# Model W Review Summary Document

Notes taken on June 8, 2018 by DPI liaison to the PLSR Steering Committee and the CRCs John DeBacher during a committee of the whole discussion of the newly proposed Model W. Notes are based upon the flipchart notes recorded by the facilitators Linda and Jeff Russell of Russell Consulting, Inc. and additional comments captured by John DeBacher.

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

- Increased Funding for All
- Current Boundaries don’t shift as much
- Dissipates tension will be limited
- Far less disruption to libraries & system staff
- Addresses inequities through standards & accountability (should improve patron experience)
- Utilizes existing statutes (may be easier to get approved)
- Seeks to directly address population density issue (that may be equity)
- Doesn’t add additional organizational structural hierarchies
- Evolutionary rather than revolutionary change
- Collaboration-based; encourages partnerships without mandating them
- Allows current partnerships to be nourished
- Integrates low-hanging fruits (with Steve’s additions)

Before proceeding to the next question, the Russell’s asked: Are we all in general agreement with these flipchart notes for this question? There were no dissenters.

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

- Loses potential to be transformative
- Success is based on statutory changes coming through (funding formula change)
- Possible to lose efficiency that may have been gained in other ways
- No new efficiencies of scale
- Issues with technology support -- local libraries may need to dip into local funding
- Would require a legislative tweak to achieve funding change
- Doesn’t address redundancies of payroll, boards, inefficiencies
- No easier way to redraw boundaries
- Is this all the change after a 3-year process?
- Using the survey of the library systems creates false issue by lack of awareness
- Assumes new capacities from existing structures
- Assumes that if you use more money you do better - not enough for underperforming (assumes additional funding provides innovation)
- The proposal urges changes to statutes to provide more standards

Before proceeding to the next question, the Russell’s asked: Are we all in general agreement with these flipchart notes for this question? There were no dissenters.
3. What is the unique contribution/approach of this model?

- DPI has greater involvement holding systems accountable
- Since it builds on the existing model, implementation is eased, less blow-back to get process started
- Seems very system-focused - does it have enough “trickle-down” for the library patron? It was noted that this was also integral in Model X.
- Addresses inequity through funding formula rather than through radical structural or service changes
- Builds on the current strengths of the existing structure
- Doesn’t reduce the current number of systems It was noted there is an additional consideration to address that. Possible but not mandatory.

Before proceeding to the next question, the Russell’s asked: Are we all in general agreement with these flipchart notes for this question? There were no dissenters.

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

Note: design principles listed in parentheses indicates a lack of consensus among the group as to whether the model fully satisfies, partially satisfies, or fails to satisfy the principle.

**Fully Satisfied Principles:**

- 9
- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- 7
- (8)
- 4

**Partially Satisfied Principles:**

- (1)
- (8)
- (5)
- 10
- (2)
- 3

**Fails to Satisfy these Principles:**

- 5
- 6
- 2
- 10

**Unclear or Not Sure if this/these Principles are Satisfied**
Discussion:

- #2 - appears in all. the model doesn’t drive innovation, but doesn’t necessarily incentivize. Also #10 isn’t wholly met - hard to
- It was suggested that innovation can be better met since it may provide more funding. Allows for systems to determine how they innovate. The multi-year process as codifying the possible improvements, but this is so status quo. Innovation comes from more than with just system aid.
- #1 “Partial” because there are different camps - in some systems, more change is needed--that steering committee was trusted to create change--this didn’t do much (though some might say it does)
- #3 Innovation is so subjective, some may think current allows for it; others would not
- #8 If Standards+, then it is partially satisfied. It misses the opportunity to get there. Others may think so.
- #5 It’s unknown whether things would get more or less efficient. It doesn’t necessarily state how they would be made, but since that is already happening, so it happens when/whether it happens. It was noted that the low-hanging fruit helps it be partially met. The workgroup reports can be mined for more efficiencies and even transformative changes.
- #5 how does it fail to satisfy? Doesn’t change status quo enough. Though the funding change addresses inequity so it’s partially satisfied.

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

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

- System staff - systems in general
- Resource libraries
- Systems that are currently under-resources (and their stakeholders)
- Certain municipalities, since less funding burden MIGHT be place on them
- LD&L - could be very laser-focused “makable case” legislative change and budget support
- If funding component works and it leads to higher standards, then the patrons win
- It was asked if the funding model could go on any of the models—this would need to be looked at.
- A large number of the public libraries, since there would be less disruption
- Strong potential for counties to support the model (increased funding, less burden on counties, service improvement)

Which are likely to be resistant? Why?

- Maybe in SWLS (some discussion)
- Tracy noted that this process doesn’t necessarily HAVE to be transformative. It was suggested that none of the workgroups suggested “blowing up” the current structure
- Maybe very small systems
- Library patrons might be considered losers (if compared to what PLSR might have provided)
• All of us, if funding disappears. It was noted that great relationships have been built that prevents that and that all models risk cataclysm. It was suggested that the model isn’t scalable
• DPI: might be more for them to do (that may make them winners, too)
• Standards may provide a negative, if it would require changes that can’t be met
• The group wanted more information on Standards – a standards task force would be used to define these.

Before proceeding to the next question, the Russell’s asked: Are we all in general agreement with these flipchart notes for this question? There were no dissenter.

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?

• Trying to use the administration code for the standards rather than legislation
• Try to make non-compliance have less impact on local libraries: minimize impact of system standards non-compliance on local libraries
• Integrate more consolidated services (Steve’s additions may address that)
• Streamline a process for system boundaries to be voluntarily changed
• A mechanism for funding to go to libraries in need - how to benefit the smaller libraries - Have a way to address inequities within a system, as well as statewide
• Incorporate more encouragement to continue changes - don’t just make the initial funding changes and then ignore the workgroups
• Address duplications and redundancies
• Look at ways to address the “uniqueness” of Milwaukee County

Before proceeding to the next question, the Russell’s asked: Are we all in general agreement with these flipchart notes for this question? There were no dissenter.

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 pursuing? 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 specific legislative and regulatory changes would be required?
• What happens if the increase in funding is not available or is less than what the model proposes?
• Is there a way to test this against the inequities we’re aware of already? How much help would this provide?
• How do we institutionalize the implementation of the workgroup reports’ potential? How do then not get forgotten?
• What are potential standards and accountability roles?
• How will transition details be addressed?

The Russell’s asked if the group had enough information to assess this model and then distributed “ballot” to the group to rate the model on the 10-point effectiveness scale.