John Thompson called the meeting of the PLSR Steering Committee to order at 9:30 a.m.

Representatives from DPI, COLAND, and WLA each spoke to the group about their expectations and hopes for this process.

After their presentations, John then turned the facilitated part of the meeting over to Jeff and Linda Russell.

Model Refining Team Presentation

The facilitators asked Steve Ohs, the leader of the model refinement team, to give an overview of the two models under consideration at the Summit. RCI noted that they requested the refinement team to refine the descriptions of both models to ensure that the Summit participants would be able to easily compare the two models being considered.

Steve Ohs thanked the model refinement team and highlighted the work of the team and the process that they used to define the two models.

Budget Projections for Model Gold and Green

Jon Mark Bolthouse presented background on the funding subcommittee's work in trying to develop comparable budget projections for the two models. He asked the group to look at the worksheet for Model Gold. Different scenarios proposed. Total budget suggested at a little over $27 million. Technology could be possible, portal as well, within current model. However, those were eliminated from the total budget since they were not emphasized.

For model Green, laid out six to eight "areas." In the middle, they looked at what are the basic costs that would be used to provide that service, along with the workgroup report totals. Looked at what is already being provided within systems and expended for services (such as ILS and digital collections). Those are known. Also, resource contracts are known already.

Unknown costs: CE and Consulting portal that is proposed. Also the "central service" or office is not explicated. Their total would be something more than $29 million, whether six or eight offices.

Questions on how derived: A participant asked to clarify the three bullets (ILS services): are they negative amounts? Jon Mark indicated no, they are additional costs, services.

Q: These are ongoing, not transition costs, right? Jon Mark indicated yes.

Themes Identified from Public Comments on Models Gold and Green

The facilitators asked people to identify any high level themes that they saw in their review of the public comments on Models Gold and Green. The facilitators
encouraged the Summit attendees to remember that the public comments only represent those who chose to comment, not everyone in the broader library community. The following themes were identified by the attendees:

1. Local control
2. Model Y has too much bureaucracy
3. Fear of top down, rather than bottom up
4. Focus on what is not working instead of preserving what is working
5. Desire to want little disruption
6. Funding
7. Concerns for small libraries; concerns for large libraries - who will feel the pinch?
8. Concern re change, don’t just make change because we’re working so hard, but we’ve been working so hard, there must be change
9. Interest in making sure a process works with legislators, rather than requiring them to bear the brunt of any backlash or “bad people”
10. To boldly go into the future
11. Finding easy wins, low-hanging fruit
12. Questions re DPI and expectations about them
13. One model going too far; the other not far enough
14. Concern for existing system staff
15. More accurately describing the disincentive, rather than voluntary merging. What are the disincentives? How are they implemented? How is voluntary done?
16. Hold systems more accountable (contrasting bureaucracy)
17. Suggesting some version of Model W could set stage for Model Y.
18. Lot of comments on need for clarification on what we’re trying to fix.
19. Unsure of staffing models; soft numbers
20. Friendly amendment to theme on accountability: Standards for library systems mentioned
21. Perception that we need to pick one model rather than discussing and choosing features of each
22. Concern for loss of relationship with current system in ILS and other services; being able to know the person on other end of phone
23. Concern that inequities won’t be addressed
24. Not all systems were represented in the public comments. Two systems were "highly engaged" in offering public comments.
PLSR Workgroup Recommendations Discussion Group Reports

Following the surfacing of public comment themes, the facilitators ask participants to form into their Workgroup-oriented discussion groups and to work through the worksheet developed by the facilitators to analyze how well each of the two models under consideration by the Summit integrated the recommendations of the PLSR Workgroups.

The workgroup invested approximately 75 minutes analyzing the two models and documenting their analysis on the provided worksheet. Note: see the separate summaries (in PDF format) of each of the six Workgroup discussion group’s findings.

Each discussion group presented their findings and the large group offered additional comments as noted below:

**Technology Workgroup Discussion Group Comments**
- No comments were offered by the group

**Delivery Workgroup Discussion Group Comments**
- No comments were offered by the group

**Resource Library Workgroup Discussion Group Comments**
- No comments were offered by the group

**ILS Workgroup Discussion Group Comments**
- Staffing needed at top level
- How will state level coordination be funded?
- Is it a mandate?

**Collections Workgroup Discussion Group Comments**
- Electronic Resources and Digital Resources addressed separately
- How was the voting range spread? Did people flip their votes to balance between the two?

**CE-Consulting Workgroup Discussion Group Comments**
- No comments were offered by the group

---

**Gauging the Pulse of Summit Participants on Models Gold and Green**

General comments re facilitators’ wanting to “take the pulse” of attendees on each of the two models after their workgroup discussions. Several asked what do you hope to achieve with this pulse taking? Facilitators: Their hope was to try to get a temperature reading on each of the two models at this point (using a 10-point scale), to see if there was an inclination one way or another among attendees, after their efforts in their discussion groups to integrate the six workgroups’ recommendations into each of the two models.

Given the amount of resistance among attendees to the “pulse taking” idea, the facilitators agreed to set aside this step in their process. The facilitators explained that
the second day of the Summit would involve everyone first spending forty-five minutes on a guided personal reflection on what they had learned about both models so far and then having an opportunity to share those personal reflections with another attendee, then the large group (for those who wished to), and then in their small groups.

**Summit Day Two – July 31, 2018**

The facilitators welcomed participants to Day Two of the Summit and highlighted the agenda for the day.

**Personal Reflections**

The facilitators invited participants to spend the next 45 minutes reflecting upon all of the PLSR work that has been done by the Workgroups, the personal review that they each engaged in on Models Green and Gold, and the results from yesterday’s review of Models Green and Gold . . . and to work through the seven questions on the Personal Reflections Worksheet provided by the facilitators.

After about 45 minutes, the facilitators reconvened the large group and asked individuals to partner up with someone with whom they believe they might have a different perspective and to share their personal reflections with that person. The facilitators invited each person in the pairing to listen with an open heart and mind, not to debate or persuade, but to simply listen to each other.

Some reactions to the one-on-one sharing included:

- We had the opportunity to be face-to-face about things and how things vary - internet access in rural areas (or lack of)
- There are a number of slam-dunk items that could have benefit. Can galvanizing happen around them?
- Fair amount of frustration that we haven’t moved the ball down the field too far - same things getting talked about over three years. There is a fair amount of consensus. There is a five-year plan for delivery and technology.
- Interesting to learn about the fears about some models going forward, reasons for liking or not liking some things.
- Thinks there is some confusion about the workgroup reports and how that relates to the models that was used differently at different tables.

**Discussions from Open Dialogue Session**

After about 45 minutes, the facilitators invited those who desired to share the results from their personal reflections with the larger group. Approximately 12-15 individuals shared their perspectives with the large group.

Some of the key themes that emerged across those perspectives that were shared included:

1. We need to make immediate changes that everyone can see
2. Need a system development strategic plan
3. Bring the funding formula/state aid into 21st century
4. Need to capitalize on facilitating technologies
5. Statewide internet access not optional
6. Continue to draw upon workgroup reports
7. Establish service standards for systems so things are done and reported more the same way
8. Continue to focus on the patron
9. Needs to be effective accountability mechanism re the standards
10. Activities and actions should lead to equity
11. Maintain established relationships *(Note: some in the group noted that this wasn’t a theme that they heard from those who shared their reflections. The facilitators cautioned people to only share themes that they heard from multiple participants.)*
12. Keep conscious of the voices not at the table, both patrons & libraries
13. Have immediate next steps and long term goals
14. Add municipalities and counties to the discussion
15. Emphasis on collaboration and innovation
16. Hybrid
17. Transitional plan. Don’t jump from a to z
18. Low-hanging fruit
19. Phased in approach

**Small Group Reflections and Recommendations**

The facilitators guided participants back to their small groups (to which they were originally assigned when they registered on Day One) and to (1) share their personal reflections and then (2) complete the worksheet asking each group to identify: (a) common themes from their reflections, (b) areas of agreement/consensus, (c) areas where they disagreed – and what was behind their disagreements, (d) what should be recommended by the Summit to the Steering Committee, and (e) some ideal next steps to move things forward.

After the small groups finalized their findings/recommendations they each presented their results to the larger group.

*Note:* See the separate worksheet note documents (in PDF format) from each of the nine small groups for a complete documentation of how the groups answered the worksheet questions.
Large Group Discussion following Small Group Dialogue Session

Following the small groups reporting out the results of their reflections (common themes, where we have agreement/consensus, where we disagree, what we want the Summit to recommend to the Steering Committee, and key next steps to move recommendations forward), the facilitators asked the large group to identify where we have broad agreement after hearing from all nine groups.

**Areas of Agreement/Consensus Themes** (where at least 3-4 tables identified this point)

1. Workgroup reports drive goals
2. Hybrid / transitional approach
3. Change the funding formula
4. Mandatory standards with adequate resources
5. Input from community members
6. Fewer systems
7. Organic changes
8. Funding analysis
9. CE Portal
10. Timeline: timeframe, implementation plan
11. Incentives for change
12. Addressing inequities
13. Delivery and technology
14. Gathering success stories and best practices
15. Successful collaboration
16. Foster buy-in, engage community
17. Communicate process, goals and results
18. Implementation plan and sustainability
19. PLSR needs to create a strategic vision and plan and present that to DPI

Facilitated Meeting Ends

The facilitators thanked all Summit participants for their active participation over the two days and for their ability to listen and learn from each other.

The facilitators ended the facilitated portion of the meeting and asked PLSR chair John Thompson to open the session to public comments.