Exploring Common Ground Worksheet

Table Number: 1

1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   a. We want goals and a series of prioritized steps from which to work: catalog current state-wide collaborations that are working today and take those as models we can build on (like how system CE people are already collaborative)
      i. CE portal
      ii. Increased state participation toward a discovery layer, which requires state level tech support
   b. Criteria for meeting the system standards: accountability and revised service standards
   c. Revisit funding formula: add criteria that address equity (ala Paula’s words)
   d. More ways to communicate how we feel about systems. Improve current method where we add a note at the end of the annual report. Perhaps allowing library members to participate in system boards to create more transparency in the process.
   e. We want fewer systems.
   f. Systems should be able to merge if they want to merge.
   g. There is room for some state-level services (tech for example)

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   a. Systems should be able to merge if they want to merge.
   b. We want fewer systems.
   c. There is room for some state-level services

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What's Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What specific number of regions we should strive for.</td>
<td>We don’t know enough of system’s self-described strengths and challenges to determine who should merge with whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether we can dictate mergers or not</td>
<td>Who would decide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree we should work toward a long-term plan with short term goals</td>
<td>Disagree or don’t know enough to determine what the goal(s) are and which are the better short-term goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of Disagreement | What’s Behind the Disagreement?
---|---
Tech being a state-level service | Disagree on how you pay for this service. Some very happy with the current tech services from their systems

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   a. Don’t choose one model over the other: pull strong pieces from each
      i. Discovery layer and CE/consulting portal don’t depend on how the number and size of regions plays out
   b. Produce a plan to DO SOMETHING
   c. Fiscal analysis of proposed plan(s)
   d. Timeline
   e. Widely communicate the plan when we have the plan. Provide marketing/educational tools for us to sell it locally

5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**
   a. We want to give the Steering Committee the authority to decide “what is the win.”
      i. Have them identify priorities that are emerging with each additional gathering of minds
      ii. Does Steering need a deadline?
      iii. Develop the implementation team(s) if an implementation team can be developed—who fills void
   b. Systems explore whether they might consider merging
      i. An outside group communicates with individual libraries within systems to determine how amenable they are to merging
      ii. Systems should explore organic collaborations and should report back to Steering and the library community on findings

6. **MISC: parking lot**
   a. What’s WLA’s role in this?
   b. What’s DPI’s role in this knowing they self-report an inability to add staff and/or add duties?
   c. What’s WiLS role in this?
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Table Number: 2

What we need:

- budget numbers – should this just focus on technology, delivery & portal/discovery?
- funding
- awareness of the disparities in county funding; why do we only get 70%?
- De-incentivizing not a viable route
- issue with the statement of system effectiveness; structure is flawed
- there should be an annual audit of all systems – this would need to be done by a 3rd party

1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   a. Who is leading us to the future? There needs to be a continued driving force.
   b. Who is holding everyone accountable?
   c. Standards and accountability for systems is important.
   d. There should be a requirement for system strategic plans that contains measurable goals.
   e. Hybrid/transitional approach

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   a. Hybrid/transitional approach
   b. Develop an appropriate infrastructure first, focus on technology then move forward with other elements
   c. Establishment of a portal earlier on that effectively meets the current system & library needs

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of ILSs</td>
<td>Difficulty of mergers, local control, policies [all the details], personality-driven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   a. Don’t go with one of two models – look at a hybrid approach.
   b. Look at individual elements that are low-hanging fruit (i.e. portal, digitization kits, and delivery).
   c. Develop priorities – infrastructure should come first.
5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**
   
   a. Identify an independent 3rd party to help validate data/run audits.
   
   b. Determine who is overseeing the whole process, etc.
   
   c. Look for a system/group that could take on collaborative technology partnerships, such as group purchasing.
   
   d. Convene a group to start gathering this information for the portal: find CE opportunities, contact information for existing consultants, tracking CE to a particular person.
   
   e. Locate experts in the field to be acting coordinators to begin planning for delivery, digitization kits (which could use a roaming model).
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Table Number: 3

1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   
a. Change the funding formula with considerations other than library needs (Internet, poverty)

b. Clear, defined standards for systems that are enforceable

c. Urgency and concern that nothing will change

d. A transition process, with phases, a definite vision that we are moving toward

e. Not that everything needs to be state, versus not everything needs to be local; Need to shift the balance of power or sharing or power; control needs to be where it makes the most sense

f. Inequitable services to libraries translates inequity to patrons; mentoring services leads to improved service and a guiding standard helps everyone know what we are striving for

g. Need for tangible efforts; great areas for improvement would be delivery and technology and consulting

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**

a. Commit to a transition plan that leads to a structure that supports the COLAND vision

b. Workgroup recommendations should shape the structure

c. Definable, measurable, enforceable standards of system service

d. Revaluation of funding formula and funding streams regarding services currently offered by systems and potential future methods, e.g. Delivery (who pays for what and how)

e. Clearly define roles and responsibilities for state, system and local library services

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is Green the goal? A variation of Green? Or something different?</td>
<td>Not sold on Green or Gold™</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mechanism for enforcing standards</td>
<td>Mandates don’t build good relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**

a. Commit to a transition plan that leads to a structure that supports the COLAND vision. The structure should include the following elements:
i. PLSR workgroup recommendations should shape the structure

ii. Development of definable, measurable, enforceable standards of system service need to be part of the recommendations (not created by Steering, but Steering recommends that they should happen)

iii. Clearly define roles and responsibilities for state, system and local library services

b. Regarding equity, we feel that Steering should prioritize the revaluation of funding formula and funding streams regarding services currently offered by systems and potential future methods, e.g. Delivery (who pays for what and how)

5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**

   a. Our group suggests that the Steering Committee leave it to the State Superintendent’s discretion to determine who should administer the tasks associated with the prioritized workgroup implementations (such as Delivery and Technology); some administration might be better handled through state/central coordination, while others might need regional leaderships, such as through an appointed task force. Existing groups such as COLAND or SRLAAW or LD&L should be utilized for input as needed.
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1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   a. Don’t forget the efforts and recommendations of the workgroups
   b. Develop a Hybrid model
   c. Increase collaboration
   d. Listen to subject matter experts
   e. Set large goal(s) especially related to equity
   f. Inequities exist and we need to start addressing it.
   g. Preserve local control, voices, character, identity, and priorities
   h. Find efficiencies in delivery of services
   i. Start with small, achievable changes and work towards planned goals
   j. Concept of transition seems harder than a big first step
   k. Be conscious of budget and be as specific as possible
   l. Establish clear steps in the transition/implementation period
   m. Don’t leave small/rural libraries behind as we move forward
   n. Define inequities and past failures (see workgroup reports to start)
   o. Libraries should have a role in building technology infrastructure in communities
   p. The library community needs to find and define our role in providing technology infrastructure in communities (for example: advocating for equitable access, educate technology consumers, etc.)
   q. Start with reality (structure we have now)
   r. Set measurable standards for services systems provide to libraries with consequences that don’t hurt libraries
   s. Develop a statewide strategic plan for library system services in Wisconsin
   t. Advocate for addressing inequity with state system aids funding formula

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   a. Don’t forget the efforts and recommendations of the workgroups
   b. Develop a Hybrid model
   c. Increase collaboration
   d. Listen to subject matter experts
   e. Set large goal(s) especially related to equity
f. Inequities exist and we need to start addressing it

g. Preserve local control, voices, character, identity, and priorities

h. Find efficiencies in delivery of services

i. Start with small, achievable changes and work towards planned goals

j. Be conscious of budget and be as specific as possible

k. Establish clear steps in the transition/implementation period

l. Don’t leave small/rural libraries behind as we move forward

m. Define inequities and past failures (see workgroup reports to start)

n. The library community needs to find and define our role in providing technology infrastructure in communities (for example: advocating for equitable access, educate technology consumers, etc.)

o. Start with reality (structure we have now)

p. Set measurable standards for services systems provide to libraries with consequences that don’t hurt libraries

q. Develop a statewide strategic plan for library system services in Wisconsin

r. Advocate for addressing inequity with state system aids funding formula

s. Develop a single strategic plan with measurable goals and outcomes with accountability mechanism. Would contain an action plan (ie Portal, Discovery Layer).

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries should have a role in building technology infrastructure in communities</td>
<td>• Is this truly the role of the library. What about hunger, where do you draw the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Role is not provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We have little leverage with telcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Could lead to inequity if it’s done on a community by community basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Libraries should find their role in providing this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would be better with statewide support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are we advocates or providers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of transition seems harder than a big first step</td>
<td>• Might not be logistically possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resistance either way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Process with milestones gives everyone a chance to catch up or keep up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conceptual, not a specific change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• But, big changes can be easier to sell to stakeholders than small changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of Disagreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What's Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Size of change is based on perception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   a. Develop a single strategic plan with measurable goals and outcomes with accountability mechanism.
      i. This is a deliverable. Get input from SRLAAW. Give the community something to comment on and respond to. Presented to Superintendent. Don’t create another process
      ii. Short term goals: Portal for CE, Discovery Layer
      iii. Medium term goals: Look at ILS consolidations before delivery consolidations, expand Portal to other content
      iv. Long term: Implementing technology workgroup recommendations
   b. Work on marketing ideas and plan to libraries and the state and stand behind it
   c. Revising the system states funding formula with equity in mind
   d. 100% excited that this would only result in a small, targeted change in statute

5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**
   a. Vet drafts of the strategic plans with stakeholders like SRAAW, WLA community at conference, LD&L, Wisconsin County Association – Board of Directors meeting, League of Municipalities, COLAND, [look at slide of stakeholders in toolkit],
   b. Present the plan to stakeholder group annually as an advocacy and relationship building tool
1. **Common themes that emerged across our group: we are beyond "choosing a model thing." Are we agreed that we are beyond that?**

   a. Gold depends on funding thing, green doesn’t have enough. Neither model adequately addressed inequities or populations. Need to list out inequities.

   b. Overall purpose is to improve equity work toward similar services

   c. both involve changes based on expertise, both required buy-in, both required standards; both needed a timeline and more defined leadership

   d. service enhancements, efficiencies, allow for time but not defined, cooperation

   e. proposing merging, in principle follows workgroup recommendations, both take same approach to resource libraries, collections, ILL, technology benefits (like portal)

   f. fewer systems as outcome, standards for systems, statewide coordination of services, though all differently achieved.

   g. what are inequities- not pin-pointed; both had some sense of local control (regions), (sherry noted big differences on the statewide or regional board). Localized control might be better.

   h. funding, system standards, (portal, discovery layer), resource libraries

   i. other themes: buy-in for transition. Portal only thing of what might "go first."

   j. Talk about cost and risk - start with Gold and work on toward Green, or go whole-hog

   k. Strategic Planning, also for standards and accountability

   l. A timeline for transition

   m. whether technology could work as "low hanging fruit," seen as possible

   n. Delivery not necessarily low-hanging since there are costs. But acknowledged benefits

   o. Hybrid/transition' need standards, more teeth for public library standards, delivery, technology, ILL (ILL too much inequity- sometimes seen as hassle)

   p. Resource and collections are not fleshed out enough. How is digitization seen as a need when many libraries can’t conceive?

   q. Funding needs to stay with W and transition. Change very slowly.

   r. Hybrid, with caveats to both sides. Take on W with a timeline. Work within dollar sense. Start intentionally. Preferably less risky. Use talents and experts in field. Standards for services. Tiered standards. Re-work the governance of the Green model.
2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   a. Standards
   b. Assessment points in the plan to go forward. Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)
   c. Low-hanging fruit [CE portal, technology, delivery, ILL, discovery layer. Minimize, reduce number of ILSs? ]
   d. Fewer systems
   e. Address inequities (but the inequities need to be identified). Related to Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition plan or hybrid - Sherry dissented</td>
<td>[18-month timeline] [Timeline to what? Sherry not on board with &quot;hybrid,&quot; because it may not be needed. Corey- are there stages along where the way where evaluation is done? Assessment periods.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State librarian/State Board</td>
<td>Whether that's a State established and appointed/controlled area. You lose local reaction and needs. Politicized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   a. Develop Standards for systems: Identify areas for standards, how they are developed, task force?
   b. Determine inequities from workgroup models, prioritize and qualify them, and determine whether others can be identified.
   c. Starting with CE and Consulting, develop and implement a portal that then may be expanded to include support for technology troubleshooting, triage, and dispatch.

4. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**
   a. For portal development, have an advisory group to interface with DPI staff and determine the best approach, tools, and functionality.
   b. Study moving forward with a more distributed inter-system delivery model.
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1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   a. Collaboration is part of both models.
   b. Model Green and Gold are now divisive, gradual change and improvements are going to build trust.
   c. Stop talking about green and gold – there needs to be a way forward that works from the workgroup models
   d. Need a big vision – without it there is worry about stagnation or falling back.
   e. Buy in by the library community is critical.
   f. Need clearer transition plan and financial prognosis
   g. Refocus on the workgroup reports as the vision for services, find what all want to happen, and move forward with those.
   h. Creating library system standards that are mandatory with adequate resources – no unfunded mandates
   i. Concern about risk of opening Chapter 43, though excessive caution has the risk of not improving.
   j. There needs to be incentives for change and those that want to collaborate.
   k. The changes must relate to improved services to patrons – through services provided by systems to local libraries.
   l. Green as preferred model
      i. Modified Green – work to change where there is support.
      ii. This model best incorporates workgroup models.
      iii. It can better address the service inequity issues.
      iv. Working toward Green model will create stability in economic downturns.
   m. Green concerns
      i. Will money materialize?
      ii. Worry about whether can get Chapter 43 changes done
      iii. Larger system sizes can reduce voices of libraries
      iv. For any state scale service – how do you get there?
   n. Gold as preferred model
      i. 80% of libraries surveyed say they are satisfied with their system.
      ii. Allows for organic collaboration – like WPLC
      iii. Allows systems to be flexible
iv. Likes the idea of Model Gold with teeth  
v. Builds on documented successes.

o. Gold concerns  
i. Does not offer enough change, doesn’t do enough to address workgroup models or impact the inequity issue enough.  
ii. Potential for inequity to grow - Systems are constructs and can be barriers to collaboration.  
iii. Does not address inefficiencies that exists in current system model

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   
a. Collaboration is part of both models.  
b. Model Green and Gold are now divisive, gradual change and improvements are going to build trust.  
c. Stop talking about green and gold – there needs to be a way forward that works from the workgroup models  
d. Need a big vision – without it there is worry about stagnation or falling back.  
e. buy in by the library community is critical.  
f. Need clearer transition plan and financial prognosis  
g. Refocus on the workgroup reports as the vision for services, find what all want to happen, and move forward with those.  
h. Creating library system standards that are mandatory with adequate resources – no unfunded mandates  
i. Concern about risk of opening Chapter 43, though excessive caution has the risk of not improving.  
j. There needs to be incentives for change and those that want to collaborate.  
k. The changes must relate to improved services to patrons – through services provided by systems to local libraries.

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether change is needed or this is change for change’s sake.</td>
<td>-Perception for need for change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   
a. Begin to implement workgroup recommendations by forming teams to flesh out details to take action.  
b. Elevate the work of HR and communications team.  
c. Re-evaluate administrative capacity, governance models, and funding options to evolve and develop through the implementation of components of the workgroup models as the next step to build upon the workgroup models.

5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**
a. There needs to be someone that is empowered with the authority to move forward the implementation of workgroup models.
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1. Common themes that emerged across our group:
   a. Focus on components that will work (delivery, technology, ce, portal, etc)
   b. Concerns about resistance to change
   c. Concerns about preserving/cultivating relationships
   d. System standards (education on standards will assist w/ change management)
   e. Geographic challenges (relationships, technology/delivery logistics, etc.)
   f. Need to have some services that are statewide (tech/delivery)
   g. Continue to look to the workgroup reports for guidance
   h. Hybrid/Transition – moving from what we have to what we need
   i. Achieve measurable equity (but also define equity more clearly)
   j. Questioning need for state librarian (could DPI do it? Could it be a different structure for state-scaled services?)
   k. All moved from our initial inclinations through this process
   l. Some merging of small systems should occur

2. Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:
   a. All liked elements of both proposed models
   b. Transition over a period of time but with defined parameters/milestones
   c. Certain services work better statewide (technology, etc.)
   d. Need to have a shared definition of equity

3. Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance structure (state librarian idea, etc.)</td>
<td>More confusion that disagreement. Too many unknowns. Questioning that component of green model, Gold model does not provide governance structure for state-scaled services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System standards and enforcement</td>
<td>What should standards be? Who has enforcement authority? What consequences should there be for failing to meet? Standards may inform choices about service regions or system mergers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   a. Don’t take either model as presented but take components from each that will work. Focus on Delivery, Technology and shared portal because the workgroup recommendations are well-formed.
   b. Education for library community on how equity is defined and case examples of how inequities play out in real systems right now.
   c. Library community buy-in through education campaign.
   d. Also education: possible roles & limitations of entities like WPLC, COLAND, SRLAAW, WLA. How could they play into the long term recommendations?
   e. There is a time to stop soliciting more input/feedback.
   f. Consider Ch 43 modification to make system mergers easier.

5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**
   a. Provide a timeline of necessary steps/order of operations to achieve goals (synthesis of preferences/priorities based on summit).
   b. Identify a method for the next round of community input (on a concise draft plan).
   c. Explore other ways to address equity in funding formula by geography, demographics, # libraries, poverty, etc.
Exploring Common Ground Worksheet

Table Number: 8

1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   - a. Leaning towards big picture concept of Model Green
   - b. Phases
   - c. Incentives
   - d. Transitional funding
   - e. Efficiencies and savings
   - f. Everyone should do better
   - g. Strategic plan
   - h. Unintended consequences
   - i. Rural small library concern
   - j. Concern around bureaucracy
   - k. Transitional/hybrid model (3 votes)

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   - a. All want to examine the system funding formula with no one losing funding
   - b. Reduction in number of systems (1 dissention)
   - c. Addressing inequities around the state, referring to inequities expertise, training and possibly funding

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What’s Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in number of systems should be voluntary</td>
<td>County pushback, voluntary doesn’t work without strong incentive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   - a. Reiterate that the models are not absolutes
   - b. Implementation plan sketched out based on work group reports with a timeline (10 years)
   - c. Keep PSLR Governing Principles for Redesign at the forefront of the process
   - d. Showcase success stories from throughout the state and country. For instance Wisconsin Valley & Indianhead technology sharing, SEWI (cooperative continuing education), SHARE (multi-system ILS)
e. Implement pilot projects on a local, regional level to test and identify best practices, for example CE Portal

5. Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:
   a. Working from areas of consensus, create an overall template with timeline, based on Greenish Model
   b. Each workgroup then puts together a plan to implement model
   c. Steering Committee then works to put them all into a cohesive plan
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Small Group Reflections:

- Don’t like either model; there could be a hybrid of the new ideas. There are things we could do already, but a lot depends on funding. Where is the money coming from? There is collaboration in both, there are fewer systems.
- We need standards. Service levels are different among systems. Resource libraries are not needed anymore.
- Local control is the wrong term.
- Incentives need to be better defined.
- Compromise required. Would like to see one-card, One Wisconsin.
- Broadband is still an issue and we need to make this a priority.

- Green is too much change, but Gold is not enough change and doesn’t position us well for the future.
- Transitional plan to address staffing changes organically to protect the loss of livelihood.
- Hybrid, needs to have fewer systems and this will lead to good stewardship of funds and raises all systems to a level of standards.
- Likes the idea that in 10 years, we need to be “here.” Less systems. It shows our lawmakers that we are serious about this. We can slowly begin implementing and making change.
- We can’t stay the way that we are. We need to show our lawmakers and constituents that we are using our funds appropriately and wisely.

- Hybrid model, leaning toward Green, because otherwise things will stall. Not necessarily a state library that says “do this,” but helps us get to those changes.
- If we don’t have a structure that keeps us accountable, nothing will happen.
- Loves the idea of one ILS and one card, One Wisconsin.

- Nothing works for us in our system. We’re a big library surrounded by six counties of small libraries. We pay for support with technology.
- Sustainability and connectivity are the only way we will survive.
- Transitioning into a larger regional model makes sense.
- Libraries wear lots of hats and don’t know our limits. The CE portal state-wide would be helpful.
- If we keep the current structure and modify it, we will go in circles. We need to break the whole thing down and start over. I’m looking for something profoundly radical.

- Leaning more toward Model Green. This is an opportunity to shake things up that need to be changed.

- I love our system and the libraries, but throwing more money at us will not help.
- We need to put out there how many systems we are looking at and standards for each system.

- The system map looks piece-mailed and equity wasn’t in mind.

- Starting with low-hanging fruit would be easy, but will it do what we want to accomplish. Give systems a deadline to figure things out themselves.

- Gravitating toward a hybrid. Portal, CE tracking and validation.

- Make progress on state discovery layer. Some sort of progress could be made to improving delivery. There is a lot of opportunity in the Southeast region of the state. What is doable from a political perspective?

- I see a series of discreet improvements with teeth and plan behind the bigger changes. There should be enforcement behind this to keep it moving.

- One concern in general is that the process needs to be well-planned out and that it needs to be rolled out from a legislative standpoint.

- Next steps: Prioritize to facilitate the technology, develop the portal, common language for ILS and use what we have now (WPLC) whose job it is to begin to organize the rest of this/the reduced number of systems is.

- There needs to be a process to bring single-county systems in and ready to consolidate. That is an opportunity for transformational change.

- There should be a tweak to the funding formula to address inequities.

- Gravitating toward a hybrid. Wants to see incremental change that could build into something monumental.

- Wants to see flexibility to build on what we have now.

- Wants to see things immediately. Broadband, portal, Discovery layer.

- Green: worried about forced collaborations.

- Gold: It’s not realistic and need something more with teeth.

- Compromising needs to happen and needs to look to our communities and not listening to our patrons would be a grave mistake.

- Incremental change is happening and needs to keep happening.
1. **Common themes that emerged across our group:**
   a. CE Portal, ILS and technology collaborations
   b. Road map leading to change
   c. More harmony in funding
   d. Fewer systems
   e. Incentivized transition period so we are not in the same spot as today.
   f. Hybrid of Models
   g. Standards with Teeth

2. **Areas where we had 100% agreement or consensus:**
   a. CE Portal, ILS and technology collaborations
   b. Road map leading to change
   c. More harmony in funding
   d. Fewer Systems
   e. Incentivized transition period so we are not in the same spot as today.
   f. Hybrid of Models
   g. Standards with Teeth

3. **Areas where disagreement still lingers (and what’s behind disagreements)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Disagreement</th>
<th>What's Behind the Disagreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILS Issues (How many?)</td>
<td>There are different viewpoints on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will getting everyone on the same one really happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We should have one dedicated team of people focusing on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of systems and getting there.</td>
<td>Avoiding forced collaboration and want to get buy-in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **What our group thinks the Summit should recommend to the Steering Committee regarding a path forward:**
   a. We recommend enforceable and achievable Standards for systems that have benefits for patrons.
   b. We recommend that steering do a state-wide survey of our communities.
   c. We recommend that DPI underwrite development projects to address technology-related barriers, the development of the CE portal, and ILS interoperability. We also recommend incentives for innovation, such as a delivery pilot to occur in any areas of the state.
d. We recommend an overhaul of the funding formula, including additions and possible modifiers, to fit 21st century needs.

e. We recommend that within a finite time period that the number of library systems be reduced.

5. **Some ideal next steps for moving forward on these recommendations:**

   a. The development of System Standards.
   
   b. Identify incentives for the Standards and for innovation.
   
   c. Identify accountability measures.
   
   d. Assemble best practices.
   
   e. Identify specific funding sources.