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# Public Library Service Model

## Global Summary

**What** Focuses on **improving** local library services throughout Wisconsin through update of library system standards of service and accountability structure, adoption of a more equitable library system funding formula while maintaining the current successful regional library system structure.

**Where** Statewide

**When** The timeline would need to be determined but changes could be implemented in the near future.

**Why** There is a **high level of satisfaction** regarding library system services among the state’s public libraries (see page 4 of “A Report on Findings from the Public Library System Redesign Survey” [here](#)). This model builds on successes and offers remedies where inequity and dissatisfaction exist.

**How** Creation and implementation of revised library system standards followed by changes in the state’s library system funding formula will offer all library systems the ability to provide services that better meet the needs of their member libraries.

**Structure** The structure currently in place would remain unchanged. The **adaptability and flexibility of the current structure** offers opportunities for partnerships described in Workgroup Recommendations.

**Governance** The current governance structure would remain in place. However, in its role of overseeing library systems’ accountability to revised standards of service, DPI would be able to explore additional leadership opportunities.

**Funding** The current state aid to library systems formula in WI Stat. 43.24 (1) (a) would be replaced with the equity-based formula outlined in 43.24 (1) (c). This revised formula factors in shared revenue payments instead of local funding which **addresses the equity issues** that have been identified in the PLSR project.

### How Workgroup Recommendations Relate:

| ILS | Change is not required but is readily possible due to current flexibility and scale of ILS consortia in the state. Statewide discovery layer could be implemented. |
| ILL | The current library system structure supports the existing interlibrary loan structure. |
**Delivery**  The workgroup model proposed could be implemented with no changes to state library system structure. Greater funding for some library systems could expand opportunities.

**Collections**  Not impacted, but model allows organic partnerships and responsiveness to changing conditions. Greater funding for some library systems could expand opportunities.

**Consulting/CE**  A statewide portal for CE and additional consulting could be implemented within the existing library system structure. Greater funding for some library systems could expand opportunities.

**Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change to library system based infrastructure required but larger infrastructure regions could be built through agreements. Greater funding for some library systems could expand opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource Library**  This model wouldn’t require change to the state’s resource libraries but any changes made to resource libraries could easily be adapted in this model.

**Chapter 43**  A statutory change would be necessary to revise both the library system standards of service and the library system aid formula. A task force to review library system standards could be convened immediately. Following the work of the committee, a legislative change could be sought for both the standards and the funding formula.
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Model Title: Wisconsin FORWARD – a Flexible, Outcome-based, Responsive Way All Resources are Designed to advance the state’s public libraries

Summary Description

Maintains current regional library system structure based on county affiliation. Focuses on incremental change in library systems by targeting areas where outcomes can be improved to better serve local library users throughout Wisconsin. Areas targeted for improvement are library system funding formula and library system standards of service.

Current Library System structure is fundamentally sound. The “bottom up” approach gives community libraries a great deal of ownership, keeps citizen boards invested and responsible for oversight, and helps build relationships in a regional area—especially at the county level. The model is cost effective due to economies of scale resulting from sharing costs and resources. Library systems are able to respond to new collaborative opportunities because they are not so large that agility is sacrificed. Incremental change is manageable and risk of failure is minimized.

A task force would be convened to review and revise current library system standards of service using as a springboard the standards recommended in appendices to the 2013 SRLAAW report Creating More Effective Library Systems. The new standards would establish an accountability structure that includes measurable uniform feedback from local libraries across the state and would be designed to accomplish improvement at the library system level without damaging services to the member libraries.

Following the work of the task force, legislative change would be sought to incorporate the recommended revised standards as well as to change the state’s library system aid funding formula as outlined below. This revised formula factors in shared revenue payments instead of local funding which addresses the equity issues that are a significant concern and stated goal of the PLSR project.

The current state aid to library systems formula in WI Stat. 43.24 (1) (a) would be replaced with the equity-based formula outlined in 43.24 (1) (c). Rather than wait for the 11.25% funding trigger as specified in the statute, the formula change could be implemented now through a narrow and specific legislative change. An analysis of state aid to library systems allocated for 2019 shows the new funding formula could be adopted at this time without loss of funding to any library system. Library systems in areas where inequity needs to be addressed would see their funding rise, while the funding of other systems would remain stable. For more information see: https://tinyurl.com/y74dutm.
A robust 2019-2021 DPI budget request for increased public library system aid that sustains and builds upon the additional capacity realized in the 2017-2019 biennium would further help alleviate the equity issue.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION: Include an incremental disincentive-funding factor that addresses library systems with fewer than 15 libraries to encourage library systems serving a small number of libraries to merge with another library system. The efficiency of a library system correlates to the number of libraries it serves.

**Structure**

Local library system board (appointment based on current statute)

Local library system staff (varies by library system funding and priorities)

- System Director
- Consultants
- Technology infrastructure and support
- Support staff such as business managers

Existing statewide services have service advisory groups

Mandatory library system services would be updated through work of a task force

Statewide discovery layer could be implemented

Services offered beyond the revised library system standards are based on regional availability, cooperative partnerships, funding availability, and local priorities

Online portal could be implemented

Greater funding for some library systems could expand opportunities

**ILS**

Discovery layer could be implemented that supports existing regional networks. Because many of the state’s ILS consortia are funded with a large percentage of local dollars, it is important to recognize that it would be difficult for the state to impose a structure for ILS services. ILS consortia that form organically based on geography and relationships are stronger and healthier than ones that are forced. Additionally, because more than 95% of transactions are filled within existing consortia statewide, careful analysis must be made before investing state dollars in improving only 5% of transactions.
ILL

The current library system structure supports ILL. The additional layer of staff for ILL in the workgroup report may be unnecessary given less than 5% of the transactions are interlibrary loan.

Delivery

This model does not require changes to the current delivery system. However, the delivery workgroup recommendations could be implemented within this model.

Collections

The current library system structure supports cooperative collections as evidenced by the WI Public Library Consortium. Additional collections and resources could be added.

Consulting/CE/Professional Development

A statewide portal for CE and additional Consulting could be implemented within the existing library system structure. Collaborations are already in place. Additional collaborations and consulting opportunities could be managed by DPI. The DPI could invest in a portal using WISEdata and WISEdash funds or could ask the library systems to contribute. In fact, the DPI could ask library systems to help fund any innovative project they envision.

Technology Support

This plan, which relies on local funding dollars, could be implemented within the current structure because many of the state libraries already use local funding for technology support. Library Systems could help develop the program and may also be able to help fund the initiative with the new funding structure.

Resource Libraries

This model wouldn’t require change to the state’s resource libraries but any changes made to resource libraries could easily be adapted in this model.

Chapter 43

A statutory change would be necessary to revise both the library system standards of service and the library system aid formula. A task force to review library system standards could be convened immediately. Following the work of the committee, a legislative change would be sought for both the standards and the funding formula.
Recent legislative successes have been built upon the premise of library systems doing valuable work to the benefit of the public libraries, which interact directly with Wisconsin citizens in all corners of the state. There is no reason to believe this request for legislative change wouldn’t be successful especially if there is library community consensus.

This model builds on the positive messages of past legislative success and introduces incremental targeted change to improve outcomes for Wisconsin residents without risk of losing hard-earned legislative support. Additionally, the current model maintains the idea of “local control” within a region. This concept has historic support in the legislature and is far more likely to achieve legislative success than a model that replaces the structural importance of counties in favor of centralized funding and control at a state level.

### Key Challenges/Questions with this Model

Determining library systems’ desired outcomes and corresponding measurements would be necessary.

Implementation timetable would need to be determined.

Some library systems with a small number of libraries or in areas with more economic stability may not receive additional funding, especially if there is a deduct factor for library system size in the funding formula.

How do we make the process easier for library systems with a small number of member libraries to merge?

Is there a way to incentivize library system collaborations?

It will be important that accountability consequences be designed to accomplish improvement at the library system level without damaging services to the member libraries.

### Key Benefits of this Model:

This model continues the regional structure, which is a cost effective way to leverage resources while allowing for the most customer-driven, and responsive service program.

This model allows libraries to have a great deal of input into the program of services provided. Service programs are designed based on regional needs.

This model does not add any additional layers of bureaucracy.

This model is cost effective because personnel costs are reflective of the unique market conditions for the region.

This model keeps library system staff and board members in place building relationships and investing in the success of their member libraries.
This model is **incremental** which allows for needed analysis on the identified areas of change as recommended in workgroup reports instead of wholesale change that risks failure.

This model keeps library system boards, which continue the important **relationships** at the county level, are invaluable from an advocacy standpoint, and can be partners in **accountability**.

Changing the formula and revising library system standards will require community consensus and corresponding improvements in Chapter 43. However, the formula change is already in the statute and standards revisions developed in 2013 provide a springboard to jumpstart the work of the task force. Under these circumstances, the requested statutory changes to the legislature can be presented as logical next steps for improvement of a structure that has their strong support rather than as a potentially controversial and divisive overhaul.

This model allows library systems to **build on the recognized successes** of the past instead of on the unknown. Additional funding could be used to help the funding formula address known issues.

This model **empowers DPI** to take a more active role in ensuring quality library system services across the state.

This model continues to build strong relationships in each region as well as between regions and within the state. This network is a powerful and positive force for good for the state’s libraries.

This model continues to allow and encourage partnerships of library systems when it is mutually beneficial.

This model encourages library system staff synergy and brainstorming that happens when people see each other regularly.

This model continues to enable counties to leave their library system and join another. This choice provides a natural element of accountability in the structure.

This model does not incur the high costs associated with large-scale changes:

- Legal costs
- Unemployment pay
- Contract buyouts
- Hiring and training costs
- Rebranding and reprinting costs
- Lost opportunity costs due to large scale staffing and process change
- Potential cost of losing hard won trust and goodwill adhering to legislative investment in current library system structure
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**

Model W Review by the Committee of the Whole – Summary Documentation 2
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 dissenters.

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 dissenters.

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.
Model W Deep Review
Summary Document

Notes taken during the June 8, 2018 small group discussion. The discussion workgroup was comprised of the Steering Committee and CRCs. Half of the members were randomly assigned to work on this model, the other half on the other model under consideration. This workgroup was facilitated by John Thompson. Documentation by DPI staffers Shannon Schultz and Tessa Schmidt.

1. Suggested Changes to Improve the Model

What additional changes should be made to this model to improve its ability to respond to the current/future needs of public libraries?

- Elaborate and be explicit on the standards, need more definition; e.g. for technology, funding, ratios, etc.
  - Measurable
  - Review of current standards
  - What exists in statutes right now
  - Reporting function
  - Services standards
  - Part of standards tied to state aid, part tied to assurance of compliance statements
  - Accountability standards
  - Discussed possibility of tiers, with $ tied to it, cost per capita mandates, but tiers can also create inequity... decided to only have a minimum/core standard; focus on what is ESSENTIAL
- Does the formula do enough to ensure accountability? What do we know about how much money is needed to make a system like SWLS equitable?
- Address the optics, is this transforming enough? The PLSR charge is not to transform services, but to provide more equitable access. Model W does not explicitly say “implement workgroup model X” but would that help the optics?
- The other models didn’t allow for discussion about funding formula, but would that have changed things?
- Service models speak to centralization, how does this model work with that idea?
- Benefits of changing administrative code versus standards
- Making clearer the differences between admin code, standards, and compliance
- Making standards flexible for changes in libraries in the future
- Operational funding for updating the discovery layer and dashboard/portal
- Systems boundaries should be able to be redefined more easily; system service boundaries should be more flexible, is this essential for Model W? We need a better understanding of this.
2. Which design principles does this model (now modified by your small group) fully satisfy, partially satisfy, and fail to satisfy?

**Fully Satisfied Principles:**
- 1(7), 2(4), 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

**Partially Satisfied Principles:**
- 1(4), 2(4), 5(7), 6, 7, 8, 10

**Fails to Satisfy these Principles:**
- 5(1)

**Unclear or Not Sure if this/these Principles are Satisfied:**
- 1, 3, 5, 6, 7(2), 10

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

Which library stakeholders are likely to be strongly supportive? Why?
- Systems/system staff
- Resource libraries
- Under-resourced systems and stakeholders
- Certain municipalities (possibly reduces funding burden)
- LD&L- focused for legislative change and budget support
- Patrons will win throughout the state
- Many public libraries-no major disruption to system
- Counties likely to support- increased funding and more support, $ back to local communities
- DPI- Role is enhanced

Which are likely to be resistant? Why?
- Those expecting a lot of change [revolutionaries][could change as model develops]
- Under-resourced systems and stakeholders- funding increase may not be enough
- Very small systems (cannot clearly define), if there is not financial support to merge or if standards are too expensive
- DPI- more monitoring and evaluation would be required

4. Questions that Need Answers/Information We Need

What are the questions about this revised model that still need to be answered to enable us to make an informed decision about whether this model is good at meeting the current/future needs of public libraries? What additional information do we need? Where might this information be available?
- Standards and accountability
- Cost of providing standards, the per capita
- How does MKE’s status play into this (applies to all models)
○ What happens if increase in funding isn’t available or is less than model proposes? -- Models could work without more funding from the funding formula proposed, as work group recommendations could still be implemented
○ What specific legislative and regulatory changes would be required? Timing? Likelihood?
○ How does equity change if everyone has more funding?
○ Is there a way to test this against the current inequities we are aware of?
○ What are the potential standards and accountability rules? Other states?
  ○ Chapter 43 Subcommittee
  ○ DPI
○ How do we institutionalize the implementation of the workgroup potential?
  ○ Need to flesh out transition strategy
○ How nimble is this model if funding source or changes occur (applies to all models)
○ Cost for providing standards