

Board report January 2008

Went to Burt to assist with the library's technology plan for USF.

Researched collection evaluation methods and PR methods for libraries. Both Committees met January 9, 2008, to formulate plans.

Booked our annual meeting (October 9, 2008) speaker. It will be Dr Joe Mika. He will do the Color Code Personality traits workshop. This will be for all staff members and board members who want to know how to work effectively with others.

Attended the Coop Directors' meeting on December 21 in Ann Arbor. We met at the Merit Office and had a demonstration of video conferencing equipment and possibilities. We made plans to conduct a workshop statewide using the distance / conferencing equipment. However, it is proving quite costly to do.

The Library of Michigan has asked me to serve on the LSTA Advisory Committee starting in April. I agreed.

We also devised an alternate plan to present to Nancy Robertson about State Aid funding. There are two alternates. They follow:

Please bear in mind that these models have not been made public. They are only for the Board to review at this point.

#1 State Aid Funding Model

The Cooperative Directors propose the following model that funds cooperatives, core services and public libraries:

50%	Public Libraries (per capita)
30%	Statewide core services (Databases, Resource Sharing, and Delivery)
20%	Eight or fewer cooperatives (current level of \$10,000,000 divided by 8 equals \$250,000 per cooperative).

Cooperatives must be funded to cover basic overhead costs. Cooperatives will work to enhance statewide core services, pool resources in order to avoid duplication and promote the sharing of services, consult (local, regional, statewide), provide leadership for the region and state, seek grants for research and development, advocate for library development (local, regional, and statewide), offer networking/communication (regional and statewide), training and continuing education (regional and statewide), coordinate statewide initiatives, aggregate buying power for members, and facilitate information technology planning, consultation, and support.

Libraries can decide if they want to be a member of their regional cooperative. Cooperatives can sell additional services to members: ILS system, ILL outside of MeLCat, local delivery, workshops, technical support/training, marketing and PR, discounts, bibliographic services, etc.

Advantages:

- Easy to explain and administer
- Ensures there will be a mechanism for libraries to pool their resources and regional cooperation
- The largest portion of State Aid goes to public libraries. Libraries can decide which services to purchase from their cooperative.
- Achieves equity in the delivery of statewide core services.
- Pool resources in order to avoid duplication and promote the sharing of services.
- Defines the basic services cooperatives provide.
- Supports public libraries and statewide core service
- Builds upon QSAC

Disadvantages:

- Reduces the number of cooperatives and current level of funding.
- Could make budget preparation very difficult.

#2 Another Model “Out of the Box. Thinking:”

In light of some of the discussion on our list regarding whether LM could get state aid directly for the statewide services as well as the concerns that seem to always come from a number of class VI directors here’s another version to think about.

The proposal is based on the following assumptions.

- Using the current funding level which is at \$10,000,000.
- Class VI libraries represent almost 60% of the population of Michigan.
- Majority of cooperative directors are concerned with what will happen to the medium and small libraries.
- \$250,000 is not much to run an office and offer any services.

The proposal:

- **Class VI** libraries receive \$.60 per capita. They can use this to pay LM for MelCat, Mel Delivery and Mel Databases, as well as purchase services from a cooperative they may choose to join. If they don't join a cooperative they can purchase some of the services offered by any cooperative in the state. The libraries may also use the funds to pay for costs associated with automated circulation systems that may have in the past been run by cooperatives but now are independent 501 c (3) operations. Some option may be available for Class V libraries that wish to be included. This would bring down the per capita rate slightly.

Projected cost: \$6,000,000.

- **Library Cooperatives:** The remaining \$4,000,000 would be used to fund the 8 cooperatives at \$500,000 each. The cooperatives would be responsible for paying for MelCat, Delivery and Mel Databases for the Class I, II, III, IV, and V libraries and based on my calculation, that would leave cooperatives with funding to develop services that would attract Class VI libraries as customers. This would also give us the opportunity to assist libraries with consultant services, USF, continuing education, technology upgrades/grants.

Projected cost: \$4,000,000.