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Public Library Service Model Z

Model Title: One Statewide Library System

Summary Description
A single statewide library system that includes different statewide and regional layers of service. An executive director sets the service expectations and vision with input from the service advisory committees and management team. The system governing board includes representation from each service region. Statewide philosophy of service. Act as a quasi-governmental agency similar to the existing multicounty systems.

Structure

**Governing Board (Representation from each service areas)**

**Executive Director**

**Administrative Support Staff—Business Manager, Administrative Assistant**

**Statewide Services Management Team**

- Delivery
- ILS/ILL
- Collections
- Consulting/CE
- Technology

**Statewide Services Staff**

- ILL support
- Technology infrastructure
- Collections
  - Digitization
  - Electronic Resources

**Regional Services Staff**

- Larger Region such as Facilities or Data
- Consulting Regions such as Administration, Youth Services, Adult Services, Marketing and advocacy, and Inclusive services

**Statewide Resource Library**

- Online portal
- Statewide discovery layer

This model would be similar to the Maine service model.
**ILS**

The model would support existing regional ILS networks with support for creating larger units of service and inclusion of additional ILS members.

Coordination of among regional ILSs.

**ILL**

State-level ILL Support.

Regional ILL service boundaries can be supported.

**Delivery**

Delivery to the individual hubs would be managed by statewide management team member.

Regional delivery based on hubs and ILS.

Regional operational delivery staff as needed for individual region

Multi-type service to libraries and regions.

**Collections**

Electronic Resources

- Some electronic resources such as Overdrive and BadgerLink are already provided statewide. The statewide approach could establish the baseline of resources along access to additional resources as determined by local needs.

Digitization

- Supports statewide services and regional digitization kits.

**Consulting/CE/Professional Development**

Consulting staff dispersed across the state with a primary regional contact.

Allows for collaboration and connections to happen as needed across the state for all libraries.

**Technology Support**

Proposed three regions based on the ideal delivery map. Delivery regions will support their distribution needs.

Statewide structure -- PC imagining/infrastructure/maintenance, Procurement, Network design/equipment/processes

Regional field offices to provide direct support/on-site work can be supported by this model.
**Resource Libraries**

A statewide resource library would be supported by this model. Variations could be: Delivery region resource libraries to support specialized collections within a region.

**Key Challenges/Questions with this Model**

1. Ability to merge under current Statute would be difficult. Can a minor tweak to Statute help facilitate this model?
2. Perception of a “Madison” person telling us what to do.
3. Is it too top-heavy? Balance of administration and service.
4. Creating a mechanism to ensure local voices are heard.
5. Location of statewide staff
6. Roles for existing library service agencies/providers.
7. Implementation timeline
8. Can consultants share responsibilities?
9. How to determine qualifying skills for consultants
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Global Summary

What
Eliminates existing system structure and is replaced with a single "system" that is responsible for providing services to local libraries.

Where
Affects everyone

When
The timeline would need to be determined.

Why
Increase in scale will create efficiencies.

How
Method would need to be determined

Structure
An Executive Director oversees the operation of the system to meet the expectations and vision established with an advisory committee and with the efforts of a management team and other employees. Established as a quasi-governmental agency. Includes statewide portal and discovery layer.

Governance
A governing board consists of representatives from each service area.

Funding
No mention of funding in this model. The model could ensure service equity if the funding remained the same and everyone received the same service levels. The cost to local libraries - if any - could be a subsidy to systems with less local funding available.

How Workgroup Recommendations Relate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILS</th>
<th>Statewide discovery layer that supports existing regional networks with support for creating larger units of service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>State-level ILL supported; regional ILL service boundaries can be supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Includes service to multi-type libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>Continuation of state purchasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/CE</td>
<td>Consulting staff disperse across the state with a primary regional contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Support</td>
<td>Overlays 3 technology support regions. State level purchasing, imaging, network design, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Library</td>
<td>Statewide Resource Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What are the Strengths/Upsides of the Model?

Comments of workgroup:

- Puts the service providers closer to the revenue source
- One system would lead to one clear philosophy and goal set
- Clearer, easier path to equity – nimble, unified budget
- Single resource library?
- Greater purchasing power
- Coordination of special collections via a single resource library
- Field office concept creates opportunity for regional relationships
- Single data collection/collocation point
- Clear efficiencies for delivery and technology
- Well defined management team concept

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:

Define “Madison-effect” – concept that some bureaucracy in the capital is telling us what to do (as a small library – overriding local control).

Service –offices- how are they defined – workgroup didn’t discuss, felt that part of the model was unclear. ILS/CE Office is what was meant by service offices.

Do you see any opportunities to partner with other state agencies? We felt being part of state procurement would slow things down – workgroup didn’t recognize that model proposed a centralized procurement body not DOA/DPI.
2. What are the potential challenges/downsides of this model?

Comments of workgroup:

- State procurement process is onerous and slow
- Requires statutory change
- Chances are great for unintended consequences caused by changes to statute
- What happens to services currently provided by systems that don't fit into this model?
- How would county fit in to this?
- How to reconcile service standards created by system and “last mile” service provision in resource-light areas of state
- Model doesn’t address accountability at county and local level
- Bringing innovation to local level would be a challenge
- It’s hard to steer a big ship
- Less redundancy, more funding vulnerability
- Creates more negative and positive competition (more propensity for “zero-sum” thinking)
- State librarian appointing authority is important (appointed by Governor or other body?)
- There would need to be an extremely effective mechanism to win trust of all stakeholders for this to be effective
- Needs to be a carrot or a stick for large libraries to participate

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:

None

3. What is the unique contribution/approach of this model?

Comments of workgroup:

- Management team = ability to address interconnectedness of services
- Statewide discovery layer
- Unique opportunity for singular focus in accomplishing projects/initiatives
  - ILS interoperability, network convergence
- Unified e-resource procurement opportunities
- Governing board with regional representation of all regions
- “Single bucket” approach to state aid
- Statewide ILL support?

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:
None

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

Comments of workgroup:

Fully Satisfied Principles:
10 – Ensure all Wisconsin public libraries have the capacity to provide equitable access to excellent library services regardless of the race, ethnicity, income, gender, or employment status of the people they serve, or their location within the State (potential for fully depending on ???)

Partially Satisfied Principles:
4 - Ensure accountability to the public library community (partial to unclear by virtue of single chain of command/accountability chain)
5 - Achieve efficiencies relative to cost and service (partial with possibility for fully)
6 - Protect public libraries willingness to explore new service models and to enter into large scale collaborations (collaboration intrinsic to model, innovation may be dampened due to model)

Fails to Satisfy these Principles:
8 – Respond to local public library needs (torn between partial and fails) – the struggle is real

Unclear or Not Sure if this/these Principles are Satisfied:
1 - Proactively foster, build, and maintain trust throughout the library community in Wisconsin – Madison factor, county trust hard to achieve
2 - Allow for innovation and for services to evolve (some workgroup participants leaned
3 - Include transparency in decision making - need more details on: roles and powers,
7 - Minimize any negative fiscal impact on libraries as much as possible – risk exists from cracking open Chapter 43. Potentially positive due to collective fiscal approach
9 – Preserve or improve the level of services currently provided by systems. Services will not be decreased for some libraries in order to improve services for others

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:
None
5. Does this model create winners/losers or does everyone win?

Comments of workgroup:

Which library stakeholders are likely to be strongly supportive? Why?
- Under-resourced (libraries, counties, systems)
- Stakeholders used to dealing with change
- Entities that stand to be “rolled in” to statewide model
- Large libraries (potentially)

Which are likely to be resistant? Why?
- Feedback from workgroup:
- Well-resources (Counties, local library boards, small libraries
- Small libraries (rural) – Madison effect
- LD&L – Systems fund SRLAAW financial advocacy (differing perspectives on this point)
- Any stakeholder placing exceptional value on local control
- Current systems
- Some resource libraries?

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:
None

6. Suggested Changes to Improve the Model

Comments of workgroup:
- 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?
- Some mechanism for infusing library-level advocacy/representation/oversight into the model
- Build library-ed/library-centric decision-making into the model

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:
None
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?

Comments of workgroup:

- Many resulting from “unknown” answers to Question #4
- Fine governance mechanics (who, how elected, duties, term limits, powers, funding)
- How will this model translate into “boots on the ground” reality?

COMMENTS OF WHOLE GROUP:

None