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# Public Library Service Model Y

## Global Summary

**What**  Reduces the number of systems to between 6 and 8, based on the delivery regions recommended by the Delivery Work Group.

**Where** Changes will take place in all areas of the state, although those with large geographic areas may feel the change less acutely.

**When** The timeline would need to be determined.

**Why** Increase in scale will create efficiencies.

**How** Method would need to be determined

**Structure** A statewide management team is responsible for delivering services. Includes statewide portal and discovery layer.

**Governance** Provides for a Statewide governing board for all library services, but systems remain with individual governing boards.

**Funding** Each of the new systems/regions will see new budgets based on the current formula. The only way the regions will see increased revenue is if the new larger systems include significantly higher levels of population.

### How Workgroup Recommendations Relate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</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>Boundaries of delivery regions become the system borders. Work group recommendations fulfilling implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>Purchasing pools become larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/CE</td>
<td>Implement online portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Overlays 3 technology support areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Model Y - 6 - 8 Regional Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>(Funding &amp; Appointments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide Governing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Execution)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory &amp; Discretionary System Services</td>
<td>Mandatory &amp; Discretionary System Services</td>
<td>Mandatory &amp; Discretionary System Services</td>
<td>Mandatory &amp; Discretionary System Services</td>
<td>Mandatory &amp; Discretionary System Services</td>
<td>Mandatory &amp; Discretionary System Services</td>
<td>System Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
<th>Advisory Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Libraries</td>
<td>Local Libraries</td>
<td>Local Libraries</td>
<td>Local Libraries</td>
<td>Local Libraries</td>
<td>Local Libraries</td>
<td>Local Libraries</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide Online State Portal</th>
<th>Statewide Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Discovery Layer</td>
<td>Statewide Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Library Service Model Y

Model Title: 6-8 Regional Library Systems under a Statewide Services Umbrella

Summary Description

This model aligns with delivery regions which also incorporate one or more shared ILS. A statewide governing board and statewide service management team help provide and monitor service expectations. Creating a statewide service philosophy with a more formalized regional structure.

Structure

Statewide Governance Group

State Library Board—Representational appointment from each system (member librarian based?)
State Librarian
Variations for Statewide Governance Group—Statewide service advisory group(s)

Statewide Service Management Team

Delivery
ILS/ILL
Collections
Consulting/CE
Technology
Variations—Team Leader/Functional Manager versus State Librarian; Management team members could be responsible for multiple service areas

Mandatory System Services and Standards to support equity of service (SRLAAW Creating More Effective Public Library Systems 2013)

Statewide services such as ILL; Technology Infrastructure; Delivery to regional hubs; Electronic Resources (Baseline); Digitization; Discovery Layer; Portal

Regional System Board

Representation from Region
Appointment of citizens and library staff
Geographically diverse

Regional System staff

Dedicated staff for each service area
Multiple region staff such as Facilities and Data

Online portal

Statewide discovery layer
### ILS
The 8 proposed delivery regions mirror shared ILS regions. Further mergers of ILSs could reduce the number of delivery regions. Existing ILSs could co-exist in larger regions.

### ILL
Regional ILL service boundaries can be supported.
State-level ILL Support.

### Delivery
The model would mirror the 8 proposed delivery 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 would be based in system areas.
Add multiple system region consulting staff such as facilities and data.
CE staff could mirror number of regions.

### Technology Support
Proposed three technology regions based on the ideal delivery map or similar map.
Delivery regions will support their distribution needs.
Infrastructure (technology regions or Statewide) and regional field offices can be supported by this model.

### Resource Libraries
Regional resource libraries to support specialized collections within a region. This is a variation from the workgroup model.
Could add statewide resource library concept in addition to regional resource libraries.
Key Challenges/Questions with this Model

1. Coordination of services.
2. Will silos be reduced?
3. Is it too top-heavy? Balance of administration and service.
4. Incentives to merge systems and ILSs.
5. Balancing of state funding between new system areas.
6. Roles for existing library service agencies/providers.
7. Implementation timeline.
8. Can consultants share responsibilities?
9. How to determine qualifying skills for consultants
10. How can we make it easier for entire systems merge with each other?
11. How to create an easier way for a county to realign with a different system
1. What are the Strengths/Upsides of the Model?

- There would be more state involvement in the systems. Better access to decision makers, drivers of funding.
  - More direct interaction with state policymakers.
  - Both positive and negative. Legislative day is so important, but that could be everyday.
  - Big proponent of marketing and public relations. Libraries fail now, but this opens a door to improve.
- Efficiencies and access to services. More access.
  - For example if there was one person who was an expert on something everyone would have access to that person. One stop shopping.
  - Key basic services would be delivered with equal service excellence throughout the state with ease of access.
- Statewide governing board with representatives from each region of the state.
- Greater efficiencies. 8 hubs instead of 16 would allow for efficiencies in delivery, collection, administration.
  - Potential to save money.
- Standards would be established for all libraries. We have the new Wisconsin standards. It is important to say you have equal access to services to meet those standards.
- Scale is the main virtue.
- Helps us move towards equity. Local libraries will receive key services where they might be lacking.
  - Inequity has been identified in rural areas of the state with low system funding, so less services provided by the system. This would ensure the state is delivering a certain set of services that local libraries can rely on and expect.
- Filters down to better services for patrons. Help the library directors do their job better and focus their energies to the patron.
• Least resistance, easiest to implement. It isn’t a dramatic shift and is a middle ground.
  o Seems realistic as well as progressive.
  o It’s approachable and a place we can get to, but it is a move forward and not sitting in inertia. Transformative.
  o One of the fears raised was that nothing would change based on this process.
  o Even this level of change would take courage to enact.
• The statewide governing board in the structure could be made up of member librarians or system staff and could insure flexibility and responsiveness to local library issues.

2. What are the potential challenges/downsides of this model?
• Funding. How will this work with county and cross-county funding?
  o Statutes say you can still bill counties.
  o There might be adjustments needed.
  o How would county government react to this?
  o Some communities don’t want to pay for library services. All taxes are seen as negative, so local libraries don’t get an increase in funding. This model doesn’t address local funding at all.
• A loss of local, regional autonomy. Northern regions will be spread out even further.
  o Geographically, regions will have to be bigger.
  o Further travel for consultants or CE opportunities.
  o Loss of local relationships.
  o How would you structure the new system? If they are structured as they are now, how can you accommodate services? System governance could be set up differently than they are now.
  o More member libraries to serve in some areas.
  o Providing enough attention to all the libraries in a larger system would be a challenge.
  o Staffing would have to be adjusted to accommodate larger demand.
• How do we handle the people (staff) who are in positions now? Furloughs, transitions, etc.?
  o Location and physical buildings also play into this.
  o Will staff have to move their lives to work in the new system?
• Selection of the regional hubs. Where are they going to be?
What makes it best for our patrons in the state, we could move there gradually?
- This will be complex and political.

Where does the centralization process live?
- If it lives within the state it will be subject to procurement rules.
- Centralization under what umbrella.
- How do we centralize without sacrificing flexibility?

Funding will be based on population size. Milwaukee will be getting all the money again. How do you sell that idea when you're in LaCrosse or Richmond Center.
- The current formula is based on population. This won't allow for equity.
- Current formula conflicts with the goals of the PLSR process.
- Also isn't dynamic

Funding of state level service could also be problematic, how is it distributed or funneled?

Ambiguity in relationship between regional and centralized governance?
- What authority does the regional governance have? Is it advisory?
- This model implies that not all services are provided at the state level, but it doesn’t define what the breaking point is. Needs to be better defined.

Would like a current organizational chart for how things are defined now vs. what this model is describing.

What is the statewide governing board?
- Representatives from each system, state librarian, representatives from advisory groups.

None of these models take into account that there are other levels of decision making bodies that aren’t considered in this model.
- For example ILS consortia. They could choose to cooperate.
- Incorporation of existing policy and funding bodies outside systems are not considered.

A loss of control and status by individuals.
- Library system boards, library system directors, resource libraries and librarians.

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

- It balances things. Allows for statewide overall services that will benefit libraries and patrons but also has regional control but allows for regional voices.
- Compromise
• Least dramatic (and traumatic)
• There are things that would really help library directors that will filter down to patrons.
  o Lots of statewide services and access to expertise.
• Good balance between statewide and local needs.
• Regional people on state board would represent the more local views and have a voice to bring issues up.
• Legal questions could be answered via hotline. Expertise is easily accessible.
• This model is based on delivery workgroup and they have strong data.
  o Also implied by many of the other workgroups.
  o Patrons expect speed and delivery so libraries should too.
• Dramatically reduces the number of systems.
  o This was recommended in almost every workgroup.
• Eliminates duplication of effort and gives everyone great access to expertise.

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

Fully Satisfied Principles:

10
  o This might just be a start, but because of issues around funding it might be partially satisfied.

2
  o It isn’t extreme, but it has room for movement

5
  o Has potential

6
  o Member libraries on a system board that interacts with the state
  o Would be flexible and responsive
  o There are differing views in a region that has to filter up to the state
  o Nothing would prohibit individual libraries from collaborating on a greater scale
  o What happens to WPLC, an alliance of 16 library systems?
  o Are systems as flexible as they are now? Goes back to the question of authority of regional governance. If it stays the same as it is now it would stay the same.

8
o Will save local library directors time and money
o Within the context of system services it does fulfill, otherwise maybe not.
o What is the local municipal responsibility to fulfill these need?

9
o By design, that’s what this model does
o It all has to start with basic standards and guidelines

10
o The model itself gives some libraries things, but it doesn’t take away
o If we assume that funding is adequate, this fully satisfies this requirement

Partially Satisfied Principles:

10
3
o Not fleshed out enough
o Is some of this already in place?
4
o Same amount as now
o Representation on representative boards

Fails to Satisfy these Principles:

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

1
o Hard to say

7
o The funding level for systems is stuck without statutory changes, if you
don’t change the formula the money has to come from somewhere

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

i Think everybody wins. As long as we talk about full implementation and not
during implementation.
o Delivery will help everyone
o Libraries will have better access to expertise and higher level resources
• Will small libraries have as strong of a voice in larger regional service areas? Will
they be able to build relationships?
Sacrificing connections can be seen as a loss. Will IT people be able to know what your library cabling looks like.

- Perception that Staffing is increased in workgroup models. There would be more consistent visits based on new staff.
- Will highly functioning libraries “not lose” instead of win?
  - Everyone comes up to the level of highly function libraries, but this wouldn’t do much for those libraries.
- Will things be taken away from some libraries at the local level because services are provided from a larger region of service? That money won’t be able to be funded/spent and could be reduced.
- Nicolet has one tech guy for 42 libraries. This is an equity issue.
- Equity issues are the result of a choice made at some point. Are we looking for state funding to replace local funding.
- Consensus: The intent is there to start moving towards having more winners.

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

- Rural
- Library directors
- Library patrons

Which are likely to be resistant? Why?

- Resource libraries
  - Maybe not
- System
- Well funded systems
- Well functioning systems

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?

- Include some sort of transition. Maybe we start with 16 hubs that moves to 8 systems.
- Provide guidance and help for libraries to meet standards through consulting. Define those standards first
  - New system or regional level service?
- Doesn’t explicitly state what regional services are, but does define state. That would be helpful.
  - There should be flexibility, but minimum standards are necessary
  - Also standards for those services
  - What will systems even be doing?
    - Systems take responsibility for E-rate application?
- Better explanation of filling out the annual report.
- New director bootcamp?
- Support for budget planning, grant applications?
- These types of activities build a trusting relationship between the system and libraries.

- Examine the population models for regions, the way the funding is distributed now.
  - The delivery map might create winners and losers
  - Not focused on highways
- Define incentives, what could encourage people to start doing this on their own
  - Should there also be penalties for non-compliance?
  - 1% increase in state aid?
  - 5 day a week delivery as an example, it’s baked into the workgroup reports
- Define layers of government more clearly
- Customer service representative model. We should expect the service model provider to provide that level of service to keep your business. Account representatives. Even if that person changes, the support should be continue to be delivered at a high standard.
  - Each library should be treated differently and each service provider can’t build relationships the same way. One size doesn’t fit all.

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?

- Talk through how things get down to the level of helping patrons. What is the value case to the local library?
- More definition in the statewide governance section. For example: Who appoints the governing board?
- How should a library be representative at a board level when there are disagreements among the libraries they are charged with recommending?
- How do regional concerns get represented adequately at the state level?
- Cost analysis. Price it out a little more.
- Convert percentages to dollar amounts. In the funding report.
- Dig into the funding report a little more.
- Can we assume that this will be fully funded?
  - Is there new money?
- Transition plan? Should be clearer.

On a scale of 1 – 5 how do you feel about the model?

- 4
- 4 – if fully funded
Feedback from large group discussion:

- "I love it."
- What are the benefits to local libraries?
  - It consolidates expertise and allows local library directors more access to that expertise without requiring them to jump through hoops.
  - Takes state provided core services off of the system’s plate. The system would have more opportunity to interact with member libraries and provide the services they need.
- Would delivery be provided at a statewide level?
  - Yes
- ILS is not discussed in the Workgroup report, did you talk about it.
  - It also wasn’t addressed in this discussion.
  - Not talking about a statewide ILS
- The model reduces the number of system and aligns to delivery
  - Didn’t talk about a specific map, but used the delivery map as a point of reference during the discussion
- Talked about accountability to members, did you talk about accountability from above? What type of oversight would the statewide board provide?
  - Added that to the tweaks that system service standards needed to be defined.
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?

- Y should be more fleshed out in the manner that W was so that we’re comparing apples to apples.
- Since large group likes both Y and W, can we meet in the middle? Maybe a transition plan showing how 16 systems would eventually end up with fewer. Lacking a transition plan or maybe this should be pared down to be closer to W. Group expresses agreement that all models need transition plans.
- More than just a transition plan is needed – what will happen to staff, buildings, vans, etc. etc.
- If we are basing this off of delivery, is it freeway compatibility? County lines? Need more detail in order to have a reasonable conversation by the end of July. “Boundary principal.”
- If this is the alternative to the thing we know (W), when it’s nebulous it remains scary. It’s an unknown.
- Funding is still the biggest unknown. It’s hard to compare with W because theirs is based off of modification of funding formula. Y needs a funding model/element and how Chapter 43 affects that.
- Hopes that we can find the good in both W and Y.
- Systems could be “experts” in one area – one does all consulting, another does marketing, etc. This is a good compromise if we are scared to take these services from systems and put them at a higher level.
  - Or, we could create a system where these kinds of things could just emerge naturally due to conditions/incentives/etc.
- What is the legislative/regulatory strategy for both Y and W?
- What are technology standards at library level?
- Praise for Y model for being able to provide better system services, e.g. building assistance.
- What’s the new definition for resource libraries in Y? There’s no standard of services provided by them.
- W addresses equity via statute – interested in adding that to Y as well (Equity equalizer in financing model).
- How much power does the state have over systems in Y?
- Thoughts on structure?
Main difference is governing board – seems key to this model, to make a
statewide view of system services happen. Not necessarily the enforcer
though – that would still be DPI.

Otherwise, not a lot different

How will systems relate to one another? Boundary issues – town vs village,
system agreement conflicts, etc. How can we move away from that?

- Depends on how systems are drawn but this could solve some of
  these issues. Fewer systems would result in fewer points for conflict,
  but it will be a big adjustment and conflicts will still exist.

- Can systems still freely associate to create bodies like WPLC to get around
  state procurement issues? In this model, seems like yes they can.

- A compromise between two models isn’t far away, just need ways to fund state
  overlays
  - This model has discovery defined and more about what Steve laid out in
    his model, which is missing in W
  - Incentives for system consolidation/create a simplified process

- Logistically, does it make sense for systems to be grouped around delivery hubs?
  Geospatial logistics
  - Consultants don’t necessarily need to sit in the same space as delivery,
    etc.

- Don’t like how this cuts out some systems – 8 isn’t the magic number, it could be
  12 or 14. Hard to put weight fully behind Y because it seems likely a hybrid will
  develop.

- Some libraries currently feel really far from system hubs. This could exacerbate
  that, but others think it doesn’t have to be that way, system staff can travel, etc.
  - More work needs to be done on outreach to smaller libraries, geospatial
    logistics again, etc. What’s the proper service level? A library gets visited
    once a month?

- Both models lack focus on marketing/PR/publicizing libraries

- Collaborating on services with bigger regions frees up systems to be more flexible
  in the services they provide

Do we have consensus?

- Many are more things that need to be fleshed out vs. overt changes. All are in
  agreement on all items identified as Suggested Changes (captured on flipchart
  pages)

Item added after-the-fact, after completing #2 below

- Legal implications, resources available for accomplishing a transition – is this all part
  of a transition plan?
  - Legal, administrative, buildings to sell, organizational culture – consensus that
    this doesn’t need to be decided at this level, it’s complicated, and it will be
    part of the transition plan once we get to that point.
2. Which design principles does this model (now modified by your small group) fully satisfy, partially satisfy, and fail to satisfy?

**Fully Satisfied Principles:**
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – Collapsing systems, there had better be efficiencies
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10

(7, 8, 9, 10 depend on the addition of an equity equalizer)

**Partially Satisfied Principles:**
- 1
- 3 – Expanding committees to be less local seems like it could cause loss of transparency

**Fails to Satisfy these Principles:**
- None

**Unclear or Not Sure if this/these Principles are Satisfied:**
- 1 – Transitioning, geospatial logistics make this unclear
- 6 – No guarantee that a larger geographic area of service would encourage libraries to innovate – context is subjective
- 7 – Same reasoning as 6. Larger areas of service change relationship with small/rural libraries, so it’s unclear how this will change trust, support to try new things, etc. On the flip side, if there is a lot more money you would theoretically be able to provide better services. With an equity equalizer, 7 moves up to fully.

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

**Which library stakeholders are likely to be strongly supportive? Why?**
- Large library systems – they would have to change the least
- Library directors and patrons. Directors would have better access to resources for their patrons
- Could go both ways. “Being small and insular is our brand.”
• Stakeholders could appreciate the “lean”-ness of this model – legislators, funding authorities, etc. would appreciate the proactive measures taken
  o This assumes systems/libraries aren’t asking locally for more money, which you probably are in order to kick off some changes to save money down the road
• Improved service philosophy – change needs to happen to provide better services
• Under-resourced systems, libraries, and counties.

Which are likely to be resistant? Why?
• Anyone who doesn’t like change could resist; those most impacted by the transition
• Folks who feel the brunt of redistribution of funds or diminished services
  o Large, well-funded systems who have to take on smaller libraries with less funding
• Smaller systems asked to merge with larger – disparate power relationships – “you’re joining us”
  o Example of systems cooperating and when writing memos, have to alternate which name appears first
• Anyone afraid for their job (system staff) – high risk, potentially low reward at system level but not at library level
• Small libraries – local control
  o Also big winners – depends on perception and where you live, could go either way

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?

• Risk/Reward dynamics for stakeholder groups (somewhat covered in 3 but less adversarial)
• Local control considerations
• Cost analysis/funding
• (lots of what could go here is already covered in 1)
• Deemed most important by the group:
  o Legislative strategy
  o Transition Plan
  o Pros & Cons for local libraries