

**LiLI Unlimited Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
September 16, 2004**

Meeting Memory

Participants:

Marcia Beckwith, Boise School District	Chris Ann Brown, Boise Public Library
Kay Flowers, Idaho State University Library	Margaret Fujishin, Homedale Public Library
Susan Mueller, University of Idaho Library	Louise Nofziger, Buhl Public Library
Heidi Riddoch, North Bingham Public Library	Dawn Wittman, Lewiston City Library

Ann Joslin, ISL Associate State Librarian (Recorder)
 Stephanie Kukay, ISL Research Librarian
 Gina Persichini, ISL Networking Consultant
 Sue Walker, ISL Public Services Librarian (Facilitator)

COST SHARING OPTIONS

Gina shared 2 potential cost-sharing formula options. The group shared +/-Delta on each option, in addition to some additional options.

Option A – Base formula on Collection Expenditures

+	Δ
Translates to what a library would be cataloging; actual use	In small libraries, money spent on collection can vary greatly from year to year
Reflection on ability to pay	Some libraries have zero collection money
	Would collection money include donations, grants, etc?

Option B – Base formula on FTE Employees

+	Δ
FTE reflects community size and collection better	Districts with branches will have more staff than single-site libraries
FTE is a more constant number from year to year	Some school districts are adding students(growth) and cutting FTE's
Libraries with < 1 FTE may now be able to catalog faster and more accurately for the first time	Libraries with < 1 FTE may have a hard time participating at \$300/ year
Librarians I know feel FTE is more fair and affordable	

Option C – Base formula on Total Expenditures/Income

- Covers both FTE money and collection money as well as other budget items
- Use a flat percentage of total exp. → 1% or 3%? (ISU's is about 1% of total budget); have a base fee
- Would total include donations, grants, etc.?

Option D – Formula based on Size of collection

+	Δ
Correlates to number of records in the database	Reflects historic budget
	Some libraries weed; some don't
	Size of building may limit collection size

Option E – Formula based on size of population served

+	Δ
Tied to revenue coming from the population	School students are counted twice as part of public library and school district
	Consortia definition of population served is difficult
	City libraries may serve larger area than the city (and possibly non-resident fee is less than the property tax residents pay)

Option F – Formula based on budgeted amount (rather than expended) commitment from the community

+	Δ
	Not a stable amount
	Don't include grants, donations

- Any FTE count – how are volunteers, student workers, etc. considered?

Consensus to use formula based on FTE

FTE OPTION, using ranges of FTE Employees for public libraries

* First category should be 0 – 1.0 FTE

Potential ranges, with number of public libraries in range in ():

- > 1.0 – 2.0 (18)
- > 2.0 – 3.0 (10)
- > 3.0 – 5.0 (17)
- > 5.0 – 10.0 (11)
- > 10.0 – 15.0 (5)
- > 15.0 – 20.0 (2)
- > 20.0 (7)

PARTICIPATION

School libraries estimate may be low. We should consider possibly 25 schools and 5 school districts as a realistic goal for school participation.

Aren't there more specials?

Publicly funded special (state agencies, feds some hospitals) aren't accounted for on spreadsheet

Consensus to base formula on covering costs with 75% of participation of public libraries

SCHOOL FORMULA

- Consensus: use full-time enrollment to determine costs for public schools
- Use 3 tiers:

0-500 enrolled:	\$300
501-1,000 enrolled:	\$600
1,001 or more enrolled:	\$900
- ISL may need to adjust range distribution after examining the reported enrollment for school
- Consider 3-year stepped rate for first tier libraries → proposal withdrawn
- Consensus that fee for smallest libraries in scales will be no more than \$300 annually
- If more schools are estimated, lower the amount for public libraries at 2 – 3 FTE

FORMULA FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Consensus that public library fees will be \$300 per FTE Employees. FTE will be rounded to closest whole number, with all libraries with less than 1 FTE being rounded to "1." (amount / FTE may change based on school and special estimates) FTE Employees value is drawn from most recent Public Library Statistics definition.

GROUP CATALOG

Parent group: All libraries in Idaho

Scope groups:

Super scope: PAC NW (Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho)

Super scope: Intermountain? (Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada?)

Sub scopes:

- Academic libraries
- School libraries
- Public Libraries
- Special libraries

Medical Libraries
Law libraries
North Idaho libraries
Southwest Idaho libraries
South Central Idaho libraries
Eastern Idaho libraries

Lynx Consortium
LCEI
VALNet
CIN
WIN

Question: Can we have sub-sub scopes?

If so, → Schools
→ Each District
→ Elementary Schools
→ Middle/Junior High Schools
→ High Schools

If no sub-sub scopes, users can limit search to a library's 3-letter OCLC symbol

IMPLEMENTATION

Participants Brainstormed: We are years in the future, what worked well with LiLI Unlimited?

- Increased ILL activity
- Easy to use for patrons and staff
- Faster
- More materials end up in catalogs
- Current catalogs → easier and cheaper to maintain
- Incentive for larger libraries to do their recon and/or backlogs
- Opportunity for smaller libraries to find catalog records
- Even smaller libraries will see themselves as part of the project
- Cooperation (implied), better use of money
- Legislators will see scope of Idaho library services
- Preview/play time available prior to training
- Staff has step-by-step list of implementation → cataloging and ILL
- Public will know that librarians can get anything from anywhere

QUESTIONS/ISSUES TO ADDRESS (Collected Throughout Meeting)

- ILL requests – can it go direct (unmediated) Idaho libraries but mediated if it goes to WorldCat? (Kay's?)
- Is there potential for incorporating a LiLI (statewide) borrowing card with LiLI Unlimited?
- OCLC fee for exporting OCLC records to a local system?

- Would there be LSTA money to fund recon. for libraries that don't have electronic records?
- Potential for LSTA money to support document deletion, courier, postage?
- What will requirements be for loaning? Cost is an issue for some libraries.
- Some libraries don't pay any cataloging now. What's the incentive for them participate?
 - Learned from pilot project → frees staff for other activities
 - Marketing/training issue
- Now, no provision for consortia pricing
- Consortia – must each library have its own OCLC symbol? School can participate as individuals or districts.
- Need good definitions – FTE, “budget”, “expenditures”, etc. “collection”
- Would cost sharing amount stay consistent over the years, or change for an individual library if its situation changed?
- Is there an option for a sub-scope tier?
- How do copy cat. libraries do original cataloging and get the record in WC?
- Will each library have it's own administrative access and authorization?
- Different fiscal years → OCLC bills at beginning of their fiscal year, July; phases that begin in January will be billed by OCLC for 6 months?
- Consider consortia pricing at some point

NEXT STEPS

- Distribute meeting records – ISL Support staff to transcribe; Gina distribute
- Answer questions – LiLI-U team
- Tweak the formula – Gina
 - Ad hoc committee will review
 - Distribute to LiLI Advisory Board
 - ISL staff will share feedback of LiLI Advisory Board to ad hoc committee
- Develop an FAQ using Questions/Issues list – LiLI-U team
- Timeline for libraries to commit in each phase – LiLI-U team
- Marketing plan – LiLI-U team, Ad hoc members?

MEETING REVIEW

+	Δ
Started at 9:00am (allowing for morning travel)	Library director/Consortium didn't know about the project
Lunch brought in	
Organization: facilitator, agenda, etc.	
Emailed overview and agenda prior to meeting	
DEMO of SILC (Illinois group catalog)	
Spreadsheets with formula options and doing the “what if's”	