

MINUTES
Public Library Division
May 25, 2012
Salem Public Library

1. Call to Order & Review of the Agenda: In attendance were Ted Smith, Pam North, Jane Tucker, Karen Mejdrieh, Su Liudahl, Dan White, Colleen Winters, and Mo Cole.
2. Minutes of March 23, 2012 Meeting; Minutes of April 26, 2021 Business Meeting: Jane moved and Su seconded that both sets of minutes be passed as presented. They were approved unanimously.
3. Review Program Evaluations: Ted had all of the program evaluations for the programs sponsored by PLD, which we all had the opportunity to review.
 - a. Pre-conference: *The Poverty of Culture*. Many attendees learned a lot from this program, although everyone wished that attendance had been higher. Still, PLD did not lose money, earning about \$212. Su was disappointed with the scope of the program and really wished that the presenter had revised her presentation to make it more applicable to libraries. It was added that this program could have been marketed to the Bend schools had we had a bit more information. Jane commented that what she learned from the content is resonating with her on a daily basis and she feels it gives her a much better understanding of some people's perspectives.
 - b. Regular sessions: According to comments, there was no one program which was a flop, and in fact, many of them did quite well. The Library2Go had attendees who needed more basic information, like 'what is L2G'? It was not a good program for small libraries. This topic tends to fall on PLD annually as a Public Library topic.
 - c. Banquet: We don't know how much money we made on this, but it was generally well received. People networked and seemed to enjoy having time to talk together. The lack of music was not a problem. Because people were coming early to be in Bend for the next morning, a lot of people signed up for it; there were 85 attendees. Everyone seemed to like the author, Bill Deresiewicz. He was a personable speaker. The food was good. The charge for the food was very close to PLD costs, so it is unlikely we made much on the food. The OLE winner was delighted with the attention she got, not realizing that it was a big deal.

For next year, there are some takeaways and questions.

- d. Do we need a checklist or questions we need speakers to respond to in order for PLD to market the program as effectively as possible?
- e. How do collate conference information-such as number of attendees, size of room, popularity of topic-in such as way as to impact future decisions?
- f. How do we ensure we get the conference information so that we can collate it?
- g. How do we document all of this to pass onto future board members?

- h. Ideas for next year:
 - i. Amazing customer service
 - ii. Rick Huddle
 - iii. Repeat of some of this year's programs? *The Culture of Poverty* might be perfect as we'll have school librarians.
- 4. PLD Business Meeting Discussion: discussion items 4 and 5 were combined
- 5. Standards Discussion

We learned at the Business Meeting in Bend that many people are interested in the review of the Standards, now that we stated our goal to give them a complete evaluation. How do we capture that interest in an organized, systematic, and transparent manner such that it does not overwhelm the project and bring it to chaos and paralysis? Emporia State University, on the other hand, is not interested in contributing student resources to this topic at this time as it does not really meet their needs.

Discussion broke down into the following topics:

- a. Interest group: As stated above, how do we involve the people who would like to participate in these discussions? We all agree that in order to come out the other end with a product that more people and institutions buy into, as well as avoid some of the criticism of the original group, it is important to include representation of librarians from around the street. It is important to seek representation from not just geographic locations, but also sizes of libraries, and perhaps different types of library organizations and/or governance (i.e. district, LSSI, consortium, etc.) There may also be different levels of involvement. For instance, should there be a group overseeing progress of the whole in addition to subcommittees for each separate standard? If there are subcommittees are formed, does each one need to have varied representation? How can that be achieved without assigning or naming specific individuals? Should specific individuals be selected because of the type of representation they bring? Should each individual represent a group and be responsible for disseminating information back to that group? If we offer to pay for travel, how will we select who receives those funds? Should there be an application to address interest level, ability to invest time, ability to speak for others, and the ability to disseminate information? **It was decided that Su, Pam, Colleen and Karen will develop and bring back a 'letter of interest' for interested librarians.** This will form the foundation for our decision on who to include. However, we will be sure to disseminate regular information as well in addition to distributing questionnaires. **They will also bring back an outline of the process we should follow for this entire review.**
- b. Grant: At many points, it's been suggested that we apply for an LSTA grant. However, the grant process follows a specific timeline, and the applications for this cycle have already ended. Writing a grant would help clarify our goals, but it would also take a lot of time, and we are not sure what we would use it for. Someone suggested that it could supply travel funding to participants, but we realized PLD has money it could use for this same purpose. It was suggested that

it could be use to do research and a survey of how different states handle Standards. But that work has already been started by Ted and Sue. A consultant is great to have but slows the process then creates a product that is sometimes rarely used. Finally, it was suggested that in order to be as nimble and speedy as possible we should move forward without a grant, but **ask the State Library to match PLD in funding towards travel money for participants. A grant will be put off til next cycle and then one will possibly be written to design a questionnaire or to do a report on the impact of technology on the standards.**

- c. Questionnaire: We think that we will want to send out at least one survey (perhaps we need a group which commits to taking all of the surveys?) We may be able to start by giving a survey in the fall at the public library directors meeting at the State Library. That actually does not give us very much time to design a survey.
- d. Other states: Ted and Su have stated a compilation of Standards in other states. The Colorado Department of Education has a comprehensive list but it has not been updated for many years. **Mo and others pledged to call each state to find out the most current status of each state's standards, how they update standards, and to find out if they have done any research on the impact of technology on the standards.**
- e. State Library support: Ever since the annual conference, PLD has believed that the State Library should play a role in this project to lend credibility, to share costs, to help identify vital participants, and to extend the invitation for participation. They could play a big role in providing a location, starting the the Public Library Director's meeting. The main points that Ted will be asking the State Library as the following:
 - i. It is PLD's job to review the Standards
 - ii. In reviewing them, PLD determined that a comprehensive look at every aspect of the standards is needed, from the philosophy to the format to the organization.
 - iii. PLD needs buy-in from stakeholders state wide in the result.
 - iv. The best way to do that is to have the State Library as a partner with PLD on this project
 - to establish credibility
 - to share costs
 - to extend the invitation

Ted will write to MaryKay and ask her to participate. We do not expect an objection. She has commented that she is in favor and could provide certificates. Ted will invite her to our next meeting on July 27 to discuss the extent and type of partnership as well as the process of this project.

- f. Public Library Director meeting: Su and Jane will be working with MaryKay on the fall meeting as noted elsewhere. **They will talk to her about the possibility of turning over part of the day to this topic and providing questions ahead of time, and segmenting off time for a discussion including breaking into smaller study ground.**
- g. Questions to answer in review process: In the future, some of the questions which need to be answered every time a standard is reviewed are:
 - i. Are the standards holding up to changes in the world?

- ii. Are the standards being impacted by technology?
 - iii. Are there standards we have not thought of yet (i.e. privacy and security in a cyber vs physical world?)
 - h. Steps/Timeframe: do the assigned work, meet in July with MaryKay, refine process and application process, refine our relationship to the state library, figure out how to factor in other people (architect), define a communication protocol (wiki, what else), define a documentation/archives protocol (part of the existing Standards problem), think more about questionnaire and September director's meeting. Plan on taking the next year for this project, meeting at least 6 times during the year on this project only.
6. Board Elections – new terms begin September 1; the OLA Annual Retreat is July 31
Two terms are expiring – Jane Tucker and Pam North – and other people are changing places. The future board will look like this:
- Colleen off
Ted turns into Colleen
Su turns into Ted
Pam this position is open as an at-large position.
Jane this position is open as an at-large position.
Dan, Mo, Karen finishing first year of 2 year term

Pam is interested in running again and she is running for chair elect -- unopposed as of right now. Jane will run for one of the two open at-large positions. Ted will send an announcement seeking nominations/volunteers run for both at-large openings on PLD later this week. Jane may or may not be reelected. If re-elected, Pam would agree to be chair.

Ted must post invitation to run for PLD on the Memberclicks site. Then elections can run in June/July.

- 7. Next Meeting **July 27, 2012 in Tualatin**
- 8. Adjournment at 12:37 p.m.