# PLD Business Meeting April 21, 2016 McMenamin's, Bend

Present: Kevin Barclay, Mo Cole, Lorie Vik, Hillary Ostlund, Krist Obrist, Karen Muller, Kirsten Brodbeck-Kenney (with Malachi and baby Ciara ©)

Absent: Jane Tucker

Other attendees: MaryKay Dahlgreen, Ted Smith, Pam North, Stephanie Lind, Ruth Metz, Aletha Bonebrake, Ann Malkin, Vailey Oehlke, Sarah Strahl, Anne Duyck, Molly Carlisle.

## **PLD** structure and priorities

Mo opened a discussion about PLD's structure and priorities. We have been identifying areas of focus for PLD including: standards, SWAT, clearinghouse, directors meeting/training, membership, conference liaison, and review of the bylaws and mission through the lens of our fundamental role. This structure will allow us to recruit volunteers including: 1) past board members to take advantage of their talent and institutional knowledge, 2) board nominees that didn't get elected, and 3) staff and students who express interest.

Furthermore, all of PLD's work can be examined through the lens of our stated priorities and initiatives. For example, even with awards, we could recognize those libraries achieving success with the initiatives (standards, Project Outcome, etc.).

### Discussion

Discussion was focused on a few main issues:

- PLA's Project Outcome: <a href="https://www.projectoutcome.org/">https://www.projectoutcome.org/</a>
- Using Edge to tie in with the technology component of the standards: <a href="http://www.libraryedge.org/">http://www.libraryedge.org/</a>
- Partnering with the state library to incentivize libraries to use the standards and Project Outcome
- Data collection and evaluation

Discussion came around to using SWAT\* to help implement the above, starting with Project Outcome and the standards. The state library is also pushing this, and we discussed how the state library and PLD can best collaborate. Since PLD has no influence or incentives to hand out, one strategy is to explore how the state library could be the one to set certain requirements (e.g., tracking statistics, data collection and reporting) and provide incentives (e.g., LSTA grant funds).

Project Outcome, Edge, standards, and data collection would be ways to tell stories to legislators that demonstrate the impact of their libraries, not just tell them how great their libraries are. Project Outcome has tools to help you use data to craft stories. We can turn the standards and data into outcomes and stories that demonstrate impact.

Right now the state library is marketing Project Outcome but doesn't have the staff to go beyond that. The more libraries that participate, the more data is gathered. Then we can use it to support efforts. Also, a strategy used for Edge that could work here is to get on the agenda of existing meetings (e.g., regional cooperative meetings). In short, go to where people are already gathered when possible. It's key to have someone lead the process which can be where the SWAT team comes in.

Ideas about SWAT were discussed including creating a team of staff from a variety of libraries who are the drivers behind Project Outcome and are willing and able to go out and help, mentor, and learn from one another to share it.

Vailey offered to pull PLA into this to help us get launched. If we could figure out how to do Edge, outcomes, data collection and evaluation, that could be game changing for public libraries and a great model for others.

A startup meeting will be tied in with PLD's next board meeting. MaryKay offered to host the meeting at the state library. We need to prioritize and narrow down to what we can do well now and then build on that.

## **OLA strategic plan**

Ted asked how this all fits into OLA's strategic plan. Who decides what the priorities are at the division level? The strategies should be broad enough to guide the work. Divisions decide how they would contribute to each goal or imperative.

#### **PLD** nominations

PLD's nominations this year will clarify roles and responsibilities of board members in order to create a structure that supports PLD's priorities and moves to a more inclusive structure for members and volunteers.

\*SWAT – The idea behind SWAT is to establish a team or teams of library staff with specified expertise who partner with libraries needing help. Examples include a tech team to help libraries implement Edge, or a team trained to help libraries with Project Outcome.