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Public Library Service Model X

Model Title: Current Regional System Structure

Summary Description
This model is based on the current 16 library system structure and current State Statute but reduces the number of systems. System size could range from 3 to 15 counties with the initial number of libraries of not less than 15 libraries but not to exceed 75. Additional new libraries could be added after the formation of the new regional structure. Maintaining regional service philosophy with some increased scale for efficiency.

Structure
Local system board (appointment based on current statute)
  Alternative representation by library sizes
Local system staff (varies by system and funding)
  System Director
  Consultants
  Technology infrastructure and support (add as required service)
  Support staff such as business managers
Existing statewide services have a service advisory group
Access to services are limited based on regional availability or agreements
Online portal
Statewide discovery layer
Mandatory System Services and Standards to support equity of service (SRLAAW Creating More Effective Public Library Systems 2013)

ILS
Regional ILS are based on individual system boundaries and/or collaborative efforts between systems. Existing ILSs could co-exist within an expanded system area.

ILL
Regional ILL service boundaries would be based on system boundaries.

Delivery
The proposed delivery regions are based around current shared ILS boundaries.
Statewide delivery hubs would be a variation from current practice.

Collections
Electronic Resources
Some electronic resources such as Overdrive (cooperatively purchased) and BadgerLink (state funded) are already provided statewide. Statewide advisory group could establish the baseline of resources along access to additional resources as determined by local needs.

Digitization

- Supports statewide services and regional digitization kits would require coordination between boundaries.

**Consulting/CE/Professional Development**

Consulting staff would be located within system boundaries. Data; facilities; and other consultants could be added based on agreements or other mechanisms to share staff.

**Technology Support**

System based infrastructure and support staff.

Variation—agreements to build larger infrastructure regions

**Resource Libraries**

Doesn’t support model recommendation. Each region could maintain a resource library or libraries in support of specialized collections.

**Key Challenges/Questions with this Model**

1. How to increase services without impacting other system funding? Without new funding how will funds be allocated to achieve equity of service?
   a. How to ensure services are available to libraries/systems
2. Incentives to consolidate systems and ILSs.
3. Does this remove silos of expertise?
4. For cooperatively established services (either by MOU or agreement) how is hiring, retention and changes in expectation managed to ensure the stability of relationships?
5. How are statewide services held accountable?
6. How are system service held accountable for statewide equity?
7. Is sparsity funding a long term viable option to support service improvement to libraries?
8. Balancing of state funding between new system areas.
9. Roles for existing library service agencies/providers.
10. Implementation timeline
11. Can consultants share responsibilities?
12. How to determine qualifying skills for consultants
13. How can we make it easier for entire systems merge with each other?
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Global Summary

What
Reduces the number of library systems by requiring each system to include a minimum of 3 counties. This would require the 3 Systems with just one county (MKE, Kenosha, and Rock) and the 5 that include just two counties (Lakeshores, Bridges, Outagamie-Waupaca, Manitowoc-Calumet) to consolidate in some way. Would result in a maximum of 13 systems.

Where
Southeastern Wisconsin is most impacted, also the area most densely populated.

When
The timeline would need to be determined.

Why
Increase in scale will create efficiencies.

How
Method would need to be determined

Structure
Maintains current system structure; there are just fewer of them. Includes statewide portal and discovery layer.

Governance
System Boards still govern the system and determine how funding is used.

Funding
Each of the consolidated systems will have budgets that will have no net increases, as the formula will remain the same.

How Workgroup Recommendations Relate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workgroup</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>Statewide discovery layer. No dramatic change needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>Would align with new system boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Would align with new system boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>Not impacted, but could lead to more cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/CE</td>
<td>Implement online portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Would consolidate services in new systems; would not help all members who are crying out for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Resource Libraries should be maintained and deliver agreed upon services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Library</td>
<td>Changes would be required, unless this was a recommendation to be voluntarily implemented. MCFLS Board would need to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 43</td>
<td>What financial incentives would motivate systems and members to make these changes? The impact on cross-border and reciprocal borrowing would likely be exacerbated. Resource Libraries may need updated language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Model X - System Based on Current Model of 16 Systems

**State / County (Funding)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
<td>System Board (Governance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
<td>Executive Director (Operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
<td>Management Team Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
<td>Advisory Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
<td>Local Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Service

- **Statewide Online State Portal**
- **Statewide Discovery Layer**

### Member Input

- Advisory Committees
- Local Libraries
- Local Boards
- Local Communities
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Public Library Service Model: X: Current Regional System Structure

1. What are the Strengths/Upsides of the Model?

- Good in general; one county systems aren’t the most efficient
- Conceivable; not a big leap; keeping the baby, baby knows parents
- Trust maintained, as core group remains the same
- Provides for continuity of existing relationships
- Calms fears; smaller doses of change
- Addresses accountability; comfort level; feel they have stronger voice with system membership
- Counties are proud of systems they have; some don’t want borders to change
- Easily align with WG proposals—portal/discovery layer/delivery especially

2. What are the potential challenges/downsides of this model?

- This model doesn’t focus on the patron experience; it focuses on system staff and convenience
- Status quo won’t help half of the state but will radically affect SE
- Puts stress on the heavily resourced area (SE) that doesn’t necessarily need the “help”—forcing realignment based on county number does not make sense
- Squander effort of the library community (PSLR process); if changes only affect small subset, it does not take advantage of the momentum
- Balancing of state funding—how do you fix what is broken without undoing what is working?
- ILL boundaries based on system boundaries
- Forcing MKE to join with 2 other counties would be politically very challenging
- Possible challenges with those with standalone ILSs
- Resource library roles uncertain
- Uncertain whether this model offers enough opportunity for innovation
- Does not address current service inequities
- Does not future-proof systems
- Could shift back to status quo; service standard accountabilities challenges
3. What is the unique contribution/approach of this model?

- Ease of implementation (but with SE step back)
- Community expectations of grander solution; “3 years for what?"

4. Which design principles does this model fully satisfy, partially satisfy, and fail to satisfy?

Fully Satisfied Principles:
3. Include transparency in decision-making
4. Ensure accountability

Partially Satisfied Principles:
1. Proactively foster, build, and maintain trust—not a leap for most of state, but not for SW
5. Achieve efficiencies
6. Protect PL willingness to explore new service models/large scale collaborations

Fails to Satisfy these Principles:
2. Allow for innovation and services to evolve
8. Respond to local needs—not getting better for little guys and some big guys either
9. Preserve/improve level of services currently provided—status quo or worse
10. Ensure all PLs have capacity to provide equitable access to services—if it isn’t happening now, how will this model fix it?

Unclear or Not Sure if this/these Principles are Satisfied:
7. Minimize any negative fiscal impact on libraries—doesn’t address it enough

5. Does this model create winners/losers or does everyone win?

- Same winners/losers as right now, except with the potential for more losers (SE)

Which library stakeholders are likely to be strongly supportive? Why?

- Popular with anyone anxious with this process, system staff worried about jobs, systems that are already fiscally stable, high functioning and don’t need change, mid-sized systems
- Politicians who are satisfied with the way things are
- Those who are not educated on this process, out of the loop, have the attitude that if it isn’t broken why fix it, not realizing something is broken
Which are likely to be resistant? Why?

- SE Wisconsin
- Single county/small county library systems that will be forced to merge
- Anyone feeling the pain of inequity, because they may want more change than this provides
- Resource libraries—status unclear; no mandated purpose in new WG model
- Local stakeholders—counties, system trustees who may not want to expand or share the vote

6. Suggested Changes to Improve the Model

What changes could be made to this model to improve its responsiveness to the design principles, reduce the downsides, and reduce losses for one or more stakeholders?

- Adjust/fix the funding formula and system funding
  - Don’t create new winners/losers
  - Preserve service levels
  - Ensure stability
- Shift local cost to state—state funded “core services” such as delivery or other services all libraries provide
- Uniform data, fiscal, accounting practices/standards
- All systems cannot provide the WG recommendations as described.
- Build collaborations to connect service needs to grow/strengthen public services
- Higher standards to be a public library—local territory, local responsibility
- Incentivize/create pathways to create larger units of service/governance (county consolidation, branch models)
- Change system membership requirements
- Recommend districts (v. open access?)
- Expand/increase public library standards

7. Questions that Need Answers/Information We Need

What are the questions about this model that first need to be answered to enable us to make a decision about whether this model is worth pursing? In other words, what additional information do we need to inform our judgements about this model? What information is most critical for us to know? Where might this information be available?

- What would happen if used another dataset, rather than county borders, as minimum size? For example, 500,000 minimum population?
- Could this be phase 1 for implementation of another model or to build statewide structure (portal, discovery layer, delivery)
- Why not innovation? [red text added during large group discussion]
  - Some innovation is stifled now; this would not change that
- Would there be a way to find additional partnership that would lead to other revenues... LD&L mentioned, supplementary formula to help ease inequity.
  - Stability of funding—how would that be sustainable?
• Accountability—where did it fall?
  o Answer: fully
  o Comment: System effectiveness statement doesn’t do much…
  o Reply: we were thinking about it in a different way
• Thought Model X would be more positive; in light of survey, thought it would be more positive
• Straw man: the changes in Model X are not the equity changes that expected, so it seems that it was set up to fail
• Great things came out of the process whether or not things change
• How could service inequities be addressed within this model
• Still think there is potential with this model
• Not surprised by findings; don’t know about the possibilities until you see what is on the other side.