

## MINUTES

Oregon Public Library Standards Committee meeting

November 16, 2012

Oregon State Library

1. **Call to order:** Karen Muller, member of the Public Library Division Board, brought the meeting together at 10:15. In attendance were: Darci Hanning, Mo Cole, John Goodyear, Paul Lightcap, MaryKay Dahlgreen, Kevin Barclay, Kate Lasky, Gayle Weiss, Taylor Worley, Ted Smith and Amy Blossom, Emily-Jane Dawson, and Su Liudahl. Jane Tucker, Buzzy Nielsen, and Kathleen Schmidtgal joined the meeting via "Go to Meeting". Margaret Hazel, Pam North, Sami Pierson, Kirsten Brodbeck-Kenney Dan White, and Perry Stokes were absent.
2. **Minutes** of October 4, 2012 were approved after motion by John, which was seconded by Karen. **(Su, can these be posted to the PLD web site and sent to Libs-or?)**
3. **Review of activity since October 4:** At the last meeting, we were tasked with committing to support two standards each, and then respond to the group leader of that standard as the group worked out a review process. Each group ended up having varying levels of success. Kevin seemed to have hit on a formula by
  - outlining the process and establishing deadlines using an organizational project form
  - meeting via Skype or Go to MeetingIn other words, providing some structure helped tremendously. Another problem was that not only were some people unsure of the document's audience, but not knowing what the format was going to be was made it difficult to picture a product. A number of people suggested that having an introduction stating the philosophical tenets of libraries and this product was absolutely necessary for creating the foundation for the existence of the document. It is necessary to establish a 'voice' so that the entire document is consistent throughout. Further, since some libraries don't use the standards and some libraries are newly developing, we need to make these are useful as possible to all libraries.

Regardless of the progress made by individual groups, all of the attendees had looked standards from other states, which were discussed primarily to land on a preferred format. Some states are exceedingly brief, essentially saying 'if you end up with this...fill in the blank....and it's up to you how you get there....that's good'. Such standards typically say something about the library needing to fit the community in which it lives. Some states are exceedingly prescriptive, with large, complex charts and exact figures determining the success of each library's ability to achieve the standard.

Attendees leaned one way or the other based on their style, desire for structure, need for clarity, etc. However, all attendees agreed:

- there must room for community input and shaping;
- our system must be easy and clear rather than complex and difficult
- there must be a tiered system of some sort to ever encourage libraries to excellence
- there should be an emphasis on sharing and helping each other; collaboration
- must have room for the unknown future

MaryKay talked about the new North Carolina standards and encouraged all of us to look at their new web site. <http://statelibrary.ncdcr.gov/ld/aboutlibraries/plstandards.html>

NC takes a very creative approach. They use benchmarks and outcomes.

Someone suggested that instead of using outcomes, we could use 'services'. Another idea was to use 'indicators'.

It was pointed out that not only is each library a part of their city, county or other community, they are part of the library community as well. When we present standards, we are saying this is what is important to the library community and this becomes our opportunity to say why.

Another person raised the issue of adding another standard, a marketing standard. We all definitely need help with branding and marketing, so this is something to consider.

At this point, we drafted a possible format for the standards:

I. General statement

- a. mission and goals
- b. guiding principles

II. Table of contents

III. Standards

For each standard, state:

- a. Purpose/outcomes
- b. Standards/indicators: in the format of a checklist
  1. Threshold/Essential (later we changed this so that the non-negotiables become required items on a checklist)
  2. Good/Enhanced (these would be optional on a checklist)
  3. Wicked good/Excellent (these would be optional on a checklist)
- c. Resources (for improvement, etc.)

IV. Overall

V. Plan for review of the standards

There are corollary conversations which need to take place at the same time as this conversation:

What is a public library?

What do we need to collect in state stats?

A description of a legal public library should be included in the introduction, which Kate volunteered to take on in Dan's *Other* group.

We returned to the topic of accreditation; people were wondering where we landed on that. We remembered that we thought there should be at least a sticker for the front door that the State Library could issue.

We also need to remember that Grant funders do look at standards and how well they are being achieved or how well a library is striving to achieve them.

The introduction should have some high level information, then a framework for the following content, which would be followed by a table on contents. There would be information about what a library is and

does, as well as what it is for the community, i.e third place, community center, place of information and education etc. Here are some other possibilities:

A place of equalizing opportunity,

democracy,

engage with culture

place of creation

intellectual creation space

meeting space

virtual space

Someone mentioned Ranganathan's five laws:

Early literacy/education

-Books are for use.

-Every reader, his book.

-Every book, its reader.

-Save the time of the reader.

-A library is a growing organism.

Most flexible of educational institutions

Place of curiosity where curiosity is valued

Place of growth and learning and non-judgments

Place of discovery; play, explore, discover

We also need to recognize that as essential as we are, we are not a life or death service; we are preventative medicine and something a 'full service community includes'

We need to offer help to those libraries which do not achieve the standards and this is an area which library development at State Library and OLA can offer help. Some states have a technical assistance team; that could be a great collaboration with OLA and state library in addition to providing mentors and coaches. The standards could potentially be a tool to use with staff, staff training and staff sharing.

Kate and Dan will take on the Introduction and will start by preparing an outline and talking points for our next meeting

The question came up of what to do with Access? Could it be integrated into each standard or included in the list of non-negotiables at the beginning of each standard? However, it is addressed; something should go in the introduction about it.

By our next meeting in January 11<sup>th</sup>:

-Each group will meet through conference call or Go to meeting to discuss direction

-each group will have an outline of their standard prepared

-each group will send their outline to the rest of the group by Jan 8<sup>th</sup>

-each group will think of questions you'd like more help with from the larger group

At the January 11 meeting, we will:

-Be ready to constructively critique other work to date

-provide Team presentations of 10 minutes each

Do we need any professional expertise outside our realm of knowledge?

-Mo will contact David Werk

-Technology needs to include Vision and component about continuing education, staying informed, looking for trends.

We may need to reschedule May 10 meeting so we added a tentative meeting on May 17.

With that we adjourned at 1:45