have- their libraries- because they aren’t getting the support they need at the state or system level. And that, as that happens, the statewide library community doesn’t bother to feel concerned because hey, WE'RE doing fine. Two, that real and true change does happen- and that change creates so much resentment in the libraries that might not “gain” as much as others that our cooperative spirit is broken and it’s even more “big vs. small” throughout the state than it already is.

50. If systems are combined and the headquarters is halfway across the state, they will have less time for each library and communication/relationships will become impersonal. Combining systems also will put greater workloads on system staff and response time for technical needs, legal questions, etc. will be greatly delayed. Additionally, some library directors/staff and system tech people will have to drive farther for face to face meetings, continuing ed and tech repair, respectively.

51. I’m worried that our voice will be lost or that we’ll have to ‘comply’ with so much in exchange for participation in the system.

52. Inadequate staff, inadequate funding. Emphasis on rules and budget and not on working together or providing services.

53. Increased local costs in times with declining circulation (decreased county funding). Paying for services that are currently provided by the system or required to pay for services not identified as a need for our community library. Won’t have statewide by-in.

54. It will be big that the little libraries will be lost between the cracks.

55. It will be the same pig with new lipstick. I fear this process that started 5 years ago where we identified the issues has grown into the PLSR, will be a lot of work for nothing because we keep looking at what we have rather than what we need in the future. Our fear of loss is keeping us from creating what’s really needed. All over the state, circulation is down, yet we continue to worry about delivery, ILS, and resource sharing. We are trying to perhaps “redesign” something that should be replaced.

56. It will cost us more for the services we have. And we will lose funding that helps us do what we do now.

57. It will take money away from the library.

58. Lack of representation for my size library or lack of services because of isolated location.
59. Large libraries and systems will lose funding and services in the interest of same service across the state.
60. Libraries will be forced to change their current practices so all conform to one way.
61. Libraries will not be treated equal and that larger libraries will be given priorities and small libraries may be pushed out of the picture entirely.
62. Libraries will not believe in the change and tank the project before it comes to fruition.
63. Local control and decision-making will be weakened. Crucial system supports (i.e. IT assistance) will be weakened.
64. Local libraries will lose their voice. Regional library systems provide a framework that responds to local needs.
65. Losing our autonomy, and having large libraries make decisions for us. What works in Wausau or Eau Claire, may not be the best for Rib Lake.
66. Losing services, we already have and also losing the close relationship we have with our system staff and system libraries.
67. Losing something that we currently have (that we like and that patrons like). More arguments between libraries instead of trying to work together toward a common goal.
68. Losing stellar tech support Helpdesk Ticketing (recognizing that I may be wrong, and this could be a positive thing) Less face to face time - losing sense of community.
69. Loss of autonomy.
70. Loss of connection and camaraderie between our regional libraries.
71. Loss of connection with local libraries.
72. Loss of funding.
73. Loss of funding, too much oversight/ loss of autonomy locally.
74. Loss of local and regional control and decision-making authority.
75. Loss of local control and the creation of "library gets what it pays for."
76. Loss of quality of service.
77. Loss of services for patrons.
78. Loss of technology support, more expense for libraries and levy limits,
79. Loss of voice from each individual library and less access to local materials for local patrons.
80. Micro tiny libraries will be left in the dust and have no voice. Too many chiefs in the circle.
81. More bureaucracy.
82. More paperwork and less hands - on, nuts and bolts solutions to problems.
83. My biggest fear is inaccessibility for services based on financial reasons. Our library is a small library that cannot afford to pay exceedingly high member dues to a system if the cost for being a member increases. We are currently spread thin year after year because of our lack of funding, and I fear that a system merger would increase the fees that would be associated with membership.
84. My fear is that delivery logistics, CE and training, and ILS administration is still done by librarians. All of these should be overseen and delivered by academically trained professionals, and not well-intended librarians.
85. My greatest fear is all the unknowns. Foremost is the financial cost. In addition, I feel I have a voice at the system level and am concerned about losing it.
86. My greatest fear is any loss or reduction of library services and functionality, to the
detriment of our patrons, our communities, and our libraries.

87. My greatest fear is becoming part of a larger system that becomes impersonal and
unresponsive to each individual library's needs.

88. My greatest fear is being a part of a System that doesn't work - no communication, they
don't help with any needs, it becomes too expensive, we don't get services in return, if
we have to pull out of the System, we cannot do or have what we have available now,
on our own.

89. My greatest fear is nothing will happen. That this process will end up like the other
attempts that have been made in the past thirty years. Two or three systems and/or
resource libraries will show their legislative muscle and prevent change from occurring.
This is already beginning to manifest itself in this process.

90. My greatest fear is seeing the pressure to produce something get ratcheted up and the
feeling that something has to change. I have concerns regarding costs for libraries and
also loss of local control. I'm concerned that we are at this point in this PLSR process
without much information still being given to the library community regarding funding,
governance, costs, models -- and we are supposed to give feedback?

91. My greatest fear is that a State mandate will charge library systems with changing and
not offer any financial support. I fear that with a State mandate the systems will become
far too large to be responsive to their member libraries. I would hate to lose local
authority over our public libraries.

92. My greatest fear is that all the work put into PLSR will be for naught, and that we will
continue to plod along with 16 distinct library systems that pick and choose what services
they will offer, and do not cooperate as fully as they might.

93. My greatest fear is that centralized structures (someone's conceptualization of "ideal") will
be imposed upon the entire state, stunting opportunities for organic innovation in service
to libraries and patrons, depriving local libraries (especially those in small communities)
of the sense that they have a voice in system services, and severing the trusted relationships
that have been built within library systems-as-communities of member libraries over many
years.

94. My greatest fear is that due to the number of hours staff have put into PLSR, someone will
feel obligated to make a large change to prove the effort was warranted. I am afraid
that what we have been allowed to give feedback on is still based on a lot of "what ifs"
and ideal scenarios. Therefore, I am afraid that the design that gets chosen will look
different than what we have been able to give feedback on. I fear a lack of local
support, and that general state staff will not be able to provide the same level of
knowledge, advocacy, and timely responses that I get from my local system. Not
enough time has been spent analyzing or asking what local library systems are doing
well. Equity may be achieved in one service area, but it will have to be at the expense
of another area.

95. My greatest fear is that libraries resistant to change or who aren't grasping the larger
picture somehow stop implementation from happening. If that happens, we will not be
able to make great things happen (for the state as a whole) it will continue to be haves
and have nots. Until the political circle comes back around and this time the legislature
will just make change happen, similar to Illinois, because Wisconsin libraries will have
shown that we can spend all kinds of time discussing and researching and planning, but
when it comes time to do something we fail. So that is my fear. Individually libraries can
implement change because Directors can make things happen in their building, but
statewide we have many that resist change and think the answer is just leave things as they are but pour more money in to it. Which of course just leads to waste.

96. My greatest fear is that local control will be diminished, state aid that we currently rely on will disappear, and we end up with fewer/poorer services in our system.

97. My greatest fear is that my city and library will be marginalized by wealthier areas of the State. That people will continue to view Milwaukee in an “us and them” manner.

98. My greatest fear is that our current healthy library system will be arbitrarily dismantled, merged, or changed in some other way by individuals or bodies that don’t fully appreciate how well this system works.

99. My greatest fear is that things will get worse across the state for all libraries and we will serve our patrons so poorly that we will put ourselves out of business.

100. My greatest fears are that the state will decrease our funding no matter what we do to redesign; that we’ll end up like Illinois with a complete mess; and that tech services staff will be spread too thin in order for my library to get the personal service/individual help it needs, not just in emergencies.

101. My library system may lose some of its support services.

102. My library will be spending more money to offset costs for services that are basic in my opinion (ILS, Delivery & tech support).

103. No clear idea of implementation or anyone to lead the implementation - smaller libraries losing their voices when making decisions - increased costs for the same services we are currently receiving - slower response time in being able to adjust to our community’s needs.

104. No longer having a local person as a resource.

105. Not having local control on making decisions to meet the needs of individual libraries.

106. Not visionary, not responsive, not transparent, underwhelming and lacking inspiration.

107. Nothing will change.

108. Nothing will happen, and some systems continue to be unable to offer equitable services to their libraries. The state overall will benefit when all libraries can offer the same level of services to their communities.

109. Of losing the autonomy of individual libraries in Wisconsin and their decision-making capabilities. We are here to serve our residents, we who know them the best.

110. On a library level: that we’ll lose our reciprocal borrowing monies (state dollars via federated system) that make up 6% of our operating revenue resulting in deep cuts to staff and/or collections. On a state level: that all meetings, connections and relationships will need to be online/skype/email.

111. Our area being split in a manner or being integrated into a system that does not value the small libraries and their needs.

112. Our greatest fear would be that the smallest systems do not receive the same access to resources, support and services as larger systems do. How can a system provide first-rate service for its member libraries without staff?

113. Our greatest fear would be to lose services that our patrons have grown accustomed to or to have a decrease in our funding.

114. Our village will have had a library for 110 years in March of 2018. We do not want to see our library driven out because we can’t keep up to the new changes that PLSR wants to make.

115. Patrons are too overwhelmed by the changes. Disorganization.
116. People from far away will be making decisions that we disagree with.
117. People won't take a risk and try something new.
118. Politicians stepping in.
119. Reduced services and access to our local system. The IFLS system staff is amazing. We know them at a personal level too, so it is really nice to give a quick phone call and trust they are completely understanding our needs.
120. Reduced services, reduced access to resources, increased costs.
121. Regions get too big and don't meet the needs of libraries.
122. Regulations that don't fit every library No change at all.
123. Removal of my library system and placed in a library system some distance away.
124. SCLS is a system that provides good service and resources. I would not want our services leveled down to become "equal" with other systems that don't have as much.
125. Services not being affordable for small libraries. Small libraries losing their voice.
126. Services will be compromised We will pay more for less Systems become too big to be effective We lose the trust and support of library patrons.
127. Slower delivery and return of items, more complicated follow-up on damaged items (which is a HUGE thing in the MORE system), less voice at far-away meetings.
128. Small library institutions will fall backwards as opposed to being helped along. The personal service touch that I like, that helps me and the library I serve will be gone. Radical change just because or that there will be too much conservatism brought with it and not real progress for the libraries that are served by great systems already.
129. Small rural libraries will be overlooked.
130. Small, rural libraries will lose their voice. Rural residents will lose access to information. Communities will lose their libraries. The gap between services to rural and urban residents will widen.
131. Smaller libraries may struggle under a new design due to added financial responsibility in serving patrons and local areas.
132. Spreading resource/tech/ all staff too thin over large areas.
133. Stagnation- not implementing the recommendations.
134. Systems in the North Woods would combine making an even more elusive organization to communicate, travel, negotiate, and seek services from than now.
135. That "farming out" services diminishes the response time, quality, and local personality of services to member libraries.
136. That a single system comes to fruition. It would be very challenging for a single service organization to administer support services for libraries and truly understand their needs.
137. That all this time and energy is spent on re-structuring without a realistic approach of what patrons need and want. Going forward into the near future, the need and want of library services may look very different. We need to have flexibility and knowledge on how to serve the best way possible.
138. That all this work that is going into this redesign falls short of the desired outcome.
139. That an already ineffective and inequitable model will actually become worse.
140. That as a very small library we would not be able to sustain on our own.
141. That because of the number of libraries and time restrictions, the design will not be put together or followed.
142. That continuing education opportunities and delivery services will suffer while trying to make things more homogeneous statewide.

143. That I will burn-out before it happens.

144. That I will lose the system and staff and procedures that I and my staff have gotten used to. In other words, being out of my comfort zone.

145. That IFLS staff will lose their jobs and all of a sudden, our leadership will come out of a big urban center that doesn't understand little rural libraries (or our importance).

146. That inter-library loan systems in place might take much longer than current systems.

147. That is will be convoluted and confusing and not effective.

148. That it becomes too big and people miss out on important information. I worry as I said way too many time already (sorry) about communication. Also, that the cost will too high.

149. That it might mean IFLS will change in its governance, communication, or offerings. IFLS is amazing and serves our needs perfectly. I'm nervous our consortium and support will decline as we go to a level of service that is lower but more equitable for libraries across the state.

150. That it will be difficult to be recognized and served with so much more potential distance between governance and our location.

151. That it will increase bureaucracy or confusion with state/county/local partners and patrons about what services a library is or is not able to provide, or worse, result in increased costs for decrease in service to the community.

152. That it will just be sloppy, and we lose all the good quality services that we have become used to. This happened in Illinois and was just a tragedy.

153. That it will not be supported by libraries and become a HUGE MISTAKE.

154. That it will not improve services and/or accessibility.

155. That it will take away our individuality and we will lose the intimacy we share with the other libraries in our current system.

156. That it won't actually be implemented because people are afraid to change. It's due for an overhaul and at a glance it seems like there are many efficiencies to be found, but because it would mean laying off staff and losing control I'm very skeptical that any major changes will happen as a result of this plan. The one area that I could see changing is delivery.

157. That it won't be realistic, so it won't happen.

158. That large populated areas are going to have a louder voice than rural Wisconsin.

159. That libraries that are part of robust systems now will lose their benefits.

160. That libraries will lose essential services or be forced into paying more for less service.

161. That little libraries will be squeezed out in favor of larger libraries with more voices and more staff to attend meetings etc.

162. That my small library will be lost in the discussions and the result will just be dictated to me, rather than being involved in the discussions.

163. That my small rural library will get shuffled in and forgotten. That my library will be placed in a different library system and not receive the quality and quantity of support and services that I currently receive from my current library system. My library will be forced to spend money we don't have to join a shared catalog, technology services, etc., or feel like we need to, so we have any input on and help with what services we may need.
164. That nothing is done.
165. That nothing will change, that resources will continue to be wasted, and that Wisconsin will not get to see the positive effects of lightening the bureaucracy and having more dollars to spend where truly needed.
166. That nothing will happen and we're just wasting time and highlighting frustrations about inequities of service.
167. That nothing will happen.
168. That our fantastic service with SCLS will decline.
169. That our patrons will not be able to get the same level of access to databases and delivery from other libraries and that we will not have technology support.
170. That our small library will have diminished access to services and/or increased costs.
171. That our tech support will be limited, and we may experience lag time from system staff in answering our queries.
172. That patrons of small libraries switch to large libraries due to services they can provide that the smaller libraries cannot.
173. That people will become territorial and not willing to change their way of doing things for a new way.
174. That rural libraries end up receiving less support/ funding and systems that are currently doing a great job for their member libraries will have to lessen support in the new model.
175. That SCLS libraries will lose some existing services, and that existing services will cost more.
176. That service deteriorates and becomes distant and we lose cooperation as the membership splinters.
177. That services and support will actually decline. We are located in strange region of the state. It is not only with library systems that we sort of fall between the cracks...not quite the Chippewa Valley, and not quite the Coulee Region. We feel out of place, and we would like to be an active part of wherever we end up, not constrained by geography or budget.
178. That services currently received will be eliminated.
179. That small libraries in rural places will experience increased charges with no way to increase the funds coming in. Ultimately this will result in the dwindling down of the number of small, local libraries as we have seen with small local schools.
180. That small libraries might be lost in the new design.
181. That small libraries will be forgotten even though we are here and do contribute a lot to our communities.
182. That small libraries, without the means of larger libraries, will lose what benefits they currently receive from their library system membership.
183. That small, rural libraries will be lost in the re-design. I had encountered resistance from some county supervisors in the past (2006-2007) who felt that the county didn't need the number of libraries currently in operation; that patrons would travel to a more centralized library situated among stores and other offerings.
184. That smaller libraries getting lost and loosing funding. Kids are coming in to use Wi-Fi and internet....so the circulation numbers may not be accurate as to the importance of the library to a small community. These kids can stay out of trouble because they have a place to go, since there is no Wi-Fi out here.
185. That smaller rural libraries, such as ours, will not be able to afford the change or will be lost in the shuffle.
186. That the "great things" that may come out of this design wouldn't matter to me as a tiny library in the middle of nowhere. That such a large project wouldn't help us much at all.

187. That the funding will not be given or maintained to allow for the delivery of the desired services. One major concern is that the processes will not work as planned and will create greater roadblocks to equal and quality services. Or, as we all say here in this library: It might function like Sierra.

188. That the new system makes huge changes, most of which do nothing to improve library services to individual patrons.

189. That the personal contact with our system people would be lost; due to distance. Losing input capabilities due to distance. Loss of face-to-face and routine visits from staff.

190. That the process will be bogged down in details - that real change will not occur.

191. That the small library would be pushed out and there would only be a library with the highest population in a county.

192. That the state will do what so many states have and tear apart our systems and ruin what we give to our patrons "Good Service".

193. That the status quo will continue without streamlining as systems only exist with us. Should funding at a state level be reduced or cut entirely the public library needs to be able to exist on their own.

194. That there are no library systems. We would lose local authority, county library boards, system boards, and all advocacy for libraries at the state governance level. We would spend even more money to get "better" service to a smaller percentage of the population, while taking away services from high taxed counties.

195. That there could be an increased level of "bureaucracy," while some degree of quality and communication is lost at the field level.

196. That there will be a massive consolidation of systems without adequate funding from all three levels of government, a loss of local autonomy, and the elimination of monies for reciprocal borrowing.

197. That there will be great disruption of services and ultimately a decrease in services to patrons during the redesign and implementation of the project.

198. That there will become a giant bureaucracy that is unwieldly, expensive, and difficult to work in.

199. That things will become institutionalized, lack of friendly individual service.

200. That things will get too big, and individual/local voices lost. Our public will be the ultimate losers, and by extension, our communities.

201. That this new design will lead to the elimination of regional and state support.

202. That this process results in a top-down administrative model, with a handful of people making decisions for all. Libraries are essentially grassroots organizations and need to be able to grow and adapt organically.

203. That those of us with good services will be forced to give some of them up due to funding. That trainings will go away or will not be local enough for staff to attend.

204. That too many libraries fear a big change and would rather continue getting crappy service rather than take a risk on a new system. I want everyone to realize that we are stronger together than we are alone, and we have some really smart people working on this project. Trust them to make things better!

205. That we aren't trying to change just for the sake of changing.

206. That we become dust swept under a rug.
207. That we don’t lose services and staff to try to get other systems up to par while our system would perhaps go down to become more equal.

208. That we lose too much local control.

209. That we lose the autonomy of our own local library, that we couldn’t do our own acquisitions, that we would lose the power to make our own decisions about our library, that we would lose funding and cease to exist.

210. That we mess it up.

211. That we need to reduce services for some and/or increase prices for others in order to achieve the appearance of equity across the state.

212. That we spent so much time and effort on this an nothing happens.

213. That we will all be forced to follow the same rules without deviation. For example: ours is not a fining library…and we don’t wish to become one.

214. That we will be forced to make changes that are not in our best interests.

215. That we will be left without a voice. Having procedures decided for us without any say.

216. That we will end up with less customer service and that our small library budgets will be squandered on the dreams of larger libraries and their political views. That smaller libraries will bear the burden of financing the “Social Programs” that are popular right now. That my library services, programing and funding will suffer under massively inefficient and top heavy administrative structures placed at the state level. That the state will end up lumping “library services” in with education (it already does) and social services and under fund and half-ass all three entities.

217. That we will lose the good relationships we currently have within our system. It’s small enough that at our meetings everyone has input. I would hate to lose that.

218. That we will lose vital technology related services.

219. That we won’t get the excellent service IFLS provides now.

220. That we would lose the personal touch of being able to call “Ben in Northern Waters” to assist us with issues.

221. That we’re going to become just a number and lose support, to lose the connections and availability of the people we know and trust to worth with us.

222. That you will break what isn’t broken. See previous reply on local design control.

223. That you will take my money and my resources out of my area and redistribute them to areas whose municipalities don’t want to fund them. That a HUGE bureaucracy will be created, and it will be even harder to get things changed or problems fixed. That we will all be turned into vanilla libraries that offer the same things but don’t have any local flavor.

224. That you’ll change everything, and we’ll have even less money than we have now.

225. The added cost to our local library to provide the services that we currently offer or the elimination of some services.

226. The cost will increase, and services will decrease.

227. The disparity in current system funding, services, etc. is very apparent. My greatest fear is that that will continue (or get worse) for some libraries/systems in whatever the new model may be.

228. The entire project will be seen as an opportunity to squeeze money out of the consolidation process (rather than an opportunity to boost services) and we all come out worse than we have it in the current model.
229. The library will lose access to the extensive materials in its current library system.
230. The perception of decision making could be problematic. The reality, once decisions are made and implemented, libraries will get the tools and training to complete their everyday jobs, that is what matters.
231. The population and number of libraries in the northern part of the state are outweighed by the south. I am afraid due to cost constraints the statewide support will be concentrated for the majority rather than the minority.
232. The redesign is tailored around population- or budget-based decision-making, which naturally works against our smaller communities. Regional services are increased in size yet again, leaving our rural librarians and patrons even more disconnected from the centers that provide service. “Equity of service” ends up meaning everyone is given the service at the lowest level, so wealthy libraries that are able to invest more can provide more and patrons at libraries with fewer resources lose again.
233. The resistance to change. The inability to review and start over when something doesn’t work. Lack of leadership and some libraries not getting their needs met.
234. The smallest libraries fall further behind.
235. The state will hee/haw around and not make any decisions... letting politics get involved.
236. The Steering Committee principles state that they will work to guarantee that governance, administration, and funding recommendations will preserve or improve the level of services currently provided by systems and that services will not be decreased for some libraries in order to improve services for others, However, my greatest concern is that the quality of service we now enjoy will be negatively impacted.
237. The voice of small libraries will be silenced.
238. Those systems with great support and service see a reduction in that support and service.
239. To compare each library the same when sizes vary from area to area.
240. Too divided to provide services equally to the little as well as to the large libraries.
241. Too few “systems” that are too big to respond to individual library needs.
242. Too much state-level governance not allowing regional systems to operate as they see fit.
243. TWO! One, that nothing at all happens after this entire process. I think there are certainly some areas where all libraries could see improvements from a “system” structure. Two, that some attempt at equity is misunderstood and hurts local library’s ability to continue to provide great services.
244. Unfortunately, from the start, PLSR stated the goal of change. Not improvement. A goal to change is suspect, particularly given that a critical first step of assessment was completely missed/side-stepped. Also, it seems to have completely forgotten an accountability layer. What entity has the authority to demand accountability, and respond with sanctions or corrections or penalties? Part of why we find ourselves in this mess is because accountability hasn’t played the role it should have, particularly on the state level. And now this PLSR process has become so mammoth, will no one call out its many flaws? A goal of change, and not a goal of improvement, is such a tragic start to a process that has me thinking not only does the Emperor not have clothes, he no longer knows who he supposedly represents in all his naked splendor.
245. We do not want Madison and Milwaukee to determine all of the outcomes for our library.
246. We have a great system here and that we lose what we already have and get drowned out by the needs of southern Wisconsin. I have lived in Southern, Central and Northern Wisconsin and used Libraries in those areas. We are diverse, and we are different and
thinking that one model fits all will not really work. Recognize where the lacks are and borrow ideas and let’s make this a model for others.

247. We have all wasted our time and regardless of what we do, it won’t get moved forward or the politicians will take over and inflict serious damage to statute that might be currently out of date, but not broken.

248. We lose our uniqueness and effectiveness as a library and then not valued by our community.

249. We might be opening up a can of worms that could do more harm than good. This process was motivated, in-part, by political concerns, which always raises a red flag.

250. We will get swallowed up into a system that tells us how we HAVE to do things, instead of giving us a level of autonomy that allows us to take into consideration what is best for OUR patrons.

251. We will lose our uniqueness and not be able to keep up with all the requirements and expectations.

252. We would lose our technology help, and our shared catalog.

253. We’ll do something just to do something, and mess it all up.

254. What works right now is still in place.

255. When we merged into Monarch my feed doubled. If that happens again my doors will close.

256. With this the small libraries will be forced to close because they could not afford the higher prices the larger libraries would probably have to pay.
Section 4: Appendices

This section presents the verbatim responses to key follow-along questions to several 10-point scales.

- **Appendix A** – Actions for Improving Your Current Library System
- **Appendix B** – Explanation of Equity Score Rating
- **Appendix C** – Actions to Achieve Public Library Service Equity
Appendix A – Actions for Improving Your Current Library System

What is the single most important action that your system could take to move your score closer to a ten?

1. A clear indication of who is in charge of what would be great. WVLS staff is in flux right now, and I anticipate that this will improve in the future, but it is sometimes unclear who to contact when there is an issue to be addressed.

2. Accept the differences between libraries as part of serving individual communities well.

3. Actively, regularly promote the importance of and need for public libraries to local and regional governmental funding sources through the use of PR, magazine/newspaper articles, fact sheets, visits and more. My primary funding source is the County government. Its Board seems to respect professionals who do not live in our city more than the local Library Director and Board.

4. Actually enforcing all policies and laws.

5. Add marketing support and/or library system-wide initiatives beyond summer reading story wagons while maintaining the current level of technology support. There are likely resource constraints to doing this, so it might not be possible at current funding levels, and technology support is critical for us (more so than marketing, at this point in time).

6. Additional staff!

7. Advocacy for 100% reimbursement by counties for library services, statewide. This is a statewide issue and the all systems should join together to address it.

8. Agree to not be so picky and punitive on small stains or wear and tear on books and other items that circulate - things are not going to remain pristine in a library loan world.

9. Allow La Crosse Public to independently manage, maintain and control the current consortial ILS.

10. Already a 10.

11. Always be there when I need them.

12. As manager of a nearly system-wide ILS, provide adequate facilitation of member issues, provide the adequate statistical date to answer member questions, ensure that all ILS members are treated equitably.

13. As you can see by the 9.5 rating, we are very satisfied with the services provided by our system. I left the little room for improvement only because there are always additional services that could be offered. With more staff or more funds, the current services could be expanded or enhanced. There is not a single action that I would recommend.

14. As you can see, I have rated my library system a 10. I am so pleased with the services our library system provides, and actually struggle to think of any way they could improve.

15. Assure me that I will remain in their custody.

16. Be able to support library with technology when remote sessions will not work. I understand it’s a staffing issue. Current staff are great, they just need more help in these situations.

17. Be available in the office to reply to communication more promptly.
18. Be more open to suggestions that are patron oriented, eg cards on phones. Don't be so afraid to try new things.
19. Be more willing to go off site for training and troubleshooting, or improve the ability to offer web training and remote meetings. Staff are not going to do these things on their own time...they don't get paid enough, nor do I have the money in the budget to pay for additional hours. Nor do I have the budget to send them to West Salem several times a year.
20. Be proactive, rather than reactive.
21. Be quicker with answers to inquiries- or at least send a response saying that it might be a while before they can answer our questions.
22. Because Brown is not part of our ILS, we need to incorporate them or have them go on their own. They do not act as our Resource Library and we do not benefit with having them with us.
23. Better automated system-Sierra has many issues.
24. Better communicate what services they can offer us and what they can help us with so we know what to ask for and where to turn for help. They usually help us a lot, but some directors don’t know about these services.
25. Better communication.
27. Better IT. More concern with OWLS than OWLSnet libraries. Better ILS. Sierra does not meet all our needs.
28. Better technology support (network etc..).
29. Better technology support and flexibility on the type of technology being used.
30. Better, more responsive IT assistance and guidance.
31. Bridges does an exceptional job.
32. Centralized PR/marketing department at the system level. This could deliver a more cohesive, unified look in marketing materials. It could also assist smaller libraries that don’t have a dedicated marketing person on staff.
33. Cleaner, more organized, and prepared use of time during classes, meetings, workshops, etc.
34. Communicate more effectively.
35. Communicate when there is an interruption in services (ILS and delivery, etc.). Advocate with vendors on behalf of member libraries. More transparency with what projects system staff is working on.
36. Communication.
37. Communication and collaboration.
38. Communication is always the hardest part of being in a large group.
39. Communication with member libraries Fostering an atmosphere of cooperation among all members. Strong Leadership from system staff.
40. Communication.
41. Competent IT and Administrative staff who could actually deliver what they say they will deliver.

42. Consider the issues of small libraries.

43. Continue to improve/streamline/add human resources to technological support for libraries to improve turnaround time on technology support.

44. Continue to keep communications open and make themselves easily available to us.

45. Continue to move system funds to electronic resources which everyone in the system benefits from, and there is equity in that all libraries benefit proportionally.

46. Continue to provide the opportunities they do, expand cataloging for faster turn-around.

47. Continuing education--more of it that takes up less time.

48. Coordinate collaborative programming with other libraries within system.

49. Coordinate reference services from our resource library.

50. Cultivate a more solutions oriented approach to challenges such as standardized, useful cataloging templates, interfaces between technology and user experience. I sometimes get the impression that new ideas or ways of doing things are just to hard to accomplish. Would like to have more support for improving services, even if that means doing things differently than the way they have been done in the past. Also, in general, it would be good to have more librarian training in local "deep services" such as integrated software (innovative), managing computer stations (pharos) so the librarians are empowered and the system staff can focus more on broader, system wide issues.

51. Currently the library system has two part time interim Directors, would like to see a full time Director hired soon. The two people currently are doing a good joy but not the same as having an in house full time director.

52. Daily Transit Delivery would be nice to have back.

53. Develop new services for Resource Libraries or get rid of them. Brown County is my Resource library. I get more help from Appleton as a Resource than Brown.

54. Drop the prices. I know SCLS is the gold standard for library systems in Wisconsin but sometimes small libraries run out of gold.

55. Employ additional IT staff.

56. Equal Governance. Too much political power for too many years to the Milwaukee Public Library that is also the greatest net borrower in the system.

57. Evolution is part of a healthy, vibrant system. SCLS does a great job in recognizing that change is inevitable and they work hard to embrace and overcome obstacles that might arise as libraries rapidly evolve. Providing a score that is a little below perfect, is a small step in ensuring they continue their tradition of striving to provide the best service within their means, knowing there is always room for a well-place tweak.

58. Excellent service from all departments!

59. Excellent system -- small and responsive. Also very, very efficient with dollars.

60. Facilitate more conversations between directors in different counties. There seems to be a need for a moratorium on new materials at libraries and the discussion is often indirectly avoided at director's meetings.

61. Faster response time to questions/inquiries/requests.
62. Faster response to help tickets or questions.

63. Faster responses from the director.

64. For the size of the system, I think we get a huge deal.

65. Foster greater cooperation among the recently merged Mid-Wisconsin and Eastern Shores Library Systems. More education is required for many of the librarians.

66. Gale Courses is a great new service but I am concerned that if the System is unable to pay for it libraries won’t be able to support it financially. Services dropped away in Mid-Wisconsin regularly when we were in that system which is disappointing to libraries. So remaining financially able to fund services (online resources...) without charging back to libraries is a plus. Also would like delivery service to continue to be paid for by the System. Mid-Wisconsin charged it back to the libraries.

67. Gear any offerings to services that we would actually use.

68. Get better funding from the state and increase staffing. Have more nimble decision making.

69. Get system staff behind a circulation desk on a rotating basis to “see” the obstacles and opportunities which arise during a typical day...this would help alleviate TOP-DOWN administration and implementation of seemingly random stuff that takes away from our service model.

70. Give my library equal voting rights.

71. Have a full time system director. The fact that Jeff is director of both the Oshkosh Public Library and Winnefox means his attention is split. I feel that Mark does much of the director’s job (as compared to what I’ve seen directors of other systems do) without being paid for it. I also question some decisions, such as Winnefox laying off its graphic designer and then coincidentally a short time later Oshkosh hires its own graphic designer. The financials are too closely tied together with many shared staff and services, and I don’t find Winnefox to be very forthcoming with detailed information. Other than this, I’m very satisfied with Winnefox and believe it’s one of the best systems in the state, if not the best.

72. Have a permanent Director available to guide our efforts.

73. Have a youth services consultant on staff to serve as a resource for children’s services staff.

74. Have system staff physically visit my library more often.

75. Have the ability to document procedures and keep them updated (this has already improved). Have more ability to fund innovation such as digital library cards. I think both of these are funding related. OWLS provides excellent service!

76. Having a full time tech support.

77. Help more with Summer Reading Program.

78. Help us more with our promotional needs, again.

79. Help with marketing and more help with websites.

80. Hire a new system director and find a solution for the technology needs of member libraries.

81. Hire a System Director and assess overall staffing needs.
82. Hire a System Director. We have been very pleased with Roxane & Jennifer as Interim Directors but they cannot provide the on-going leadership necessary. As a system of small, rural libraries we need experienced, creative leadership to enable our libraries to provide good quality & greatly needed services to our communities. We have 29 libraries in our system and 4 of them have a director or staff member with an MLS. Having consultants available would be extremely helpful.

83. Hire competent people.

84. Hire more knowledgeable, technologically current staff.

85. Hold more meetings and CE’s closer to my part of the system.

86. I am a new director, so I have not been in this system long enough to realize what services may be lacking. So far I am extremely satisfied.

87. I am completely satisfied with our system.

88. I am not sure what that would be for me. I am certain there could be something that once I heard about it I might conclude that “yes” great idea for the system. I believe I am in a great system compared to some libraries. And I am aware that some librarians in my system are not as pleased as myself.

89. I am very happy with the quality of service we receive from our system within the existing scope. However, the scope of services we receive is far narrower than those offered by other systems. This is primarily due to payments being made to member libraries who are net-lenders. This limits the services.

90. I am very happy with the service and support provided by our library system.

91. I am very satisfied with everything OWLS does for us.

92. I am very satisfied with the service that my library system provides. I have no complaints.

93. I cannot think of anything more at this time.

94. I don’t know what they could do to increase my score, but enlarging the system would greatly decrease it.

95. I don’t think that my system needs to do much else. They are incredible at offering resources, being available at all times, responding quickly, going out of their way to assist. I am so happy being a part of IFLS!

96. I feel like I could constantly use technology help.

97. I feel very satisfied with the services SCLS provides. I love all of their consulting services and their technical support services are top-notch. I wouldn’t want to lose any of those services.

98. I think the only downside is that the price is rather high for our small library, but the services we receive in exchange for the fee is excellent, so we do recognize that it is worth it.

99. I think they do a great job with the limited resources and staff they have.

100. I think they really do everything that they can- sometimes I feel like I am bothering them with my questions- because we are public/school library- some of my needs are different than most public libraries- but that is not their fault- they are very helpful.

101. I wish that our library’s vote was weighted equally with the vote of other libraries in our system. Currently the larger libraries have weightier votes at Director’s Council meetings.
102. I wish there were more support for staff members within the system. There is support now, but we're only just now implementing a mentoring program for new Directors. More inter-library support would be helpful to spread knowledge, resources, and overall backing of each other.

103. If I could have given the Bridges Library System an 11, I would have. They are responsive, locally aware of library challenges and community needs, excellent advocates, offer wonderful opportunities for the system libraries and staff to collaborate, and deliver efficiencies in terms of services and cost savings. They do all of these things extremely well.

104. IFLS is very helpful in all areas.

105. I'm a new director without a huge library background. The Assistant director met with me when I first started, but it was all very quick and I still didn't know what to expect. I wish there was more of an orientation for new directors. On the other hand, I always know that if I have questions, they will take the time to help me and give the answers I need. I'm not sure they would be able to really do much more than they already do, but when I first started, I felt like I was sort of thrown in and expected to know all of my duties. It would be hard to spend a lot of time with every new director, so I still think our system does a marvelous job and I'm comfortable asking questions.

106. I'm already at 10.

107. Implement a new ILS.

108. Improve delivery services.

109. Improve director's council voting practices.

110. Improve staff responsiveness to member library needs. NWLS really needs more staff to handle all of the tasks they do, and I know this is a budget issue. However, current staff could benefit from training to improve communication and be better prepared with info and data to help our libraries make decisions. Sometimes it feels like staff skills have not kept pace with their job requirements as systems and technology change, and the services we receive have not improved over time as I have seen happening at neighboring library systems.

111. Improve urgency of tech support.

112. Improved equitable service to all members.

113. Improved ILS. Our open-sourced version is mediocre.

114. Improvement needed with continuing education, more in-person hands on type of training. There are some webinars. They provide CE when asked, little initiative concerning CE. Assist members in such endeavors as: strategic planning, building design, interior design. Connecting members with experts. It would be nice if there were a strong network for library systems that provide access to the expertise not found in our system.

115. Improvement to ILS system and more cost-saving initiatives for member libraries for enhanced programming opportunities and digital collections.

116. Increased public relations, marketing, etc. Getting the word out about the system itself and the many offerings and benefits patrons can find at it's member libraries.

117. Increasing technology training!

118. Initiating services to us more. They 'ask' what we need and want, rather than doing the research and initiating what they might provide that would be beneficial.
119. IT support - tickets resolved – communication.
120. It would be great if the System offered continuing education classes.
121. It would be great if there were System staff members that can help the libraries with more innovative programs and services. Some systems already offer these services, such as, Bridges and the formation of Memory Cafes.
122. It would be nice if they offered delivery 5 days a week to all the libraries in the system. We have currently have delivery 3 days a week along with other smaller libraries. The larger libraries have delivery 4 or 5 days a week. Our patrons would be better served if they could receive materials from other system libraries in a more timely manner.
123. It's already a ten. Bridges does a great job at serving member libraries, and by extension, the member libraries' communities. Budgets and other considerations aside, it could serve as a model for systems throughout the state.
124. It's already there because SCLS is fantastic!
125. It's at a 10.
126. I've put it at a ten because of the excellent service they offer. Whenever I call regarding information or troubleshooting I get a quick, satisfying response.
127. Keeping up the wonderful services that WRLS provides.
128. Less expensive.
129. Less expensive technology services.
130. Less regimentation, more local control especially dealing with ILS.
131. Let member libraries have more control over reports and data that can be extracted from the ILS.
132. Lower costs through combined purchasing power.
133. Lower costs while maintaining high quality.
134. Lower costs.
135. Lower fees to member libraries.
136. Lower participation fees.
137. Make sure everyone follows the protocols.
138. Marketing assistance.
139. Marketing resources.
140. Mentorship between experienced directors and new. Even directors with a few years on the job have questions that a former mentor may help with.
141. Mentorship, training, and support for new directors and staff.
142. Merge with other library systems.
143. More accessible and consistent technical support.
144. more assistance w/keeping our websites up to date.
145. More CE, co-sponsored with other library systems if necessary, that are held somewhere besides the Milwaukee suburbs.
146. More collaborative purchasing: books, electronics (computers, printers, scanners etc.) and office supplies.
147. More consideration and discussion of changes to current policies.
148. More consulting services Institutional knowledge.
149. More digital resources for the public.
150. More electronics for patrons.
151. More Graphic Design Support and/or Education to help us through when we have limited staff and funds AND/OR Website design help/Education.
152. More help with "hands on" help with technology for everyone that is not computer savvy.
153. More in-library computer tech help. They are great but spread thin across 50 libraries.
154. More IT assistance.
155. More IT support.
156. More of a focus on Cataloging.
157. More one on one talking with directors. Have the director and the library system each have at least 10 questions of their own choosing that they get together at least once a year to ask each other.
158. More personal reaching out to directors, such as a phone call when I have to miss a Library Advisory Council meeting to let me know what I’ve missed, and letting all of us know when someone has a life-changing event, etc.
159. More proactive advocacy and involvement at the state level.
160. More system-wide policies might make things less confusing for patrons and easier for neighboring libraries to cooperate.
161. More system-wide promotion of system-level resources and library awareness.
162. More tech help!
163. More tech help. I think we’re getting there though.
164. More training for new library directors.
165. More training on computers, better communications and faster support. The people that do work are very helpful and just need more people to help service the system better.
166. My score is already a ten. The system staff can continue doing what they are so good at doing: supporting our library whenever we need it, communicating often and consistently between the system staff and the library staff, making themselves available, going above and beyond in helping to resolve issues that arise, providing in-person training and support, being cheerleaders for the library.
167. My system doesn’t negotiate contracts well. For a while they required that we only use specific vendors who then charged more than other vendors. They also chose and ILS that does not work well for staff or patrons and paid almost all the funding for it up front. So we never got a good product and now we appear to be stuck. Customers complain daily about our ILS. On one hand, our system seems out of touch with libraries today. On the other, the librarians and not business people so they don’t know how to negotiate contracts or work from a business model.
168. My system is very responsive. Their services are excellent and they often provide things that I haven’t even thought to ask for. I could not be more happy.
169. My system rocks.
170. N/A.
171. N/A.
172. Negotiate a bit more on pricing for databases and help more with group purchases.
173. Nobody's Perfect. Help finding grants that small library's can actually use.
174. Not applicable.
175. Not sure if they can do anything to improve funding--as systems fees go up, our local funds are used more for system and less for any local needs.
176. Not use Google services so extensively. Find other platforms to communicate and conduct surveys.
177. Nothing.
178. Nothing - they are doing a great job!
179. NOTHING I CAN THINK OF.
180. Nothing. The Bridges Library System deserves the highest score possible by giving its member libraries exceptional service.
181. Offer more CE opportunities especially for directors. However, I know there is a survey and a plan in place to increase these.
182. Offer more hands-on training for directors and staff.
183. Offer more on-site assistance/visits other than technology needs.
184. Offer more training for CEU.
185. Our library system is always helpful, friendly and ready to help us stay at the forefront of the best service for our patrons.
186. Our system began charging "service" fees for certain services that used to be free, or rather, included in our consortium membership fees. Now the consortium membership fees go up to pay for services our library patrons hardly use (digital magazines) and I have to pay extra for the services my patron would benefit from. I usually have 20 or so items every year that I can't catalog. I used to be able to just send them to my MORE resource and they would come back with MARC records and I would continue on. Now, because "cataloging" is a paid for service, I don't want to send them in, because my library opted out of paying for cataloging services. Also certain technical support now has a charge and I am reluctant to ask for technical support because I am unsure of what my system will expect me to pay for.
187. Our system needs a full time director. We are running with 2 part time directors. My opinion is that the PLSR has interfered with our director search because no one wants to step into a system that may have big changes in the future.
188. Our system primarily provides support for network, ILS, and PC support activities, as well as being our liaison on various state bodies. It would be great to see them expand into additional areas, like marketing and programming support.
189. Overall, services and support have been great. But for a very small library, it's an expensive system to be a part of. For example, we are currently unable to afford membership in the ILS system.
190. Participate vigorously in efforts to increase state funding to Wisconsin library systems derived from the Universal Services Fund until such a time as the funding reaches the statutorily required level that has not been actually been budgeted by the state for many years.

191. Positions, jobs duties and staff have been rotated in and out extensively for the past year or so—it will be better and more efficient when everything is settled into place.

192. Provide a collaborative marketing plan!!

193. Provide instructors or a list of instructors that could teach classes/programs at the library for adults and kids of all ages.

194. Provide more information on funding projects for the smaller libraries in the system.

195. Provide more onsite staff development and technology services for the larger libraries.

196. Provide more system wide services. Increase tech support for smaller libraries who do not have the budget to have their own paid tech support staff person.

197. Provide smaller libraries with more of a voice in decision making whenever possible. It seems that our needs sometimes get lost when competing with those of significantly larger libraries.

198. Provide some sort of mentorship program for new Library Directors that talks about certification, introduction to the System and It's resources, and monthly contacts over the first year to see how things are going.

199. Provide staff with expertise in running usage reports and data analysis.

200. Quicker technical support.

201. Read ticket and email requests carefully before responding. This is the greatest aggravation for multiple staff members.

202. Really nothing under your control...you are doing an amazing job. Moving meetings closer would be a huge plus for us, but completely unrealistic.

203. Reduce fees paid by libraries to support system services to bring us more in line with the rest of the state.

204. Reduce our annual fees to be part of the system.

205. Reorganization at the system level would allow system staff to better provide for our libraries.

206. Replace some positions not re-filled by a prior director when there was a departure/retirement. It would be great to have, again, someone well-versed in both Badgerlink and WISCAT...that could communicate those skills to the rest of us. Badgerlink, in particular, a great but underutilized resource.

207. Restore some services that have been cut over the years - particularly the help with booking summer reading program performers/contracts.

208. Restore the decrease in reciprocal borrowing that was implemented in the last contract.

209. SCLS works hard on effective, transparent communication. Reps from committees in the governance structure make regular reports via email and meetings and the agendas and minutes of all committees in the governance structure readily available. However communication about topics that are on the fringe of, or deep in the details the governance structure (e.g. ILS problems and workflows) could be improved.

210. Some form of direct hands-on end-user technology support would be extremely helpful.
211. Staying more on top of vendors when there is an issue we are waiting to have resolved. Also, being more on top of the new tech options for our systems.

212. Stop requiring that every decision require a committee and several work groups to institute. Allow SCLS staff to make recommendations and see if a committee is even needed. This process of continual meetings hurts the smaller libraries who don’t feel they have adequate staffing to attend meetings AND keep the library open. Their voices need to be heard—it’s too easy for the small libraries to be overlooked.

213. Success in our system director search.

214. Switching to a better ILS. Koha offers an inferior product, working around its limitations wastes staff time and the search function of the public interface is not good. SCLS has great libraries and should have an ILS that adds to our quality of service instead of detracts.

215. System taking a bigger role in coordinating staff training, programs, services, etc. More site visits to the system libraries.

216. Take leadership on issues.

217. Take over our payments for ILS. Some systems don’t have complicated payment formulas with unweighted voting.

218. Technology assistance and training.

219. Technology support.

220. The director position has been vacant which creates an obvious hardship on the system. They continue to work diligently to try to get the position filled.

221. The only library system services our patrons see are our library catalog, our online products, and how quickly they get what they want. Our catalog does not include all of the online materials available to our patrons and does not have a front page that lists them, and it is hard to use on a phone. The authentication process for a cell phone user to access any of our online products is a great deterrent to using them.

222. The only that would make library system better would be to provide technical assistance for any necessary onsite technology work that does not have to do with our ILS.

223. The system would need to be the "think tanks" for the future for libraries. It is the directors/advisory committees, other system libraries coming up with creative workable ideas for the greater good of the future of literacy. I know most of theirs is administrative and uses up resources of time. How about subsidize for each small library director to become a member of WLA so we can get the ideas directly for ourselves at the conference?

224. There has not been a transparent document or system in place to show as a formula, and what that formula is based on, for charges to libraries. We wanted to explore a new technology resource and spread the cost over all libraries prorated by some measure (size, pop served, circ.), but nothing was in place, and the result was a no vote by libraries because of the unknowns. There is no consistency in what you get from the system as services, so you never know what to expect.

225. There is a lot of energy spent around managing our ILS. SCLS needs to find a way, perhaps engaging member libraries, to pressure LibLime to be more responsive and deliver a product as robust as we need it to be. The time of ILS staff seems like it is bogged down in Koha.
There is nothing of immediate or great need that they aren’t currently providing. In a perfect world having an easily accessible dashboard for statistics would be great but not necessary.

They already are at a TEN. I think my system is exceptional. Its Director, Connie Meyer, consistently impresses me with her leadership, management, and budgeting skills and she has put together a stellar team who are innovative, enthusiastic, motivated, and exceptionally helpful. I can’t imagine that they could do any better. And yet, every year they do just that – they do better. They provide us with improved and/or more services. We are VERY lucky to be part of the Bridges Library System.

They are at a ten. We are completely satisfied here in Hartland.

They are doing it. Governance is democratic and system hears when libraries speak. Partnering with other library systems with different resources and different strengths and sharing between what is best about the system and collaborations between systems helps everyone. Technology support is still an issue and always will be for libraries without their own IT. Training has been and continues to be well shared across systems. Combining systems and offering more work with less local control, more libraries to serve, and greater distance to libraries, isn’t the answer— but this kind of resource sharing is.

They are great now.

They are great. The only thing we wish sometimes is that they spent more time on the front lines out in actual libraries so they knew how difficult it is to keep up to their suggested standards in procedures! This is probably impossible, however. :-(

They do great service.

They get a 10, so combined all of their actions have earned them that score.

Treat smaller libraries better. The large libraries are taking over the way the consortium is run and resentment is growing in the staff of the small libraries.

Understanding that equity is not equality and each member library has different needs, as well as, things to offer the system. -Budgeting support.

Very occasionally follow through is lacking - but on the whole, the system staff is very responsive.

We already feel it is a 10. The attention to small and large libraries to fill their needs takes skill and our system fills that need.

We don’t have a technology support person on the system staff. We need to contract out for those services. Having someone within our system who could help with IT issues would move my score to a 10.

We have to have a greater emphasis on support (support rather than lead). Our system is out in front and I think this makes it less responsive to what libraries are needing. At meetings, directors seem to respond to what the system wants rather than the other way around.

We lost the graphic artist that used to do posters, stationary, etc. Having that position back would be a plus.

We need to find a director with the experience to help libraries succeed and with the courage to make big changes at the system staff level in order to make SWLS a functional, viable system. The combination of uncertainty because of the PLSR process and the budgetary situation we find ourselves in is making it very difficult to find that leader.
Appendix B – Explanation of Equity Score Rating

Please explain. Why did you rate library service quality equity with the score that you did?

1. A library is supposed to be an engagement place for a community and recent years our library has been lacking that. I think this goal is extremely important for people to feel connected to the world.

2. A new formula for system funding needs to be devised. Currently, smaller and more rural systems receive less funding and due to the distances between member libraries, many costs are greater.

3. A percentage increase to all does not provide the needed assistance that our rural library system needs. There needs to be a basic level of services available to all state residents. Libraries located in resource rich areas are looking at enhancing their existing services, libraries located in resource starved areas are looking to stay open. The need for more services and a greater range of services provided by rural libraries grows as state & federal service providers “centralize” & remove face to face contact from rural areas.

4. Access is the foundation of public libraries,

5. All libraries deserve equity; the population they serve and the staff available varies greatly so equity is very important.

6. All libraries should have equal service, just as we as institutions strive to provide equal access. Geography should not determine quality of service.

7. All libraries should receive services on an equitable basis.

8. All libraries should strive to offer the best service/programs/access possible.

9. All libraries, and the citizens they serve, deserve the best possible services from their systems. Geography and size of budget should be less of a barrier for receiving stellar system services.

10. All library should be treated equally - every person we serve is important regardless if it’s a small library or a large library, a rural library or city library - each one is as important as the other.

11. All library users and libraries should have comparable service, if technology allows. Until the PLSR process, I didn't realize how ‘rich’ we are compared to many systems in the state. And I didn't understand that the state aid formula was primarily based on population density (85%, I think).

12. All patrons should have access to the same services.

13. All people in all communities, all over the state, should expect to receive quality library services, wherever they are. It is for sure that some communities will always have more, but there should be a minimum level of service everywhere, and in that sense equitable.

15. Anyone accessing a library expects a standard level of service for their tax dollar. This is the ideal. Education and Training of librarians is the most important factor in service equity as well as the funding levels needed for those hours (MOE insured this) and even training and education of library board members. A director can try to keep a standard of service, but without dollars to hire good potential librarians along with substantial hours, it is very difficult. Where is the assurance of enough to keep the doors open in small isolated rural libraries?

16. As a public library director, of course equity (in theory) is important. However, in this PLSR process, even though it has been adamantly denied, equity seems to be more aligned with equality, and those are two very different things. Equity needs to be nimble enough to take various factors into consideration. In the vast state of Wisconsin, there are two significant factors that work against each other - the largest populations are compacted in tight geographical areas, and the wide expanses between populations in other areas are a challenge to bridge. Equity is supposed to level the playing the field, but expanse and density are the two realities diametrically opposed. Unfortunately one of the components that has been missing from the start of the PLSR process is an assessment of what currently works, and what currently doesn’t. Assessment would have focused the conversation to address expanse and density.

17. As a small library, I do not want to be put on a back burner or rated not as important. I strongly believe all libraries should get equal service.

18. As a small library, we want to be able to provide the same services to our patrons that larger libraries (with larger budgets) are able to.

19. As a small rural library, equitable access to services and support is very important. With a small budget for programming and materials, it is essential that we have access to the larger Library Catalog and the programming support through the library system.

20. As a very small library (service population ~2,700) with a relatively small budget (~150k), we are both at an advantage and disadvantage. As a member of a large system, we have access to higher level services than we would be able to coordinate on our own. The downside is that some SCLS services (namely ILS) are more expensive than we can manage with our budget. We have created a local system to open access for our patrons but because our patrons can’t browse and request books independently (without an interaction with library staff) I believe it’s a barrier to free access to information.

21. As an example, the biggest library in our system has not been paying its fair share (based on usage) for OverDrive. Any new initiatives by systems must be based on usage.

22. As Director of both the Oshkosh Public Library and of the Winnefox Library System, equity of service is a key professional and personal value. Winnefox strives to provide excellent support services to ALL 30 of its member libraries. I believe that the equity challenge before Wisconsin’s library systems is to find ways to extend excellence over distance in order to better serve all public libraries and public library patrons in the state.
23. As we are such a small library we don't have a large need for the services. When a situation arises it can usually be dealt with on a personal basis and accommodations are made to create a more equitable service. Across the board policies are important to us, but dealing with individuals seems more successful.

24. Because all libraries should be able to offer patrons services which are replicated across the state. There should not be hills and valleys of service when one uses different libraries, or when one moves from one area to another.

25. Because every community deserves the best support possible to help them grow and learn.

26. Because if the small, rural communities are left out of service, their patrons never get access to the services needed to thrive in the current, WiFi connected environment. It's a continuing problem now in rural communities that still don't have affordable broadband services--at a time when urban communities are giving up wired networks for WiFi.

27. Because it is important to provide patrons with high levels of service, regardless of where they live. Libraries often act as a bit of a social equalizer, providing people with resources opportunities & access that they cannot afford on their own. In order to best help our patrons, all libraries from big to small of course need an equal level of support.

28. Because we are a small, rural library and do not have access to many things that libraries in large cities have, we want to ensure that our patrons receive the best service that we can offer.

29. Because we strive to give the best possible service to our community.

30. Because when library patrons travel to larger communities (much more than an hour away), they come back to use and say how awesome another library is in a big community. We'd love to be able to provide those services but cannot with current funding. It's not a lack of desire, it's a matter of money.

31. Being a middle size library I am concerned on having services for our patrons. We can afford most services but I feel like we may miss out on things because of our limited funds.

32. Being a small library, being a part of a library system, OWLS in our case, is essential. We do not have the budget to offer services other libraries do. Having the library system ensures that our patron get access to computer use, a large inter library loan collection, and programs to enrich our library for our patrons.

33. Being a small, 1-staff library, we often do not have the manpower or funding to provide as many services as we should/could. Anything that our library system can provide to assist us in those ways would be very important to us. Our patrons want the library open more hours/days and this would require more staff. These are not feasible in our current budget.

34. Being a very small library in a rural area, service equity is very important to our library and our library patrons.
35. Currently in my system, all libraries in the system, regardless of size, are treated equitably.

36. Different libraries have different needs so they don't need to provide the same services. However, access to services and support should be equal and it should be left to the individual library which services would work best for them.

37. Each community is so different and smaller populations may not have the interest for the same services larger ones do--so equitable access isn't always necessary.

38. Equity doesn't mean equal. I appreciate that our system balances the needs of a very diverse group of libraries. Everyone's needs aren't the same.

39. Equity is a basic tenet of librarianship.

40. Equity is defined as fairness. The ideas that I hear coming out of the work groups often sound more like an attempt at equality (applying the same service parameters to all libraries). I believe in the idea of equity as a principle, but this question asks if I believe in "the goal of service equity" which I am connecting to the ideas from the work groups. In that case, I do not rate this of high importance. I believe that statewide service equity goals will take service prioritization away from the local library. Individual libraries will lose the ability to speak for their patrons about which services should be available, especially with limited resources. I do not believe a decision can be fairly made to decide whose service equity goals should be prioritized, and whose should not be. Because of this in the end equity will still not exist.

41. Equity is important but not at the expense of other member libraries who are doing their job well. Instead of preaching equity across the board, the ones that feel that they have "less than" should be brought up to the higher standard of the correctly operating library systems, instead of the other way around.

42. Equity is only valuable if it is raising everyone up and not cutting services.

43. Equity is paramount to public library service. However, equity doesn't necessary mean equal since different communities will have different needs. So an understanding of what is necessary to achieve equity is important for individual libraries and systems.

44. Equity is the reason to be in a consortium and belong to a system. If every library could do everything themselves why belong.

45. Equity is very important but cannot be at the expense of well-funded, well performing, well-staffed libraries in the state. Cannot impose unfunded mandates that will result in local governments forcing libraries into silos to protect local investment in libraries.

46. Even the libraries serving smaller communities should be able to provide stellar services to their patrons. With the assistance of the system, both in research and economies of scale, our smallest members are able to offer some pretty impressive resources.

47. Every American deserves access to a quality library.
48. Every citizen in Wisconsin deserves the same level of service and quality of service.

49. Every person should have equal access to library services.

50. Everyone across the state should have close to the same level of service possible. Access to the internet, books, resources...these should be available to everyone regardless of where they live in the state.

51. Everyone deserves equal access to quality service and support to meet the service goals and program needs for their communities.

52. Everyone deserves quality library service.

53. Everyone deserves quality public services and libraries are vital to vibrant and successful communities.

54. Everything we do in libraries is to level the playing field and provide equity of service to our community.

55. First, I’d like to distinguish “equality” from “equity”. Let’s say “equality” is giving all parties the same service, and “equity” is giving all parties the service they need to be successful. Then the question is “what is success?,” which is a difficult question. We do know some libraries are not satisfied with their system services though, so I think “success” could be defined as those dissatisfied libraries receiving better service in most or all areas, without decreasing funding or service levels for those libraries that currently receive excellent service. I rated equity a 9 because all Wisconsinites deserve to have libraries that receive equitable system support.

56. From a user’s perspective, any library a person visits should be able to provide similar services. From a library’s perspective, no library should be unable to provide adequate services due to inequitable funding.

57. Goal of service equity is paramount.

58. Hard to argue against equity.

59. Having worked at many different sizes of library, the rural and small libraries may serve a smaller population—but that population should receive service that is equitable to those in larger cities. Good and available materials, excellent programming, and a stable funding source know no boundaries. Fair funding and system governance ensures this equability.

60. Having worked in a small library for over ten years and now a larger library, I understand and realize there are different needs and workflows. Equity is more than the mandates...it starts with system leadership and their philosophy.

61. I am a new director, I already see what the difference of resources means to the patrons’ experience. I would hope that a shared resources and technology would be a goal for the patrons of the entire state.

62. I am aware that not all libraries in the state have access to the same system services. I think improving access for these area is essential. However, while equity is important, priorities vary in different regions of the state. Since there is limited funding available, decisions need to be made by each library and each
region about what is important to them and what resources or services they feel
best support their citizens. There is not a one-size-fits-all solution to this. It is
important to make services available on an equitable basis without requiring
participation, or reducing or eliminating services currently provided in systems
with high levels of system satisfaction.

63. I am in a rural library and I feel as if rural libraries are often left out of the "state"
conversation and yet we provide services that are critical to our small
communities, perhaps even more so than in larger cities where there may be
other options for obtaining services.

64. I believe all citizens should have equitable access. I was very disappointed
when the same services provision (for systems) was removed from state statute
as it splinters services and is confusing for patrons. For example, Menasha
subscribes to Hoopla but Neenah does not, so a patron who uses both libraries
now has to have a card with a Menasha barcode; but if Neenah gets its own
unique resource requiring barcode authentication, how does that patron decide
which to pick since they can't have two library card accounts?

65. I believe all patrons regardless of location, financial status, education and any
other reasons all deserve equal access to the library and services.

66. I believe that all citizens have a right to expect a core set of services, base levels
of materials and hours.

67. I believe that all libraries should have equal opportunity to serve their patrons
and staff. It appears that location and funding issues have caused a lack of
equity among systems in Wisconsin.

68. I believe that all people in Wisconsin should have their needs met through public
libraries like the services and support that IFLS offers.

69. I believe that every public library should have the same great service provided
by the library system. It's the only way public libraries can provide the best service
to patrons.

70. I believe that the goal of service equity for libraries in Wisconsin is important but
equity isn't the same as equal. I strongly am opposed to the "Robin Hood"
approach -- taking something away from one library system to give to another.
The needs of libraries in systems/regions vary and systems currently set priorities --
doesn't mean "inequity" if a system doesn't allocate their staff and resources the
same way. Local funding is vital and "service equity" should not reward poor
local funding.

71. I believe the library is a place where all people can come together and
everyone is on the same playing field. Everyone is equal and everyone receives
fair and respectful services.

72. I can understand the plight of smaller libraries or libraries outside of a system that
will not or cannot provide quality services. Equity can be achieved through a
better utilization of state funds.

73. I do not believe all communities can support a library at the level of "equitable
service". There are certain areas such as delivery and automated services such
as ILS and e-books that should be provided at the regional or statewide level. State funds should not be used in an unbalanced manner so that communities that probably should not have a library are able to do so.

74. I do not feel like the libraries in the MCFLS System are libraries that are not being served equitably. For this reason it is not an important issue to this library. That said, I still believe that service equity is an important goal for the state.

75. I do think this is an awesome goal but the needs of a small library and large library are very different. It will be very difficult to achieve this goal.

76. I don’t believe there should be winners and losers within or between library systems. One system can barely provide the basics, and another has excess funds invested in the stock market. These inequities seem to extend to the local library level. While equitable system funding may not make up for this, it would be a start.

77. I feel all size libraries need to be treated the same, smaller libraries may serve less patrons but the percentage for the community size may be larger than a bigger library.

78. I feel basic library needs should be met for everyone (books, media, internet). However I do know there are parts of the state, even parts of counties, that pay much lower taxes and with that they have lesser services. example: I work in a rural county, the roads are paved and plowed less than the higher taxed county where I live. I feel this would be reasonable throughout the state.

79. I feel it is important but yet somewhat unrealistic to provide. The larger libraries have many more opportunities and much more money to provide services that the smaller rural libraries cannot. Systems can help provide services to libraries and ours is doing a very good job with that.

80. I feel like we have great service. I am almost afraid that sharing will lower the level of service. (Like....it is mine, I am happy, and I don't want to lose anything.)

81. I feel our system provides a high level of service. While in an ideal world I would like to have equitable service amongst all libraries in the state, I would not want to have our level of service drop to achieve this. I would want other libraries to have the same high standard level that we have, but would not want our level of service to decrease to meet this. I fear raising all libraries to this level of service may be cost prohibitive and fear there may not be the financial support to achieve this ideal goal.

82. I feel that all libraries should have equal service for all patrons. This goes beyond the library system and directly to libraries. The neighboring library to us that is in a different system right now charges our city patrons to use their library which I do not feel is providing equal service to all.

83. I feel there are different levels of equity when you talk about service equity in libraries. In an ideal world, it would be great to have complete equity across the board in all areas of services and materials offered. But realistically we know that is not always possible because of funding limitations, politics, and the sources from which the libraries get their funding. Within my own library, my board and
staff would rate the importance of service equity for our patrons at ten. Within our Library System I would say the same thing goes – it is ten on service equity. But once you start going beyond our library system the rating on service equity begins to drop. The further you go, the lower the number drops. We must answer to the people who pay the taxes that fund our library and most of the funding comes from my municipalities.

84. I firmly believe all patrons should have equal access to services and programs.

85. I frequently feel that library patrons in the Northwoods are short-changed in library services. We are not able to provide the same level of services that larger library systems can provide, and this is mostly due to our budget. When I compare what I am able to offer with the opportunities that library patrons in Madison and other "wealthy" places in the state receive, I feel very disheartened. Our patrons would benefit greatly from expanded educational resources like Lynda.com, classes taught by professional instructors, and technology equipment. Better enrichment opportunities with quality presenters could also provide some significant quality-of-life improvements in our small rural town, since we have few other cultural opportunities. When providing basic library service (keeping the doors open, computers on, and staff paid) eats up most of our budget, we cannot offer the same opportunities as larger libraries.

86. I have seen first-hand that many smaller libraries are struggling and need better services. Giving each library the same service is not equity. Giving each library what they need to succeed is equity.

87. I have worked at libraries with a lot of money and resources, and libraries with a lot less. The quality of the staff in both places can’t be impugned, but the quality of the available resources can vary considerably. In a digital age, though, there’s no reason for that. If we have a strong universal baseline across libraries, we can provide good service even to people who live in areas with fewer financial resources.

88. I have worked in a variety of small, rural libraries. There is a large gap in the level of service that many small, rural libraries are able to provide. Often, the library staff are too busy providing basic levels of service to the public and are not able to further their education, participate in regional networking opportunities, or experiment with new and improved offerings.

89. I haven’t given much thought to service quality equity.

90. I just believe in the idea that each library, whether it has a large budget or small budget, can have equitable access to services.

91. I rated it this way because I think it’s quite important.

92. I realize that while MCFLS and WFBPL are doing well, not all libraries in the state are as well supported. It is an important philosophical and ethical point to have libraries provide an equitable level of service to all state residents not just those in well-off areas. Libraries can be the place of last resort for citizens to obtain needed services and at times those with the most need have the fewest options.
93. I see this from both sides. As one of the largest libraries in the state, it's important that there are not islands of service. We can provide things smaller libraries cannot. I think this is in fact good sometimes, but not with core services we all should provide. While we are one of the largest our support per capita is on the low end of the curve at about $26/capita. So we also slip into this category of not being able to offer things that other libraries our size, or even smaller than us in other systems can offer.

94. I strongly believe that library services should be equitable and available to everyone in all walks of life. No one should be left out.

95. I think "equity" is a worthy goal.

96. I think DPI's Statement on Inclusion sums it up well.

97. I think equity of service is very important, especially since we are a small library. It is important to provide services for non-mainstream patrons.

98. I think it is good ideal to strive for but there isn't equity now nor will there ever be.

99. I think it's important that every resident in WI- whether they live in a rural or urban area- has access to the same level of library service. People in our area need the library and the services it provides just as much as those living in other areas and shouldn't have to pay more for those services. Funding levels in our state are definitely NOT equitable, and the services that our systems and our libraries can provide reflect that inequity. While a municipal level of support will always mean some differences in actual services and how libraries provide them, there are some things that just aren't options in our area that are taken for granted in other areas.

100. I think service equity is very important but I also have worked in various rural areas where equity of service means something different than it does in larger communities. I would need a definition of service equity in context before I could give it a higher priority.

101. I think that libraries are the hub of each community. Libraries are more than just books today. They are a place where the community comes together for so many things.

102. I think that there should be a 'baseline' level of service that libraries in Wisconsin all receive. That will help serve all residents and provide them resources that can be used to improve their quality of life. At the same time, I don't think resources within a system or region should be diverted to libraries that don't receive adequate local support. I feel what has happened in the past is that some communities don't support their library as they should, and we're talking basic levels of financial support here, and the library system has then felt well since that community doesn't want to support their library then we will divert some funds to help them out. I don't think this should be done. I feel that support should be for things that all libraries benefit from.

103. I think the concept of equity is an element in local library services. As important, or possibly more important, are the local community's needs and hopes for itself. It isn't easy to separate those things. For instance, a community might highly
value fast internet connections at the library while valuing summer reading programs for children less. Those values can come from local needs—maybe this is a primarily retirement community. How does the idea of equity fold into that situation?

104. I think the system should not fill in for library administration. The smaller libraries need to invest in administration and not rely on the system for everything.

105. I think we should all have quality services. I also think the services needed vary. My small library does not have the same focus as a large library. I also don’t have the staff to provide such a range of services that might be required with a large population.

106. I understand that larger metro areas have different needs and have more resources. It is the access to these resources that needs to be equitable.

107. I understand that rural areas have limitations, however, we hope to provide our community with an above average level of services and programs.

108. I want everyone to have the same awesome experience.

109. I was previously in another library system where access to services, support, and even money was significantly less. It creates almost a competitive situation between libraries, especially on system borders. The less funded system’s libraries will continue to lose county funding as more of the patrons use the better-supported library. It’s a self-perpetuating cycle.

110. I’m confused a bit by the question. I think it’s important to have equality of services and support in the state, but not sure what this means. I would like to see the services offered by the state or library systems benefit all different kinds and sizes of libraries, despite geography. I don’t think that every library needs the same services. I don’t think it makes sense to have a small library have every single kind of service a large library can offer. Nor do they need it.

111. I’m not sure what you mean by service equity. If you mean that every library offers the same exact service to their patrons then I don’t think that’s achievable. Every municipality has different resources and a different set of priorities. If you mean that the System offers the same service to its libraries then I think that’s very important. Libraries can decide what is important to them from the offerings and pay for them.

112. Important for patrons to be satisfied with the service they receive. Need to provide the service they require in order be valuable to the community.

113. In the past, our library has focused on the patrons and community that we have, rather than diversifying. Our community has no diversification, so we’ve been noticing that our services aren’t necessarily equitable throughout the community also. I would love to be able to create a more diverse library service with the goal of equity and diversification in mind. In turn, this would increase our library’s importance on equity across the board.

114. It hasn’t really been clear on what "equitable access" means. Does that mean everyone has the same thing, or a basic set of services are available everywhere?
115. It is extremely important because balances of services to all public libraries keeps us better customer service oriented.

116. It is important that all libraries provide and receive fundamental library services. However, equity is not parallel to all having identical or uniform services. Library diversity of size, communities & identified needs are factors to be considered in regard to services provided and needed.

117. It is important that all residents have access to quality service, information and resources.

118. It is important to help our patrons any way we can and service equity is an important part.

119. It is important to provide services with equity for library patrons, not sure what is being asked. Equity in terms of ADA access; regardless of social, economic, racial, sexual orientation, etc.; in terms of collections - this question can be interpreted in many different ways. If we are talking about all of these issues, or overall service quality, of course we want a ten.

120. It's an admirable goal, but what's good for, say, Bridges Library System may not be good for another library system. I wouldn't like to see currently successful systems lose out to other systems that may not need the same services.

121. It's important for patrons in both rural and urban areas have equitable access to resources and services.

122. It's important to be inclusive of all patrons.

123. It's important to provide equity in the quality of library services, but sometimes small towns make this difficult because the large majority of our patrons are more needy than most. It's hard to balance it out.

124. It's just the way it should be. It's a no-brainer. I can't believe there would be libraries who think it's not important.

125. It's something libraries are committed to - giving everyone the same level of service. Libraries receiving inadequate funding may struggle to provide the same quality of service as libraries that are well-funded. Libraries in rural and urban areas have access to different resources.

126. Juneau Public Library is a small, rural library. Service equity, especially funding and technology, are crucial as the tax base in our smaller communities can limit the budgets for the public libraries.

127. Just because our library is in a small rural town, doesn’t mean that my library should be limited in the services it can provide and how much support our system provides. There should be equal access to materials and technology as if I lived in a big city. There may be local staff and budget differences, but as far as system services, there should be no difference where your library is.

128. Just because we are small, we should still be able to offer similar digital services in all parts of the state.
Larger library's get more opportunities because of their larger budgets. Smaller libraries have to downsize a lot on what they can offer because of space, operational hours, and dollars to spend. Sure it is great what the libraries can offer. But as a small library I can’t compete with them. It’s odd we both call ourselves libraries when what we have to offer are so different.

Leveling the playing field for all is the backbone of library service.

Libraries are places that try to serve their communities equitably. It only makes sense that system services should be equitable to all libraries, not determined on funding or population levels.

Libraries in Dane County are in a bit of a bubble. Not until conversations are had with librarians outside of Dane County, does one realize how uneven equitable access to service and support really is. Those of us lucky enough to be in Dane County, should unequivocally support the same level of equity for all Wisconsin libraries. The caveat is that this must be done so in a way that makes it affordable for all libraries.

Libraries in this system that are well funded end up subsidizing those that are not well-funded at virtually no reciprocal cost. Not a bad deal for Milwaukee Public Library. Not a good deal for tax payers of West Allis.

Libraries mission is to provide equal access to resources and services, so we are continually thinking about different services that we can provide and ensuring we are meeting our mission with each program or class we offer. That is also extremely important with our collection development, we want to ensure we have a balanced collection so everyone can find materials to support their view points but also opposing viewpoints to educate them further if they choose.

Library customers benefit from predictable standards of services. Equity of services can help make that happen and help balance the workload across the state.

Library patrons should be able to get comparable services no matter where they are located in the state.

Little libraries are as important as big ones, however I understand larger libraries might need more resources for their patrons.

Living up here in the northern tier of the state, it’s easy to feel like the forgotten people, sometimes. Yet, those who live and visit here deserve...and expect...the same level of service they receive at their home libraries...often located in larger metropolitan areas.

MCFLS provides excellent service. The service quality equity question doesn’t seem to apply but for the sake of other libraries outside of Milwaukee County I think this issue is moderately important.

My library is small and rural. We already miss out on some services provided by our system because of cost. We can’t provide the same access to the same materials for this reason.

No matter what size library and town, we should all be treated in fairness.
Not sure if I'm defining it the way you are, but basically equality of access is supremely important to me, central to my mission of informing and empowering the populace, and we need help with resources and guidance in order to do that. I find that rural, small library patrons especially have challenges to becoming informed and perhaps need more attention in order to be considered as having equal access as their urban counterparts.

Often libraries get supported with a "squeaky wheel" approach - what would be most helpful is knowing what concerns are being raised by other libraries to be aware of issues and possible solutions before we run into them.

Often times larger libraries have access to better programs and services because their operating budgets are higher and they have more staff. Library location, staff size, or operating budget should not be a barrier for libraries to receive support.

Our library is in a poor, rural area. Without a good library and the services it offers a lot of people in this community would do without.

Our Library staff and Board view service equity including lending and borrowing to be of great importance.

Our mission intends to serve any and all members of our user community and beyond.

Our purpose is to bridge the gap.

Our small library would likely be overlooked if there were not service equity.

Our system has libraries that range from very small to large; providing service equally to everyone is important regardless of size. IFLS does an excellent job of this.

Patrons across the state deserve equal access to programs and services. Smaller libraries often cannot provide the same programs and services as larger libraries because they do not have the staff or funds available.

Patrons are served as equally as possible.

Persons in rural areas have the same needs as persons in urban areas, just less access to resources.

PLSR states that equity doesn't mean equality, yet the draft models have shown equal services for libraries (e.g. overnight delivery, tech help, ILS.) Needs vary by region and I probably define equity differently than PLSR. Given that state funds are limited, totaling less than 7% of government funds to libraries, achieving "equity," with them is unrealistic. Wisconsin residents make service level choices by where they reside and tax levels they support; limited state funds are not well used to "shore up" libraries that aren't adequately locally funded; doing so discourages, rather than encourages, adequate local support. Equity works both ways: communities that support libraries well shouldn't see service degradation because of communities that don't. My rating of 7 gives me access to the "bonus question" which follows. I'm discouraged that bright,
concerned librarians have been denied this chance to suggest ideas and that answers will be skewed through deselecting respondents.

155. Providing equal services to all Wisconsin residents is what libraries are here to do.

156. Public libraries are the great equalizer in our society and should be available to everyone.

157. Public libraries function in many roles. For some citizens, the public library and its resources provide the only access to unbiased, free information. For some, library programs can be the means to changing one’s life for the better.

158. Quality of customer service is always number 1.

159. Regardless of the size of the library system, all services should be equal.

160. Residents of a town with a library should not have to travel away from their town for better library service.

161. Rural libraries operate with limited budgets. Without the help from the state, many of these services and programs would not or could not happen.

162. SCLS libraries receive fantastic service. I would like other libraries to enjoy similar levels of service.

163. Service equality is important for all, but would also depend on what is important to the individual library.

164. Service equity across the state is an important goal, if this means creating and maintaining a minimum standard level of service. Libraries should still have the flexibility to meet the needs of their individual communities however. Not all libraries need to be open the same number of hours per week, for example.

165. Service equity could mean all kinds of things, different things to different libraries. A different word choice would have been helpful.

166. Service equity is a great goal but not at the expense of the exceptional services our library receives from our library system and library staff. I would hate to lose daily deliveries, PR assistance that is created and directed for our patrons, the many layers of support that we receive from system staff. I would not support compromising or losing services for our patrons.

167. Service equity is crucial to this process. While our library is lucky to be a member of a very well-funded system, staff have worked in other smaller, more rural systems that struggle or simply cannot provide the resources our system can because of how funds are currently dispersed. Our library serves patrons from three systems and the service equity across those systems becomes evident quickly when talking with them. Patrons who have the means drive past libraries in their home system to come to libraries that have significantly more service resources. If this process is about providing service equity across the state, which is needed, the statewide library community has to be open to a change in how rural libraries are funded. This may mean that some systems see a reduction in funding or it may mean that systems with the biggest need get a larger percentage of the funds.
168. Service equity is important throughout WI, and the country. Service quality and equity = equal access = intellectual freedom = democracy!

169. Service equity is INSANELY important to me and how I run the library. However, I don’t feel as though it is as important as it should be to my library board or the Village of Cadott. My main reasoning - our library has a lot of stairs and no was to enter the building if you cannot climb stairs. There have been attempts to work on a building project, but it consistently placed on a back burner for the town and board.

170. Service equity is the foundation of public libraries. In our society of ever widening gaps between those who can afford and those who cannot, the library is a singular institution that, through equity in service can minimize the larger barriers present in our communities.

171. Service equity is the “raison d’etre.” In all businesses and industries standards of service are the norm; it should be the same for libraries.

172. Service is the bedrock of what we do. Anything we can do to bolster the quality of our services to the most people is important.

173. Sharing resources is what libraries do. Equitable services between libraries helps to impress upon users that all public libraries offer qualitative and essential services. We set the standard for sharing resources, and patrons need to feel confident that they can receive the same essential services from any library they utilize. In doing this, we ensure that public libraries are a necessary and integral part of a democratic society.

174. Since our library serves a small rural community, it is vital that we provide equitable service that equals the service found in larger urban areas.

175. Small libraries and large libraries won’t be able to offer the same programming opportunities to all patrons. I think we do a great job with what we have, and appreciate the support we do get, but we can’t offer as many programs as libraries that have designated staff for those positions. Rural patrons and urban patrons should have access to the same kinds of materials and opportunities.

176. Small libraries are at a disadvantage in staff, time, salary, size, and community resources often taken for granted by the larger libraries.

177. Small libraries need to have an equal say and equal quality service as larger libraries to keep a consistent, satisfied patron base.

178. Small libraries should be treated the same as the larger libraries. Voting and all services...no matter the size, we are all working for the betterment of our communities and surrounding communities.

179. Small rural libraries that serve smaller populations are entitled to the same level of service that urban populations receive.

180. Smaller libraries have many of the same needs but on a smaller scale. May not be able to provide as many programs and services as larger libraries.
181. So that there are lesser "have nots" in society. Including the "have nots" of a physical library due to the municipality being small, the budget being small and the struggle of proving the need.

182. Some libraries/municipalities would rather go cheap than provide the best possible service to their patrons. Therefore, I think a tiered approach to providing service is more appropriate than "everyone gets everything..."

183. Some systems in the state do a better job than others or are offering different services that may be useful in other systems. It would be good to be more unified.

184. Sometimes the small libraries get forgotten and they need all they help they can get.

185. Sparsely populated areas may need few hours. All areas should have access to all services.

186. Support to all libraries is important but keeping it fair between very small and larger libraries is important to me.

187. Taxpayers across the state pay for our services. Yes they should be equal. But we do need to recognize that local funding can have a negative effect on equalization. Very small libraries are limited to what they can provide and can sometimes act as a drain on county funding for other libraries in their county. When are small libraries too small?

188. That is the primary purpose of Wisconsin's library systems.

189. The context of 'equitable access to services and support' is vague. I largely believe the financial support for a library drives the quality of programming, staffing and services available to a library. Homogeneous support across the state doesn't dictate that a library will be successful in its community - factors like attracting excellent staff who connect with the community, developing collections (traditional and evolving), and attractive spaces are factors that help make a library stand out in its community. Equitable access to services for the library and its staff is not something that I would say makes our library stand out in our community. Equitable access for our patrons to our library and others is only one of many factors that make a library successful or not.

190. The disparity in systems is very apparent, it seems as though equalizing that divide would benefit library patrons.

191. The funding can swing wildly based on circulation, collections size...etc. If we had an increase in financial support, we could bring in better services and resources, and this would increase the number of users, the library's circulation numbers, improve collections...etc.

192. The funding formula does not create equity. Whenever libraries are reimbursed for service to non-library users at less than 100% it is difficult to maintain quality services. Beyond low county reimbursement, sustaining funding from municipalities does not always provide funding at a level allowing for equitable service.
193. The goal of equal access should absolutely be in play - but that access should be high quality.

194. The library I work at is in a rural county with no urban areas or colleges. This hampers our ability to implement programs that could educate and inform our populace due to the lack of expertise in our region.

195. The main goal of the library is to serve the public. If all libraries receive the same or close to the same services the general public is better served and can go to any library to receive those services.

196. The point of public libraries is to level the proverbial playing field. We are here to give the best possible service to everyone who enters our doors.

197. The public library is an institution based on the foundation of making resources available, in particular to those that would not have access or have barriers to access.

198. The user is the reason we are in business. When a library can’t provide the same service as a nearby library, it can be problematic.

199. There are enough haves/have nots divisions in daily life - the least we can do is provide equal service to all.

200. There are some communities who refuse to increase funding for public libraries. Is it fair that they get the same service level without paying the same amount as other communities?

201. There is no such thing as service equity. All libraries are unique, as are their locations/regions within the state. They all serve unique populations and have unique needs and histories. The best we can do as a state is to approach some kind of compromise in our funding systems that lead to an approximation of fairness as far a monetary distribution goes. After that, it is up to each system to determine goals, solutions and objectives. I was a library director before there was a library system in our county. I have lived through many battles for equity and fairness just within a one county system. Those battles over the years have been painful, but they have led to the exemplary system that we have today. I am proud to be a member. Hard work pays off.

202. This is a very important goal. However, in order for it to be feasible to reach the goal without harming existing high quality levels of library service currently provided in larger, more densely populated parts of the states, the State of Wisconsin will need to budget additional financial resources towards the effort.

203. To be honest, I feel that since my library is the farthest geographically from our resource library and our library system leadership, often times we are "left behind" in terms of service and support. If we have a major technical problem, we generally go back and forth for hours and hours on the phone trying to fix things, when it would be much easier if someone came out. As I said in my previous response, I do not have the budget to send staff and myself to many of the continuing education workshops and training that are offered. This leaves me with a staff that is not growing and learning, and thus service to patrons ultimately suffers.
204. To me, this is one of the single most important reasons why public libraries exist. We can’t stand on the principles and rhetoric that we (public libraries) are so great because we close gaps, offer free services, etc. if we do not do everything in our power to ensure that on a state-level we are all in parity—it seems hypocritical.

205. Unfortunately, equity is expensive and as a large library with a VERY small budget, I don’t believe my community can afford to take our already limited resources that the system provides to support libraries in other areas of the state.

206. Very important to have access to qualified educators (services and/or support), but at a scale or level that fits the size of the library.

207. We are a diverse community with English speaking and non-English speaking members of the community. We all share the low economics of our area currently so having services available to all is very important and looking at what our community needs from us their Library.

208. We are a provider of information that far exceeds books and good service is a requirement to meet the changing needs of our communities.

209. We are a small library in a rural area and often feel that we simply cannot offer the services and programs that other, larger libraries offer. We, for example, cannot afford to bring in nationally recognized authors and do not do this at a system level.

210. We are a small library who’s service population is seasonal, so when you see 3600, that is a summer number. Our village is only 712 people and surrounding Townships year round are only another 1000. Waushara is one of the poorest counties in the state, as there is no real industrial base. Every year, budgets get tighter and tighter.

211. We are a small library with a limited budget. We need help ‘leveling the playing field’ in regards to giving our patrons quality service.

212. We are a small library with limited resources. We choose not to offer some services, but choose to be very good at the services we do offer. Being forced to offer more services, but not very well, is not a goal of our library.

213. We are a small rural library and want to be able to support our patrons as fully as those in larger cities and villages. Equity in library service would give our patrons equal access to materials, programming, internet etc.

214. We are a small rural library in a high poverty area. We lack some of the resources to feel we are on equal footing with more prosperous parts of the state.

215. We are a small rural library is in a high poverty population and the library is one of the most valued resources in our community due to the wifi and internet access as well as access to resources beyond what we can house.

216. We are a small rural library. We do not receive ILL transit everyday so access to materials is slower than other larger libraries. Our internet service, through BadgerLink, is slow and often lags.
217. We are far from Milwaukee and Madison and feel forgotten up here. I would appreciate equal access.

218. We are one state. It is unfortunate that access to services is dependent upon location of the library.

219. We are small with limited resources, money, and staff but our patrons deserve access to the same services as larger libraries.

220. We feel that it is very important.

221. We feel that we have access to good services from SCLS. So, "our library" has no opinion about this. However, the people who work at and are associated with our library feel that we are fortunate to be a part of SCLS. I think we all also feel that it would nice if all libraries in the state also had access to quality services from their library systems.

222. We get what we get in terms of service.

223. We have a very small library and very small budget.

224. We have always felt that our patrons should receive the same or better service even though we are a small community and have limited resources.

225. We have an older population that has lived here all their lives and a very small budget. Most of them read, and have already read most of the collection twice. Being able to locate more reading materials is crucial and being able to borrow them is incredibly helpful.

226. We like to give our customers the service that is possible, however sometimes we are not perfect.

227. We receive excellent service through our system but, as one of the smaller libraries in our system, there are areas where we feel "left behind". Even so, I know there are libraries outside of our system that struggle more than we do in providing even basic services.

228. We should all be able to deliver similar levels of professional service on a scale relative to size and resources.

229. We strive to have as many services and programs as our staff time permits. This is what continues to bring people into the library.

230. We strive to provide the same level of service to all of our patrons.

231. We think service equity is an admirable goal to strive for but not one that can be consistently and fairly achieved locally and certainly not statewide. The level of funding varies dramatically from library to library and do not believe that local municipalities will be willing or able to underwrite the costs of bringing other facilities up to the same level when tax dollars are so very scarce. Especially in today's technology explosion that has convinced many that libraries will not be around too much longer. Also, choosing to live a more rural vs. urban lifestyle involves making other sacrifices in what a community has to offer and it is not realistic to expect the same level of all community services in all municipalities.
232. We try very hard to include ALL people with our variety of programs offered FREE of charge to everyone.

233. We want all library users across the state to have the same opportunities of all regardless of where they are located or the size of their library.

234. We want things to be fair for everyone. We have an excellent system here but we would like libraries across the state to enjoy a similar experience. Hopefully we can all pool resources and learn best practices from each other.

235. We want to serve all the people that want or need our service in our community and the surrounding areas.

236. Well...because I took the oath, you know the oath, it's a librarian thing!

237. We're a small, but really busy library, and we depend on the services and programs the state provides us to bring us up to par for our services, training, and ideas to research and personalize for our patron base. This is especially true of our youth & inclusive services, and the Internet upgrades the state provided.

238. We're a very small library, so service to us can't be the same as to a bigger library, but we still need more money, so the library staff can be full time.

239. Whether large or small service equity should be for all.

240. While I appreciate equity and ideally all public libraries would have equity within the state, I have to recognize that the local community highly supports our activities and makes our library possible. I don't mind subsidizing communities that don't have a financial means to offer what we do, however I am concerned about subsidizing communities that have chosen not to fund their library/libraries.

241. While we are very focused on equitable access to services and support for our individual community and our library patrons, we acknowledge the importance of this state-wide. Ensuring that libraries support all Wisconsin residents ensures that everyone has access to early literacy/childhood development, professional development opportunities, and lifelong learning through resources and services provided by libraries, and this has the potential to improve both the quality of life and economic performance of the entire state. "A rising tide lifts all boats"-situation.

242. While we think everyone in the state deserves a basic level of library service, unless that basic level is paid by the state we don't think our local tax payers should subsidized other, less well-funded libraries.

243. Why shouldn't every citizen of the state have access to the same level of public library service?

244. Wisconsin citizens should all have excellent service.

245. Wisconsin libraries does a great job helping out individual communities while recognizing that the level of service provided in neighboring communities impacts their own.
246. With a rural population, it’s important that my customers receive the same excellent service, programs, and materials that bigger libraries do.

247. Without the access to resources that the more economically advantaged have, the rural or poorer parts of the state will continue to see the gap of inequity grow. Our system doesn’t have enough funding to entice a Director, or to meet all the technology needs we have. We rejoiced the accomplishment all system libraries receiving 3 day-a-week delivery only 3 or 4 years ago, yet other systems can’t see how they would manage with less than 5 days a week. When our libraries’ efforts are consistently in the mode of "putting out fires" we have very little time to explore other options and growth opportunities for our communities. The ability to access databases, WISCAT (if the library can afford it), and other sharing avenues allow us to provide a higher level of service than we would be able to with only the funds granted to us.

248. Working in a small library we can see how important it is for everyone to have access.
Appendix C – Actions to Achieve Public Library Equity

You rated service quality equity an importance level of 7 or higher. What are your ideas for the ways in which the State of Wisconsin could help achieve this service equity goal?

1. #1. Expand Badgerlink/WPLC to include resources that well-resourced systems are already purchasing a la carte.  2. Create universal library reciprocity throughout Wisconsin.  (No more exceptions for Milwaukee County, Germantown, etc.)  3. Make consultation/review in functional areas (circulation, children's services, adult services, digital services) a core functional service that systems provide to libraries.

2. #1. Helping to fund libraries in poorer areas.  2. Getting rid of legislation like 2005 Wisconsin Act 420, which effectively allows more affluent counties to bill poorer counties for library service (i.e. Brown County Library billing Oconto County for services.)

3. #1. The State could provide subsidies or system grants to individual libraries that don't receive adequate funding from other sources.  2. Have library systems provide more services at the system level to all their libraries.

4. A fairer funding formula would go a long way toward this goal. I don't think that changing system boundaries or merging systems necessarily helps provide an answer. But there are overhead costs to running a system that don't get taken into account with the current formula, and it means that rural systems are getting inadequate resources to serve their libraries-- and thus, the end users. Where there are efficiencies to be had (like statewide consulting, or changes to Resource Library rules for systems) they should be explored. In an ideal world, the library tax that municipalities use to support their libraries should fall outside the municipal levy limit (much like it does for counties). To be brutally honest, there needs to be some give from those who have more than enough in order to get systems like ours to a basic level of service.

5. A proper reciprocal rate that would cover the costs of the additional work completed by our Library for net lending libraries (the main one being Milwaukee). Good luck with this. Milwaukee's political clout makes this task impossible.

6. A statewide delivery network that is not contracted out. No barriers between counties & libraries; patrons should not cause libraries to be penalized because of where they live and what library they prefer. Statewide ILS & Discovery Layer that are supported by trained professionals.

7. Additional financial support to keep our libraries open and accessible to patrons of all ages and backgrounds.

8. Adequate funding for smaller, rural libraries -Our library system makes sure that all libraries are represented and have a voice in committees and the decision making process no matter their size and location. This idea should be implemented throughout the state.

9. Adequate funding resources to employ quality personnel.
10. Advocacy is sorely needed through much of the state. Technology infrastructure, educational resources and the necessary knowledge base for support and consultant services can only be consolidated and maintained at the level our users have come to expect if there’s widespread support for libraries across political lines.

11. Allow patrons to use any library they want without punishing their home library. Ensure there is broadband service in every library not just urban. Have delivery every day a library is open. Have access to every library’s catalog so patrons can get more items without using Wiscat.

12. Any dysfunctional library system office that needs strengthening could model themselves after an existing healthy library system (like our Bridges system).

13. As in every situation, large urban libraries seem to be the focus. It would be nice if small and rural libraries were given tools and attention as well, since we frequently need to deal with our patrons a little more personally, and don’t usually have the resources to make large, permanent changes to our services.

14. Assure that state funding is distributed in a manner that reflects that needs of a region and it's residents. Assure that all public libraries are meeting standardized service expectations.

15. Better distribution of funding and personnel to systems. Some systems lose the smaller libraries. Their needs are overshadowed by 'resource' libraries.

16. Better funding for libraries.

17. Better funding. Or more equal division of monies available to libraries. Having systems that are committed to delivering equal levels of support to their members is also very important. There need to be base standards for system-provided support to all libraries.

18. Broad band across the state, increase ACT 150 & 420 models to reflect 100% reimbursement, need based grants for facility improvements that address local needs such as meeting rooms, technology / small business incubator space, mobile office kits, full public bathrooms that include shower space; and need based grants for specialize librarians who are trained in social services.

19. By giving small libraries an equal voice with the large libraries in regards to policy. Often policy is dictated by the largest library. However, each library is unique and what works well for one library may not meet the needs of the patrons of a different library. So access to money and services have to be customized for each library and their patrons.

20. By keeping library systems reasonably sized and not merging systems to become behemoths with services and staff located too far away.

21. By not creating large unwieldy systems that are not staffed adequately. This will allow the systems to provide service equity and not have to choose what library has the most need of many.

22. By providing all libraries with the same technology (internet service, ILS, databases, etc.).
23. By taking a statewide initiative to organize projects which libraries can take advantage of instead of having libraries compete against each other. Help to facilitate sharing of resources easier and allow for collaboration on projects.

24. Change the county funding formula to be less circulation focused. Ensure basics like IT support and 5 day delivery are standard.

25. Change the county funding formula. Make sure the "powers that be" have visited and learned about libraries of all sizes, from all areas of the state, so they could see the current inequities, and realize how important it is to even things out. Those in large libraries have NO IDEA how far ahead they are in comparison. It's a matter of laying out basic needs, making sure EVERY library has those covered, then using any extra monies to enhance what everyone has. Many large libraries are enhanced-to-the-hilt, while many tiny libraries don't even have the basics. It's a microcosm of our country.

26. Change the system funding formula to provide more state funds to the library systems that need it.

27. Collect more data and recommend how systems can offer more consistent services. Leveraging economies of scale through some statewide contracts might help. Opening up system lines would also help.

28. Consolidating some services/offices of current systems would help save dollars that can be allotted elsewhere.

29. Consortial purchases of databases and ebook resources are good examples. Statewide delivery of library materials, statewide library cards.

30. Continue and increase state level support for digital resources such as databases, Overdrive, Hoopla, etc. Help strengthen the delivery system, especially in rural areas. System sharing of materials and ILL help provide access to materials, but a strong delivery network helps the turn-around time with these items.

31. Continue offering education and grants that help libraries provide equitable services to English and non-English speaking people, to people without modes of transportation, to differently-abled people, to the disenfranchised as well as the publicly engaged.

32. Continue to be there to help us, just as IFLS is now.

33. Continue to ensure shared access to resources.

34. Continue to fund library systems at a level that would allow them to provide system wide resources and services to their member libraries.

35. Continue to offer access to quality databases through Badgernet and electronic resources platforms; continue to look for ways to improve quality and quantity. Also launch statewide marketing for these services.

36. Continue to promote open dialogue among all people.
37. Continued support of money channeled through the library system to be used by all libraries regardless of size. Continued communication and education for all libraries.

38. Continued support of resource sharing; integrated library systems; the delivery of materials provided by utilizing the ILS and shared resources; and the technology that is the tool to provide the information we need to serve.

39. Continuing to increase broadband and making other technology assessable and obtainable. More funding to libraries of all sizes.

40. Create family programs (offered in whatever language(s) are in the community) that demonstrate healthy eating and literacy. Our local municipal judge recently held a forum which included all non-profits, the library, police, educators, etc. in a discussion on how we can better serve our children and families.

41. Create standards to measure service quality equity. Perform the measurements and bring those not in conformance to the standards level.

42. Determine baseline services all libraries should have access to and provide funding to meet that standard.

43. Divide the tax dollars based on which systems have more or less services.

44. Don’t know. I have thought about it a lot and can’t come up with anything.

45. Eliminate overlapping services, streamline CE [maybe pro-rate for PT librarians], look at models where one card does it all like a driver’s license, create delivery hubs with reliable, on-time service...give patrons the ability to track their own items like major vendors that might start with the letter A.

46. Enforce existing statutes to require communities that aren’t following statute to do their part. Do resource sharing more efficiently throughout the state. Provide more consistent education of library statutes.

47. Ensure that all residents of Wisconsin have access to the same Basic level of quality of service. We may not be able to afford all of the bells and whistles, but need to provide the basic services that residents require to stay connected to the 21st century.

48. Ensuring that all laws and measures take into account rural populations with small budgets and very limited resources.

49. Ensuring there is not disparity between rural and urban communities.

50. Equal opportunity to obtain materials. Not having to wait 6 months to borrow new items from other libraries.

51. Establish a set of reasonable service standards, see which systems are hitting those and which aren’t. Add the necessary services to the underserved systems and then perhaps go ala carte on other desired, but not provided services. This will be very difficult without State support I fear.

52. Establish core group of services for all, and then opportunities to share those opportunities/equipment/ideas that are unique.
53. Extend internet access throughout rural communities through broadband wireless. Not just serving the library building. My patrons have very limited access to cellular networks, let alone internet service so accessing resources is a challenge.

54. Fewer systems so funds may be invested in service rather an administration. Some services can even be provided statewide through collective programming or internet portals.

55. First, I think we need to determine how we can adjust the funding formula to offer more adequate funding to those systems that are struggling, while maintaining funding levels for systems that are functioning well. We also must update the statute with current, enforceable standards for library systems to achieve. Another factor here is training for system trustees, which will help with accountability. System trustees must know what to expect of system staff, and trustees must have the training to do so. Trustee training ought to be one of the standards that systems are required to meet. Another piece of the accountability puzzle is determining what the consequences will be for systems that fail to meet quality service standards. There must be consequences that have teeth, but that do not harm libraries that belong to those systems (otherwise, libraries will hesitate to report systems that aren't meeting expectations).

56. Focus, as the PLSR process has demanded on services, not on systems.

57. Follow our system’s ideas.

58. For my personal situation I think that it would be great to do some sort of workshop or resource gathering on building projects, or persuasive presentations for library boards/town boards/community members. I also want to be fine free and that is NOT going over well in my community. My system helps a lot but I feel if I knew better how to be persuasive with my opinions and showcase them in the proper format I would be able to get more people seeing my point of view.

59. For the State of Wisconsin to actually implement equity in their budget and program decisions.

60. Fund current systems (or new proposed service models) at a competitive level.

61. Funding in the form of grants.

62. Funding is important, but making accessible materials and speakers that would make themselves available to the rural library is also a benefit.

63. Funding solutions that are more stable and able to be depended on so can grow programs without having to worry if they will be able to be there the next year and training/funding for training so Library staff can get the training they need to help in all areas of need that our community is dealing with.

64. Funding.

65. Funding. Listening to libraries’ needs.

66. Funds need to be distributed differently. We should invest in bandwidth in the rural areas so that they have similar access to the urban areas. If that means
moving some funds to help out there, then so be it. I also think we should look at how funds are being spent. I believe one system pays for capital campaign consultants? That's foolish. If that is the case, those are funds that should instead go to a system in need of technology support. So we need to have someone with authority at the state level to say no to some of these expenditures, or we should put guidelines on use. I know people want local control, and they can still have that, but there are some things money is being spent on that is simply foolish.

67. Get rid of library systems altogether. Take that money and pay for equitable services for delivery, ILS, and Technology for all in a centralized way. Establish a central "consulting" at the state that the library systems provide now.

68. Grant opportunities regardless of library size. ???

69. Grants for materials, more data bases for the public - for instance, our library cannot afford a subscription to Ancestry.com.

70. Have a basic or standard level of services that are achievable for all size libraries. Then create levels of standards as population, staff and funding allow.

71. Have representatives of small communities; support small libraries through grants and technical support

72. Higher standards for staff and managers. Better CE opportunities overseen by professional educators and organizational trainers. Regional support centers emphasizing standardization.

73. I do not have any ideas. I would like to see service equity at basic levels but my concern is that in trying to create service equity, there could be services/funding taken away from some libraries in order to equalize services across the state. In my library's situation, I feel that if some of the plans that I have been hearing about were implemented for regionalizing more services it would essentially be taking services away from my library because, at the very least, the quality of services would most definitely go down.

74. I do not have any specific ideas per se. But I think we should look at other states who have successful and strong state library support such as Ohio.

75. I don't have an answer for this.

76. I don't know. I am a very new director and am just starting to understand how things work and may not know what is all available now.

77. I feel that the library system does a good job in maintain a level of service equality. I see specific things that the municipality could do, but nothing specific comes to mind far as the system could provide.

78. I have no ideas on this.

79. I think at the state level, overall branding of libraries should be addressed. Libraries offer so much more than just books and it is the overall image that needs attention. With that, people will easily be able to see the variety of materials, services, classes and events that all libraries offer.
80. I think it would be interesting to explore ideas around the state contracting certain services and programs, and finding ways to offer them to smaller libraries at subsidized costs. For example, if a nationally recognized author typically charges $3500 per visit, plus travel, but only comes to Milwaukee for one event, might they do a mini ‘tour’ of a region in the state at a heavily reduced cost because the number of visits is high enough to provide them adequate income for the ‘tour.’

81. I think that making sure that rural areas have equal access to the technology available in more urban areas is essential.

82. I think that with Eau Claire being 20 miles away, and West Salem being roughly 90 miles away, we would be better served being in a library system where Eau Claire is our resource library, allowing us to send staff to more training and workshops, and making it much easier on library system staff to make a trip to our location if necessary.

83. I would like to see other statewide efforts in the same vein as the WPLC consortium. A larger buying pool should be able to negotiate a much better price and would be able to offer the same services throughout the state. Also, in the meetings that I’ve attended about PLSR it seems like the delivery system needs to be updated to have several hubs and that doing this would result in the faster delivery of materials.

84. I would like to see state funding being shared more equitably with the smaller systems to make this possible in the smaller community libraries.

85. I would suggest more communication and collaboration between the systems, a model that serves libraries regionally, but is not bound by regional borders. By increasing communication and collaboration we can decrease the duplication of efforts and create efficiencies. This would allow available staff to provide service to more libraries or increase available services.

86. Identify centers of excellence within existing library systems and provide support for increasing capacity to extend high quality support services to more libraries over greater distances. I am interested in seeing the State of Wisconsin provide incentives to extend services in ways that increase equity. For many years, the Division administered federal grant funds in support of the creation and growth of shared automation systems. LSTA funds helped move the state in a desired direction. I realize that the future of LSTA in particular is unpredictable. However, the principle of setting out a general goal and providing resources as a spur to organic, innovative development in the desired direction remains sound.

87. Identifying gaps, strategies to close these gaps, and the role of the public library in closing these gaps.

88. If corporations were made to pony-up their fair share of taxes, there would be much that could be achieved by allocating funds to the essential educational entities of public schools and public libraries. This is a lofty goal, but one that could be critical to financially maintaining and evolving these crucial mainstays of the commons. Other than that, I have no other answers. Hopefully this process will bring the big ideas to the fore.
I'm not sure what is provided now by the State so I can't suggest any ideas currently.

I'm not sure. It's difficult becomes it may come down to money and it will be hard to convince some areas with better resources to give up some of their money or staff time in order to help the areas with fewer resources.

I'm sorry to say I don't have any grand ideas off the top of my head. I just continue doing the best I can for the patrons in my community with the part time hours I work and the budget I have. Most of time that means turning a blind eye to what the other libraries are doing. Maybe...librarians at smaller libraries don't need as many continuing education hours. We are part time librarians (less than 20 hours a week), the only staffed most of the time, then to add classes on top of that time. Also, a lot of those classes/webinars again don't pertain to the work we do or what our library offers.

Improved communication about what is happening at other libraries and how the systems are supporting them.

Improved coordination between WiLS, DPI, WLA and systems. Improved definitions and expectations for what 'resource library' within a system can/should provide.

Improving things like technology access, broadband access, delivery...could all help achieve equity.

In my experience, I think the current system works very well.

In my opinion, The MORE system has an ideal model of customer service and an ideal way of allowing each library to have a certain amount of control over customer service policies and procedures. I would hate for the state to step in and take ultimate control with formulated policies and "one rule fits all" model. I strongly feel individual autonomy is important and that every library needs to have the freedom to reflect the community it serves.

In the grand scheme of things, it would be fantastic if the State of Wisconsin would provide specific funding denoted to community resource diversification and equality. While I understand that funding can't be provided to the extent that we desire, it would still be nice to see the State of Wisconsin acknowledge the importance of Wisconsin libraries to our communities and supply additional funds to support library service diversification.

Include electronic checkouts in the annual circulation count reported to the state. A substantial part of our funding relies on circulation numbers to the counties. But Overdrive usage, which continues to grow, does not count as "circulation"! This means our funding is not reflective of a major portion of our services, and we can't improve them.

Incorporate special funding for sparsely populated communities (sparsity) and remote rural communities (excessive distances) to reach the desired goals of equitable high-quality library services. These two principles--sparsity and distance-- have begun to be utilized to assist public school districts with needed funding.
100. Increased funding Shared statewide catalog with equitable maintenance fees
State run delivery services - get the private companies out of the business - they
don’t care about libraries.

101. Invest in fiber optic infrastructure for high speed internet access in rural areas.
Help older rural libraries improve their physical buildings as far as handicap
access and space for programming.

102. It is my opinion that the state of Wisconsin cannot help improve equity. There is
always room for improvement. I feel my system does a great job but can always
improve.

103. Keep doing what you’re doing. We had a staff member benefited from the
Youth Services Institute in 2015, the recent upgrade to our library and branch
with Internet speeds (although we would love to even be faster, actually,) so
keep up the good work! We’d enjoy seeing regional learning for staff, too, so that
local libraries could day trip, especially for management, on trending topics for
their libraries.

104. Keep strong Library systems that can help us through training, help to keep us
relevant, and accountable. As a very small library, we have many challenges
but our biggest one is time. We never seem to have the man hours to do all that
needs to be done with donating our time.

105. Maintain state wide catalog (WISCAT); aid in statewide delivery system;
encourage shared catalogs with delivery systems; assist in providing statewide
CE.

106. Make libraries a priority.

107. Make library visits part of classwork, public assistance and anyone who gets
reduced pricing vaccinations for their pets.

108. Make my system membership more affordable for my tiny library.

109. Make our village board realize how important the local library is.

110. Make sure staff are trained on patron differentiation. Differentiation is not just for
the classroom; it’s important to realize and be able to provide different levels of
support/service to make sure all patrons have equitable treatment.

111. Make sure we get the information we need to share with our patrons.

112. Making funds available to meet ADA requirements such as - interpreters, assistive
technologies, these can be considered expensive, one-off services for a very
small portion of our service population. This can include communities with a
sudden need for, say, Spanish language materials, due to an influx of migrant
workers.

113. Mandatory 100% ACT 150 reimbursement rate Continue working on equal access
to internet.

114. More “smaller dollar” grant opportunities for programs and materials would be
helpful. For example, a $500 grant would go a long way for us to provide a whole
new or updated section of materials and would easily provide programming for
the whole year (even with us using local talent and providing more programs specific to this area).

115. More attention to small, rural, isolated libraries by sending out experts, etc. It is harder for our library staff to get away to conferences, workshops, variety of media, etc.

116. More consultants available to the library system and library directors. Continue to provide remote training. Grants to assist with technology, security & staff training. Continue to provide or supplement remote resources, i.e. BadgerLink. Understanding that the rural library is not just a small urban library. Resources and needs are very different.

117. More efficient/effective use of state funding. Better use of technology. Replacement of the Resource Library model with something statewide or regional. A statewide or regional library card. A statewide ILS or discovery layer that allows for easy sharing among libraries. State support of more online resources.

118. More funding.

119. More funding to better staff our libraries and to keep educating librarians to meet those changing needs.

120. More funding. Fewer library systems.

121. More system support-dollar wise.

122. N/A.

123. Not assume that the way things are in Madison and Milwaukee is the way things are.

124. Not restructure the systems. We will have to share our resources with more libraries and more than likely the north part of the state will be ignored as it is in other redistricting scenarios.

125. Not sure.

126. Offer funding to provide building or technology access for special needs patrons. Provide translations in several languages for common signage. (e.g. Information Desk, Printer, Children's Room, Restroom, Conference Room, Staff Only) Also, provide translations in different languages for local brochures regarding social services.

127. Offer more grants targeted at the smaller public libraries. Maybe there is no money however. I never think LSTA Grant money is advertised or talked up the way Per Capita grant money was talked up in Illinois. There we purchased resources, etc. based on the goals of the State Library. Those resources augmented our libraries with things we didn't really have the funds for.

128. Offer more system money to support databases and programing.

129. Official adoption of the revised Wisconsin Public Library Standards and followed by the adoption of a public library accreditation program. DPI needs to update their documents (Trustee Essentials still has language referencing library unions.)
More collaboration and emphasis needs to happen with regional resource libraries, as library leaders and who have direct contact with users. Important to note that some directors of regional resource libraries are not active in SRLAAW. Are their library boards aware?

130. One way would be to level the playing field in terms of what services are provided to public libraries outside of their municipal budgets. I understand that some library systems cover the costs of ILS, provide WLA membership and CE scholarships, and are very good at utilizing system funding and grant funding to provide added services to library staff and directly to library patrons. Our library system does not have the funding to do this, or has not made these issues a priority.

131. Our little library needs the technical support and the sharing of library material. We need help getting citizens to use the library.

132. Our service area also lacks affordable, reliable access to broadband/high-speed internet. As the trend of digital content continues (related to libraries and in general) our patrons are at a disadvantage simply because of their geographic location.

133. Outside of statewide delivery and interloan our library really could exist without a System. Perhaps streamlining the number of systems would free up funding to provide more services for the patrons themselves.

134. Perhaps it starts at the top: not all systems have PR staff, nor do they have good tech staff. Some system directors may have plush offices and staff travels to every conference across the state and country. If there’s equity at the system level, equity at the library level may follow.

135. Perhaps something like the state does for schools with sparsity aid, library funding could be weighted somewhat by similar circumstances.

136. Perhaps, help the smaller libraries to provide the same services as larger libraries if possible in some areas where there is a financial need by providing grants relevant to these needs.

137. Personal representative for point of contact and someone close by who visits the library more than once a year. Checklists, easy to read updates, and easily accessible guides.

138. Proper funding for all libraries.

139. Provide a consistent funding model statewide. There is a lot of variation in how libraries are funded. Too much of our budgets are dependent on the whims of local government.

140. Provide a description of the services provided by the different library systems. Ask the member libraries to indicate which services would be most desirable to them. Do a financial analysis to determine how best to provide those to the member libraries. Provide the analysis to the member libraries. Ask them to indicate again which services would be most desirable in the context of the financial resources required to provide them with input from their respective communities. Put together a plan, perhaps in stages, to request the funding over time to meet the
goals based on what the communities of Wisconsin want from their libraries and put together a campaign to have constituents contact their lawmakers to support the plan.

141. Provide for the equitable distribution of resources state-wide.
142. Provide funding for staff and programs.
143. Provide libraries reimbursement for ebook checkouts.
144. Provide more centralized services when appropriate/
145. Provide more money for more broadband, staff, outreach, and help from every system.
146. Provide some funding.
147. Providing access to materials or services that my little library cannot offer.
148. Providing good leadership and development programs to help staff with this.
149. Put back into place "that the local funding cannot fall below the average of the past three years" or something that makes local governmental bodies not able to save or divert funds/money by cutting their library's monetary support. Plus I am sure there are many other ways in which the State if Wisconsin can help libraries. I am not sure consolidation of systems would be one of those ways.
150. Raise expectations from the bare minimum of a director who is in the library just 10 hours per week and the measly $2,500 in materials expenditures required to meet public library system membership requirements.
151. Really examine the ways that you can support libraries of all sizes. Whether it be state aid or some other way of funding, being able to offer the same services to individual libraries regardless of their budget is essential.
152. Recalculate the funding model.
153. Remember that there are rural libraries. Just because the service is available in Madison or Milwaukee does not mean it is available in the rural environment of Northwest Wisconsin. Provide more funding for libraries.
154. Robust financial support of Badgerlink, for equitable access to high-quality database information. Create a Speakers Bureau for those interested and willing to reach out to share their talents with Wisconsin libraries, particularly libraries in rural parts of the state. Bringing together members of the public with those that are creating content is a win-win. Create a Wisconsin Library Grant Program for small libraries with big ideas.
155. Same services across the state for patrons.
156. Savings on products or services that can be more efficiently provided on a larger scale. Sharing tested and effective procedures.
157. See what is working well currently and build on that. I have heard wonders about Indianhead’s great tech support and training. NWLS is definitely lacking on both those things. It is amazing how system support varies. I would like our system to have more resources available to check out. I would like more hands
on training by NWLS staff. I would like 5 day a week delivery and top of the line tech support. Definitely more help on the cataloging front as well.

158. Service network for transferring materials around the state should be fluid and interconnected better than it currently is.

159. Services could be provided by size/type of library rather than by geographic location. Small rural libraries have much different needs than large urban libraries.

160. Set a minimum set of standards for libraries to meet and allow state funding to pay for all these requirements. Libraries systems that already have been able for meet these standards can assist struggling libraries when needed (be it salary for workers to train or changing formulas to encourage the money that the wealthy libraries receive from the state that is not used to meet the 'extras.' Checkout numbers are not the only variable of the success of a library.

161. Set standard service levels. broadband, ILL, e-resources. (I'm not even taking open hours or wages) Reduce funding in bigger areas with more generous (and much better paid citizens and higher tax rates due to WI state levy restrictions based on net new construction) and help those libraries in smaller / more rural areas be able to offer an equitable service.

162. Share the wealth - offer a way for rural, small libraries to be able to afford to offer things larger libraries can.

163. Shared costs for digital periodicals, not just Badgerlink; shared media subscriptions ie Hoopla.

164. Sharing resources.

165. Sorry, I would need to think about this problem a great deal more to give an answer.

166. Stabilized funding for systems and collaborative efforts. Ensuring rural and undeserved areas receive funding and systems receive grants to install and provide Community Area Networks and BadgerNet lines so those areas may grow. Ensure the resource libraries for each System are properly staffed and funded for this use as well as their larger use as a system library. Make the state reports truly reflect library uses--count e materials both through the Wisconsin Digital Library and on BadgerLink (both accessible with a library card) towards library circulation. Count computer use and traffic towards consideration for IT funding within a system. A strong library system and libraries within that system makes a strong workforce for Wisconsin.

167. Standardization of the menu of services available at each public library in WI (to scale).

168. Standards that reflect the needs of the majority of individuals in the state....such as number of story times offered per population, number of hours open, WiFi availability, etc.

169. Start here: -Precisely define equity -Specify each library without "access to services and support ...," -Determine for each: Is this a local/county or a system
funding level issue? A difference in system priorities or chargeback formulas? Something else? Specify what “equity” achieves and how we will measure that. Those steps are problem definition; without them appropriate solutions cannot be determined. Next, implement: For libraries to qualify to receive, directly or indirectly, state dollars, they must demonstrate sufficient local/county funding of basic library services at a minimum or higher level: funding ILS operating and replacement costs, and funding materials expenditures and staffing appropriate to their population. This will incentivize local support. State dollars are limited and transferring a large percentage of them to underfunded libraries would damage the majority of Wisconsin libraries, causing an average degradation of library services statewide. *Non-qualifying libraries can consider county consolidation advocate for greater funding.

170. Statewide automation system. Statewide library card.

171. Systems are important and should be funded at higher levels.

172. That is a hard question. After attending some of the WLA sessions regarding the work groups, it seemed pretty clear that not every library/library system was on an equal playing field. Now that we know that, we really should address it but I think we need to dig deeper into why/how. The important thing would be to make sure that we are all LIFTED UP to the same level rather than brought DOWN to an equal level....I did not realize why everyone always wanted to talk about funding until attending those sessions.

173. THAT is the question. Finding a way to get out to the people, especially in a rural area, might be helpful.

174. The big ones for our patrons are delivery. Items could get to us a lot faster. It usually takes one week for loans within our system and two weeks for WisCat items. We could use some more tech support too. Help with library’s website and the library system libraries could be a lot more reactive to patrons technology needs, especially notifications and a more intuitive, appealing library catalog.

175. The county reimbursement minimum (for non-resident patrons) of only 70% is unfair, especially to smaller libraries. In effect, this is requiring our tiny village (which houses only approximately 30% of our patrons) to subsidize 30% of the cost for everybody else in our area who uses the library. Having 100% reimbursement for non-resident circulation would improve our budget enough to afford us the ability to provide more hours, more staff, etc. to patrons.

176. The funding formula for systems must change. While we appreciate the effort of various PLSR subcommittees to combine and share resources, many systems are already doing this, especially small and more rural systems. Libraries and systems must create their own Connecticut Compromise to ensure equity across the state. Large libraries and systems may have to consider reducing some services that go above and beyond in order to provide a basic level of service for ALL libraries in the state. We may also need to consider an education campaign to inform our patrons, lawmakers, supporters, and communities about why we are doing what we are doing and how, overall, it will benefit everyone. I think we
also need to look very closely at the proposed consultant and technology plans to determine whether we can afford increasing the number of available consultants/technology around the state without increasing a library’s overall budget.

177. The funding formula will need to be recalculated, taking into account the new service models being discussed. I believe we should consider a base funding amount for all systems with additional factors being population, geography, and poverty rates. The weight given each of these factors should also be recalculated. We should examine if any current practices within systems are creating surpluses that are not benefiting all systems and libraries. Some systems appear to be charging its members for services, resulting in excess revenues. As a business model, this may make sense. As a practice for a state-funded entity? It makes me uncomfortable.

178. The gap in services between library systems is awful right now. There are systems that have great services and support for libraries (thankfully we are in the best one) but I’ve seen others that offer almost nothing to their libraries. It seems unfair to the libraries, but ultimately to the patrons. All libraries should be able to offer the same level of service and learning for patrons, so they can improve their lives and be productive at work and at school.

179. The library system funding formula could be looked at as a means of achieving the goal of service equity.

180. The State of Wisconsin needs to look at Statute 43 funding formulas and needs to directly get involved in libraries in technology needs and training of personnel. The trickle-down effect through municipalities, counties and systems doesn’t help when geographically, our service area for our residents is 30x larger vs other "cities" libraries in our county. If all funding is based on circulations, not service (including electronic & face to face information exchanging ) along with programming needs, it can’t ever improve without donations. And donations are usually used for tangible items, not salaries & utilities. Why do libraries need to pay the full cost for director’s basic 4 classes? The biggest helps in technology - no brainers like T1 lines & computers in the old days were fast easy improvement concepts. With limited staff with limited skills,, but the familiarity with population in rural libraries, library personnel need these.

181. The State of Wisconsin should do everything it can do pursue federal, state, grant, private, and any other kinds of funding that can then be pushed out to library systems. It should take system evaluations of needs as well as demographic and economic information into consideration when allocating that funding. The State of WI should provide transparency into the process; from funding sources to evaluation of services and resources provided.

182. The State of Wisconsin should offer more support for our libraries. Maybe offering programs for special needs and the unemployed to help find work.

183. The State should formally follow up on annual report system effectiveness comments. In addition, the State should mandate system governance guidelines
and transparency of fee structuring. Library system decisions should be 'one library, one vote'.

184. There has to be more funding.

185. There is strength in numbers. Sharing costs, knowledge, technology and services on a larger scale should make offerings more effective and equitable for all libraries.

186. There must be a fair funding formula and updated state statutes to reflect the changing technology. Most importantly, fewer systems in the state to improve efficiencies and hopefully create equality.

187. They have been successful in trying to increase our bandwidth so we are comparable to bigger city libraries - but we can always use more! We often lack technology resources that bigger cities have because we are so isolated in our location.

188. This library is a small, rural library with part-time staff. Staff members are required to know something about every task in the library and cannot concentrate on any one area. System support in technology, cataloging, library policies and procedures, social media, building and using a website, grants and grant writing, municipality, Library Board, and Director responsibilities, and so much more.

189. Through close collaboration and shared services, I hope libraries can get more bang for less buck. I hope that fewer system staff redundancies throughout the state will allow for a proliferation of professional services offered and overall cost savings to those of us who pay more for our system services at this time.

190. Through surveys at the system level, the System Director could monitor the equity within the system and report the gaps in service equity within the system. Only then can one truly see where the gaps are for rural libraries vs urban libraries.

191. Through training, funding, and communication regarding various opportunities available.

192. To improve the business climate, community-supported internet services that would make it affordable for new businesses to set up shop in a small town. Often there is a ready and willing, but under-educated workforce available that need only the chance to find a job in the community. Another improvement would be transit services connecting employment hubs (like Wisconsin Dells) with the rural community around it. The potential workforce surrounding the Dells needs reliable transportation. Various types of shuttle buses have been tried, but they need support from the State to really be able to continue.

193. To offer feedback to all libraries through local publicizing of positive events and activities at each library. We need positive support, forget about the negative comments. All people count!

194. Training about services available AND really recognize the importance of small libraries in small and rural communities.

195. Transparency and communication. If you asked me what services were available at different systems throughout the state and if they were comparable
to our services I wouldn’t be able to tell you. I know you can look it up but most of the time it’s not consistent. What does “Tech support” mean? It’s different for everyone.

196. Understanding that smaller libraries have smaller budgets, allow for proportionate pricing for resources.

197. Using resources and collaborating among libraries in order to provide more services to patrons (ex: Memory Cafe among a group of libraries).

198. We could use help in making sure all citizens are aware of what the library offers.

199. We feel our area does fairly well. We really don’t have the full picture of where inequities may lie. Brown County Library charging our county for services is still a HUGE issue in Kewaunee County and we hope it gets addressed. It leads to problems and misunderstandings. We want libraries to be seen in a positive light and not that they are costing taxpayers and the county so much money.

200. We hope that small libraries can continue to provide all the services a larger library can provide.

201. We must provide high-speed Internet to all areas, which Badgernet is helping make a reality.

202. We need more money.

203. Winnefox offers service equity to 29 (in the past 30) libraries. This will be the point of PLSR to figure out how to achieve this goal.

204. Wisconsin libraries need to offer same services, as they currently do in many ways. However, individual libraries also need to be able to service community-specific needs and maintain their individuality. This is going to be a tough equation to balance. Whatever model is adopted, it is essential that the policy-makers are accountable to upholding high standards that contribute to the excellent services currently being provided by Wisconsin Libraries.