MINUTES

Oregon Public Library Standards Committee meeting

January 11, 2013

Oregon State Library

Call to order: Su Liudahl, chair of the Public Library Division Board, brought the meeting together at 10:05. In attendance were: Su Liudahl, Mo Cole, Karen Muller, Pam North, Ted Smith, Dan White, Buzzy Nielsen, John Goodyear, Paul Lightcap, Gayle Waiss, Kirsten Brodbeck-Kenney, Taylor Worley, Margaret Hazel, Emily-Jane Dawson, and Amy Blossom. Kevin Barclay, Kate Lasky, and Jane Tucker attended by GoToMeeting. Darci Hanning and MaryKay Dahlgreen checked in but did not stay. Sami Pierson, Kathleen Schmidtgall, and Perry Stokes were not available. Each participant also stated which standards committees they participated in.

Review of meeting tasks:
a.   -be ready to constructively critique other work to date
b.   -provide committee presentations of 10 minutes each
c.   -ask questions you want help with from the remainder of the committee

Presentations from Standards Committees:

1. ***Staffing Standard:*** Presentation by Taylor, Emily-Jane, and Jane-see attached draft
The purpose to of this standard is to provide assistance for boards and elected officials and therefore, this committee wanted to talk about staffing and its relationship to everything else. They also want it to be practical and easy to use.
The things they want to point out are:
Professional training
Good salaries
Regular job reviews
Following the law
Safety for staff
Sufficient staff for services
Staff should be capable of providing services for all ages
Staffing should reflect demographics of community
Sharing training as a way of bonding, learning more deeply, and stretching the training dollar

Questions from the committee:
-how should we handle graduate degree?
-are there requirements for the library?

They did not want to use grids, charts and quantitative measures, but they did not have good alternatives. This is the tension many of the committees are having. They want to include qualitative indicators which are not prescriptive; it might help to have comparisons to other institutions or adding a range. Using the service population as one measure is hard because it does not account for other demographic factors.

This standard can create fear because it is so directly tied to budget and therefore, they wanted to set the tone of being reassuring, supportive, and positive

Questions/comments from the large group:
-What about unpaid staff or do these just apply to paid staff? They can add language; this was still in it's conceptual stages
-Is there an amount of money which should be spent on staff development? Some people use a percentage- 1, 2 or 3 percent. As an alternative you could determine a portion of staff time (so many hours) devoted to professional development. This then would need to be added to the job description and in job review
-The mission focus in intro was very specific focus about providing access to information; can we broaden that? Yes
-In response to the indicator which states you must have sufficient staff for services, you must look to your library service plan: are you staffed for that service plan?
-Vermont's standards-certain number of hours of staff development; maybe because so many things are free and some years want to spend way more money.
-Mostly want staff teaching each other because then you learn it more; but is harder to add up
-New 2012 North Carolina: well trained staff available during hours; ensure the library has sufficient staff under supervision to ensure safety and library services.
-What about the MLS degree and professionalism?
-Encourages volunteers as appropriate; must have policies dealing with non-employees; perhaps there will be a statement in there saying 'library will develop a policy'
-Use IMLS data from the 2010 IMLS statistics
-Some states have standard just on staff development; do we need to separate this out?
-Training for everyone in the library not just professional staff-this should be encouraged
-Could we have some statements in more than one standard? Yes, some statements may be reiterated as they cross boundaries
-What about succession planning? And how does that tie together with cross training? It was noted that cross training also makes people better co-workers and it is good for the institution
-At a Threshold level: cross-training should be included
-Should there be a comment about creatively developing people as to make best use of their skills and developing the staff they have
-Send them thoughts about directors and managers question about requirements
-Public administration training: should this be added for directors
-should we add that we should create career ladders within structure but this will not be a universal indicator
-Add an indicator about collaborating with neighbors.

Need to decide on format before we go further: Jane and group refuse to spend more time on this without know what format they are hoping to achieve

2. *Materials Standard:* presented by Karen, Taylor, Paul, Gayle
-They firmly believe that each library should have a collection management plan
-Like the staffing standard, they like Qualitative over Quantitative; they did include 3 different measures for quantitative:
      Turnover
      Circulation

Expenditure
-These charts reflect the current numbers of Oregon and gives ability to compare
-If you do all the qualitative, then quantitative becomes important; must adopt entire standard
-What about customer satisfaction? Fill rate surveys; which did not make it into draft;
-Annual analysis should include these indicators is powerful and not just based on one; add statement that includes comprehensive view, i.e. annual analysis using the following indicators. To prevent people from just latching onto one; a single one of these cannot stand alone;
-Giving context to everything is helpful in all of these because not just librarians reading
-What this draft is lacking:

> 1. Broader collection planning, i.e. planning your collection is coordination with other libraries; discussing who will keep the historical record or getting new things. Mostly this is not in here because without a courier, it's moot. Someone then suggests if scanning helps overcome this as a solution?
> 2. Something in here about collection reflecting community and resources for community; it is expected that the library is the expert about those resources, local history, genealogy etc. even if the library does now collect those materials. Maybe partnerships take care of that; at any rate, the library is the gateway to local information; and the library is partly services, partly collection

-Value of weeding statement
-The committee needs to write intro, and they can include statement about weeding
-The committee needs to broaden the word 'downloadable' to something else, a different word that includes more formats
-Do we need a services standard?
-What about services and access?

Decision: services and access will go together (and services will include programming) Pam will lead this group and will go through all the standards and look for access topics to pull out

3. Marketing and Advocacy Standard; presented by Pam, Taylor, Amy
Decision to name it Marketing and Advocacy Standard
-Does it deserve to be alone: marketing, pr, and advocacy? **Yes**
-Do we want marketing plan or guidelines?
-How wide or broad is the library's outreach effort
-Does the library have a Strategic plan for marketing?
-Suggest changing the word social media word as it is already rather outdated and uni-modal
-Keep perspective about comment on uniqueness since some libraries are a department of a bigger organization and must remain part of that organization
-Promotional materials be useful and relevant
-Positive, polished online presence or any presence/material
-There should be a very extensive resource list to this standard
-Mention friends groups, foundations, etc. to ensure that internal marketing takes place

4. *Facilities:* presented by Mo, John, Kirsten, Jane, and Kevin
This committee followed Colorado's lead and essentially included their entire introduction. They also liked the checklist formats.

Some of the indicators which were discussed were:
-Follow the law. Buzzy questioned whether something so basic needed to be included. Even though it feels unnecessary, it is not a given that a library will meet all local and federal laws, including ADA. It

needs to be really apparent that if a library does not meet them then that library is not on its way to being excellent. It may be easier to not be specific about ADA so that when it changes, or when there are changes to other laws, and many of these laws do change frequently, it is phrased so that always meeting the law is the expectation;

-A branch may not offer all services, so does it need to be as big as a main branch, potentially;

-Hours indicators, because they pertain to the Access Standard, may get pulled out; however, it's really hard to be specific about hours; could there be a minimum?

-Must include a statement about planning for new facilities

-People would like us to include something about technology such as eBooks and what that is doing to library space needs;

-Should this standard include something about space for parking, although this is usually addressed with local regulations and would therefore be included in the statement about a library meeting all local and federal laws and regulations

-Should this Standard address community space?

-People were confused by the format which included indicators to use when creating a facility plan; the consistent formatting decided upon should take care of this

-change the indicator including children and persons with disabilities to separate these; they each deserve their own indicator

-add a specific entry about adults and teens, not just children

-perhaps say something about outlets and other technology, even though this is addressed in the Technology Standard

-And what about overall space needs; what if people could drive to another library; could you use library card registrations, active users in order to help libraries determine space needs?

5. *Governance:* presented by Ted (Sami was on this committee but was not available)
This committee borrowed heavily from Georgia, Missouri, and Colorado, and includes a short introduction and a yes/no checklist. People very much like how clean and simple this looks.
Comments:

-Replace library board with governing body on #9 and #13

-Address difference between governing board and non-governing board

-Staff from library districts were relatively confident that a district cannot limit terms, which makes it different from other organizational forms: if permissible, this indicator should stagger and limit board terms.

-#2 supported by funds from local government: should 'ongoing' be added to this

-Library board should be encouraged to take continuing education; how far down the list should this go; should put with enhanced indicators

-Disaster plan; how to help the community through the disaster; should that not be one of our responsibilities as part of overall city? If coordinated with other departments move this indicator to excellent; also involving staff at all levels is desirable; this also becomes a training issue with may need to be incorporated into staffing; the plan should ensure that all aspects of the library are considered, included getting service back up and running, taking care of the facilities and the collection, etc.

-We should look to IMLS for information and ideas on governance

-Add something about ethics

6. *Technology:* presented by Kevin, Margaret, Paul, Darci, John, Buzzy, and Perry
This committee borrowed heavily from Library Edge, which is developing benchmarks to help libraries elevate their public technology services. http://www.libraryedge.org/

As they reviewed the site, everything seemed important to they kept it in. Also, they followed the format of benchmarks, which was quite different from other standards so far.
The element that seemed most critical was to have a technology plan. So this standard ended up looking more like an actual technology plan because the committee included many things which would end up being in a technology plan.

-Benchmark 1.1: how formal are the classes mentioned in this benchmark
  -If relevant, offer classes in other languages
  -Does the phrase 'library resources' mean catalog or what?
-Benchmark 2.1: Licensed software-what does this mean exactly; many people don't update immediately. They are moving forward but not on bleeding edge. Should it say 'recent version, usable'?
-Is there the ability to put the achievement of this standard in a time range; i.e. within 5 years; these benchmarks can all be goals with some specificity
-Pull out benchmarks so it's more readable; they could be prioritized; not all standards need this specificity but this works really well here.
-This is more about doing rather than just having
-needs links to resources
-Margaret reminded us that OLA has a tech roundtable
-One quantitative piece: #11 benchmark about technology training: it is helpful to have this quantity although it seems really high; maybe this should fit together with other staff training? Keep tech training pulled out and also put it in staffing? Demanding the training implies you have to have the equipment etc; the group must be careful of the implications of the standards' requirements; it could say 'these things are encouraged'
-'All library staff have core and specific competencies related to job'; this requirement should apply to all staffing and staffing levels. It may mean that job descriptions need to be rewritten. Staffing committee could look at job classification job descriptions, which should describe functions; could have sample job descriptions in resources
-These are to raise the bar

7*. Introduction*: presented by Dan and Kate
-Do we need a vision statement? Philosophically we should address why we are doing this, what did we think we are doing, why it matters?
-We should connect all this work to **Vision 2020**
-There should also be a section on 'How to use this document'
-It should include Guiding Principles: what standards are for, i.e. best practices, accountability, what is one in library context?
-Should it have the definition of a public library? It could include ORS definition and/or the IMLS bulleted list
-Add here "Freedom to read" and other ALA statements
-No need to put in non-negotiables in the introduction
-There could also be a section on how to use this document: scenarios
-Missouri has an Implementation plan. Do we want one, or do we want to list the order of importance?
-Some of this may be beyond the scope of our initial project; then there's next steps; resources and implementation plan/ideas, scenarios?
-Innovation: a mention of innovation should be in the introduction

8. *Community engagement*: presented by Gayle, Kate, Amy, Emily-Jane, Su
-This group was heavily influenced by Colorado and North Carolina
-They were trying to look at all the different aspects of looking at the community, communicating with the community and getting input back from the community
-As a response to all other benchmarks: reaction with could be embedded into each standard
-Some people like the benchmark pulled out, and some people like it integrated in
-This standard is all about partnerships and collaborations: should talk about schools
-Also do all Libraries have Friends group-should be encouraged to do so (Governance standard); it could go under Partnerships?
-Should volunteers go under this? **No**, it should be separate because that is about individuals not a group
-Need to create essential indicators
-Libraries reflect values of transparent government: library policies available etc.
-People like how this is strong but not prescriptive
-So important that must be in every standard
-Should be alone or embedded

-Should Community engagement/marketing be combined? One is one perspective (in looking out) the other is out looking in; these are 2 sides of conversation-what do we want to hear, what do we want to ask
-Put this one next to marketing (in the order)

We realize that there may end up being a great deal of overlap especially because the standards may not be read in its entirety. Mo thinks that the more we go forward the more comfortable we are with lots of overlap as long as defined

9. *Format conversation:*
If our audience is board member, etc: we need a checklist; it's much easier for them

Format: we liked and decided on the two checkboxes (for Yes or No) format
Essential, enhanced, excellent or exemplary
Also in some cases 'encouraged' activities

Each section should
-have an introduction
-Technology using benchmarks-do we want to use that word; the organization is hard
-like outcomes because it is so clear
-what about weighted goals; Kevin thinks that loses flexibility, he would hate have grade
-Right now people can't meet lower standards but can meet some of the higher indicators, which is not what we are going for
-Non-negotiable and what they are
-Accreditation
-Essential enhanced exemplary
-Encouraged activities: above and beyond
-Is it too big? Is it a technology plan? Strip out the sub-sections
-Have resource list and bibliography
-Outcomes a really good piece: having an outcome for each piece

CONSISTENT LOOK FOR EACH STANDARD IS THIS:
Intro:
Category: Repeat as often as necessary
> **-Essential**
> **-Enhanced**
> **-Exemplary**
> **-Encouraged activity, as it lends itself**

Checkboxes Yes and No under each category and for each indicator
Outcomes
Glossary

10. Next steps:
We agreed that we would regroup in our committees, review all of the comments, revise the drafts, and reformat the draft Standards in the agreed upon format. All committees will send out this revision to the large group no later than Wednesday, February 27th. We will meet next on Friday, March 8th at the State Library. The next meeting after that, on May 10, will be at Salem Public Library.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.