Public Library Association
Board of Directors Meeting
ALA Annual Conference
New Orleans
Saturday, June 25, 2011

Morial Convention Center
Room 238
1:30-4:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Introductions, Caplan

2. ACTION Item: Adoption of the agenda

Additional items may be added to the agenda at this time. Items may be removed from the consent agenda and moved to discussion items. New agenda items to be added to this agenda must be emailed to the PLA Executive Director 24 hours in advance of the meeting to allow time for document preparation and document distribution. Two PLA policies are included in the Board packet as background reference materials: Policies Relating to Committee and Board Service 2007.48 and Partnerships and Collaboration with the Public Library Association 2007.49.

Consent Items:

3. President’s Report 2011.57
4. 2011 Spring Board Meeting Actions 2011.58
5. 2011 PLA Election Results 2011.59
6. Key Indicator Management Reports
   a. Membership Report 2011.60
   b. Partners Report 2011.61
   e. Educational Activities Update Reports 2011.64a & 64b
   f. Leadership Task Force Report 2011.65
   g. Turning the Page 2.0 Report 2011.66
   h. Technology Benchmarks Report 2011.67
   i. Slate of Candidates, PLA 2012 Election 2011.68
   j. Awards Program Report 2011.69
   k. PLA 2012 Conference Report 2011.70
   l. Technology and Web Communications Report 2011.71

Discussion/Decision Items—decision items are identified as ACTION

7. ACTION. Every Child Ready to Read Task Force Report and Recommendations, Garvey and Feldman 2011.72

8. Budget Reports, Boria and Macikas
   b. FY 2011 Year-To-Date by Project Report thru April 2011. 2011.74

9. ACTION. Adoption of the FY2012 Budget, Budget & Finance Committee, Boria 2011.75a & 75b

PLA’s core purpose is to strengthen public libraries and their contribution to the communities they serve.
PLA’s core purpose is to strengthen public libraries and their contribution to the communities they serve.

10. Visit from ALA Executive Board Liaison to PLA, Pat Hogan  
No doc

11. Debrief-Legislative Day Meetings, Caplan and Board  
No doc

12. Legislation and Advocacy Committee Report, Reif  
2011.76

13. ALA Washington Office Annual Conference Report, Sheketoff  
ETA 2:30-2:45 p.m.  
2011.77

2011.78

15. **ACTION.** Debrief on Mega-Issue Discussion and future plans for mega-issue discussions, Caplan, Warner and Board

16. **ACTION.** CoP Task Force Report; Sunsetting of Task Force-Turner  
Member Engagement Next Steps, Board  
2011.79

2011.80

http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/research/dpla  
http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/dpla/Main_Page  
2011.81

2011.82

20. Review of the ALA Council Agenda. The purpose of this agenda item is to seek input from the Board prior to Council sessions so that the PLA Councilor can represent PLA’s point of view at Council meetings, Hage

21. **ACTION.** PLA 2012 Preconferences for Board Approval, Dallas  
2011.83

2011.84

23. Service Recognition of Outgoing Board Members, Caplan  
- Sari Feldman  
- Luis Herrera  
- Sara Dallas  
- Irene Blalock  
- Judy Napier  
- Mary Anne Hodel

24. President’s Report Out, Caplan  
- PLA President’s Program and Awards Ceremony featuring Laura Lippman and David Simon, Sunday, June 26, 1 p.m., Morial Convention Center, Auditorium B.  
- PLA President’s Reception 3:30 p.m., Sun. June 26, Morial Convention Center Rm. 260–262


Meeting Adjourns
It has been an honor to serve as president of the Public Library Association (PLA) and help lead an organization that I have been a member of for 24 years. It’s no surprise that the past year was full of challenges for public libraries—from debilitating budget cuts to pervasive questions (and doubts) about the future of libraries—but it was also filled with many wins as we heard story after story of libraries, with the support of their communities, rallying to stay open. PLA has remained dedicated to doing what it can to strengthen public libraries—developing new programming, publications, and events to help its members prepare for the challenges and the wins.

I’d like to thank the PLA officers, our committee chairs, task force chairs, community of practice members, and all the members who have worked so effectively during this past year to make a contribution to the field as well as the association. Thanks also to Barb Macikas, executive director of PLA and the PLA staff for their hard work on our behalf. I look forward to representing and serving PLA next year as past-president.
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PLA Professional Development

In the past year, PLA continued to offer its premier level of professional development, but with a new level of online engagement that included “Public Libraries at Work,” a monthly webinar series, and the first-ever Virtual Spring Symposium.

Leadership Development

In 2008, PLA began a leadership initiative that has continued to grow. The ideas behind PLA’s leadership model are to give members the tools to:

- Understand the major forces that are driving change in public libraries
- Learn how they can effectively respond to these forces
- Begin to navigate the local environment using PLA’s leadership assets

PLA has presented leadership education programs online and at conferences, sponsored an executive leadership scholarship program, and made leadership a priority goal of the 2010 PLA Strategic Plan, ensuring a future of transformative leadership education and resources for members.

2011 PLA Virtual Spring Symposium

Through the years the PLA’s Spring Symposia have built a reputation of being premier education events for public library staff. This year, PLA brought that same level of professional development and inspiration right into the library with the Virtual Spring Symposium, creating a more convenient and affordable event for members.

On March 30, more than 675 online attendees joined PLA for a full-day of public library education. Eight programs highlighted topics in technology, youth services, administration/leadership, and adult services. Individual registrants were able to switch between simultaneous tracks to find what suited them best, while registered groups streamed simultaneous tracks at the same time (on two computers) to help their team get the most out of the day.
Special programs of the day included a lunchtime interview with author Diane Ackerman (*A Natural History of the Senses, The Zookeeper's Wife*) led by *Booklist* editor Donna Seaman, and a lively closing session, “The Sustainable Library,” with George Needham and Joan Frye Williams.

The Virtual Spring Symposium also allowed for interactivity. Participants sent videos and photos that were shown during breaks, and they contributed throughout the day by writing messages in the onscreen chat window, tweeting, and asking questions of presenters.

“Public Libraries at Work” Webinar Series

In an effort to offer more professional development opportunities throughout the year, PLA developed a webinar series, “Public Libraries at Work” in the fall of 2010. The series is designed to offer practical education and innovative ideas that help participants make a difference in their library.

2010-2011 webinars included:

- “Transforming Our Image” – Presented by Valerie Gross, Valerie Gross, President & CEO, Howard County (Md.) Library
- “Nancy Pearl Presents: Gifts that Make Great Gifts” – Presented by Nancy Pearl
- “Right on the Money: Financial Literacy @ your library” – Presented by Project Read Staff, South San Francisco Public Library
- “Creating a User-Friendly Website for Your Library” – Presented by Nate Hill, web librarian at the San Jose (Calif.) Public Library
- “Cracking QR Codes: What Are They and How Can They Help Your Library, Carson Block, IT director of the Puddre River (Colo.) Public Library District
Online Course – “Accidental Public Library Technology Trainer”

Registration for the first offering of the “Accidental Public Library Technology Trainer” online course filled up fast! This sold-out, four-week blended learning course was designed for library professionals who have unexpectedly found themselves responsible for technology training at their library.

Librarian, author and trainer Stephanie Gerding guided participants through a highly interactive combination of live webinars, independent assignments, and online discussions.

PLA will offer the course a second time in August of 2011.

PLA-Sponsored Library Management Workshops

This year, PLA continued to offer public library management workshops that provide in-depth education and interactive opportunities for library professionals. The courses, developed and led by nationally known trainers, can be taken individually or used cumulatively as credit toward the Certified Public Library Administrator (CPLA) program. The two-day workshops are offered in every region of the country and tackle valuable topics like Budget and Finance, Fundraising, Marketing, Serving Diverse Populations, and Planning and Management of Buildings.

PLA Publications

PLA offers a wide range of resources for career advancement, problem-solving, continuing education, and library information for public library professionals. In the last year, PLA released three new publications.

*Time Flies...But Where? Time Management Tips and Tools*

In October 2010 PLA released *Time Flies...But Where? Time Management Tips and Tools*, its fourth downloadable training program for public library staff. The training will help participants
evaluate the balance between their work life and personal life and understand their time management choices and challenges. The program will culminate in a personal plan outlining steps and tools for better time management for each participant.

Authored by Sandra Nelson, Time Flies...But Where? (ISBN: 978-0-8389-8563-2, $45, ALA Online Store) includes all the materials needed to present a day-long (4-4.5 hour) training program. The materials include formal learning objectives, a detailed agenda, an engaging Power Point and companion script, guidelines for leading discussion, an implementation plan for attendees and a final evaluation form.

2010 PLDS Statistical Report

Published annually since 1988, PLA’s Public Library Data Service (PLDS) Statistical Report presents timely and topical data to assist public library administrators in making informed management decisions. The report is compiled from voluntary surveys submitted by public libraries across the United States and Canada.

In the 2010 edition, 987 public libraries shared their data on finances, library resources, annual use figures, technology, and more. The 2010 report also features a special section on children’s services in public libraries. This section details populations, materials holdings, material expenditures and fines, annual counts, literacy programming, borrowing policy, and technology in children’s departments throughout North America.

PLA publishes the report both in print and digital format. The digital database offers greater flexibility, allowing users to search, filter and customize their dataset. A subscription to the PLDS Database provides unlimited Web access for one year to all data and reports from 2006.

Every Child Ready to Read® @ your library®, 2nd Edition

The eagerly anticipated Every Child Ready to Read® @ your library 2nd Edition will be available in late June 2011.

The 2nd Edition is a toolkit of resources that enables public libraries and other early literacy centers to present workshops that help prepare parents/caregivers for their critical role as their
child's first teacher. The workshops demonstrate how parents, grandparents, childcare providers, and preschool teachers can use five simple research-based practices—talking, singing, reading, writing, and playing—to develop language and pre-reading skills in children from birth to age five.

The toolkit includes early literacy research, customizable PowerPoint presentations, participant handouts, reading lists, brochures, posters, and bookmarks. Every Child Ready to Read is a project of PLA and The Association for Library Service to Children (ALSC).

For more details, visit www.everychildreadytoread.org.

**Public Libraries Turns 50!**

In January 2011, PLA released the 50th issue of *Public Libraries*. In honor of this occasion, we redesigned the magazine to give it a more contemporary look and feel. In addition to creating a new masthead, our editor and designers also developed a new layout for stories and columns inside. PLA looks forward to 50 more great issues of this peer-written and peer-reviewed journal.

---

**PLA @ Conferences**

Whether it’s at PLA Conference or ALA Annual Conference, PLA has a reputation for providing the best in programming for public library professionals.

**PLA @ ALA Midwinter Meeting**

Preceding the ALA Midwinter Meeting in San Diego, California, PLA hosted a day-long institute, “Public Libraries Survive and Thrive in the 21st Century.” A panel of top library administrators and consultants offered bright ideas to help public libraries weather the current economic environment and grow strong into the future. Topics highlighted were: budget decisions, fundraising, technology, facilities, staffing, community collaborations, and customer service.
PLA @ ALA Annual Conference

This year, PLA is offering 23 educational programs dedicated to public library professionals at the 2011 ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans, Louisiana. Topics include digital literacy, diverse communities, unique programming, and library management.

The PLA President’s Program and Award’s Presentation will recognize the PLA 2011 award winners and host keynote speakers writer-producer David Simon and mystery author Laura Lippman.

In addition, PLA will host its first-ever Mega Issue discussion during the PLA All-Committee Meeting. The discussion will be an interactive event led by a facilitator and designed to offer public library professionals an opportunity to meet in person and provide input on the topics of leadership development and membership engagement for PLA.

For the second time at ALA Annual, PLA will co-sponsor, “Consultants Giving Back,” an opportunity for attendees to meet one-on-one with nationally-recognized library consultants for complimentary half hour sessions. More than 15 consultants plan to participate.

PLA 2012 Conference

PLA and its National Conference committees continue to plan for PLA Conference, March 13-17, 2012 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. PLA Conference has a reputation for excellence and offers attendees nearly two hundred high-quality educational programs, world-class speakers, a bustling exhibits hall, and countless networking opportunities and social events.
**Member Engagement**
PLA continually looks for new ways to involve and recognize members.

**New and Improved PLA Communities of Practice**

In the summer of 2010 PLA introduced restructured Communities of Practice (CoPs) to offer a more engaging and rewarding way for members to become involved in the association. The CoP enhancements were designed to strengthen member opportunities for networking, sharing best practices, engaging in discussion, and developing new ideas. There are more than 20 active CoPs.

- Branch Libraries
- Building and Facility
- Cataloging
- Collection Development
- Continuing Education
- Digital Librarianship
- Intellectual Freedom
- International Relations
- Library Management
- Marketing Public Libraries
- Public Library Services for Children
- Public Library Systems
- Readers’ Advisory
- Reference
- Rural Libraries
- Services for Spanish Speakers
- Small and Medium Libraries
- Staffing Issues
- Strategy for Public Libraries
- Technology
- Urban Libraries
- Volunteers

**PLA 2011 Awards**

PLA is pleased to offer annual awards honoring the best in public library service and innovation. In 2011, awards were given to twelve recipients.

**Allie Beth Martin Award, sponsored by Baker & Taylor**: Angelina Benedetti, Cluster Manager, King County (Wash.) Library System
Baker & Taylor Entertainment Audio Music/Video Product Award: Huntsville (Texas) Public Library

DEMCO New Leaders Travel Grant: Anna Bates, assistant director/children, Stuttgart (Ark.) Public Library; Rebecca Clarke, reference librarian, Springfield-Greene County (Mo.) Library District; and Jenna Hecker, technology and reference librarian, Morrill Memorial Library, Norwood, Mass.

EBSCO Excellence in Small and/or Rural Public Library Service Award: Independence (Kan.) Public Library

Gordon M. Conable Award, sponsored by Library Systems & Services LLC: Melanie Miller, former director of the Hays (Kan.) Public Library

The Highsmith Library Innovation Award: Noble County (Ind.) Public Library

The Polaris Innovation in Technology John Iliff Award: David Newyear, adult information services manager of the Mentor (Ohio) Public Library

The Romance Writers of America Library Grant: Costa Mesa (Calif.)/Donald Dugan Library

2011 Public Libraries Feature Article Contest:
Co-authors Paula Brehm-Heeger, Central Region Library services manager, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County (Ohio), and Greg Edwards, library services director, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County (Ohio), “Remaking One of the Nation’s Busiest Main Libraries,” (September/October 2010 issue)

Robert Rua, assistant marketing director, Cuyahoga County (Ohio) Public Library, “Reconnecting With Reading,” (January/February 2010 issue)

PLA Member Update Webinar

On March 2, 2011, PLA held its first-ever Member Update Webinar. The 45-minute, free webinar was developed to inform and encourage member engagement within the organization and throughout the field of public libraries.
A variety of panelists presented on topics relevant to PLA Members:

- **2011 PLA Elections and proposed dues increase**, Audra Caplan, PLA President,
- **Participating in PLA Communities of Practice**, Jay Turner, Gwinnett County (Ga.) Public Library
- **Engaging in public library advocacy**, Kathleen Reif, director, St. Mary’s County (Md.) Library
- **Preview of 2011 Virtual Spring Symposium**, Larry Neal, Clinton-Macomb (Mich.) Public Library

PLA anticipates holding future member update webinars as a way to connect with members and offer interactive opportunities outside of conferences.

---

**PLA and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation**

In 2011, PLA was fortunate to renew its partnership with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and move forward on two projects—*Turning the Page 2.0* and the Public Access Technology Benchmarks initiative.

**Turning the Page 2.0**

*Turning the Page 2.0* is the next generation of the popular and successful *Turning the Page: Building Your Library Community* program previously offered by PLA. Free to all participants, the 2.0 training addresses the same core issues of advocacy, communications, and relationship building—this time in a convenient blended-learning format.

In this six-week, facilitated online course, library staff and supporters learn how to create and tell their library’s story, deliver effective presentations, develop a compelling case for support, and build and sustain partnerships along the way. Participants choose an advocacy goal for their library and are guided through the creation of an advocacy work plan.
Turning the Page 2.0 will be offered six times through 2011 and 2012. Each session of Turning the Page 2.0 consists of:

- In-person kick-off (Attendance is not required but is suggested.)
- Weekly interactive one-hour webinars with PLA-trained facilitators
- Independent assignments to advance Advocacy Work Plan (1-2 hours/week)
- Personalized facilitator feedback

By the end of six weeks, participants will have a road map for making a tangible difference at their library.

Public Access Technology Benchmarks Initiative

Spring 2011 also saw the start to a groundbreaking coalition and project funded by the Gates Foundation—the Public Access Technology Benchmarks initiative. PLA joined 11 organizations, including ALA’s Office for Information Technology Policy, in an effort to develop, pilot, and promote the adoption of public access technology benchmarks for public libraries.

The primary goals of the initiative are to create benchmarks that motivate local re-investment and inspire continuous improvement in public access technology at public libraries, ensuring they are meeting their communities’ needs. Libraries will be able to use the benchmarks as tools to evaluate and plan for their technology needs.

PLA, specifically, will lead development of a training program for libraries and library trainers in order to encourage adoption and implementation of the benchmarks.

Beta benchmarks are scheduled to be announced in September of 2011 and pilot-tested through December, with a national launch anticipated for April 2012.
More Partnerships

Merck Pharmaceuticals and KidsHealth.org
In partnership with Merck Pharmaceuticals and KidsHealth.org, PLA distributed “back-to-school” health brochures to 300 libraries during summer 2010. Over 800 people replied for the 300 slots! The participating libraries received a display unit and 300 Fresh New School Year! brochures covering such topics as smart snacks, calming first day jitters, staying safe online, and questions to ask your child’s doctor. Libraries were asked to have the brochures available at the circulation desk and at any programs for parents of 11-14 year olds. Each participating library received a $50 honorarium.

Federal Trade Commission
The Division of Consumer and Business Education from the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has numerous resources aimed at helping consumers protect themselves from identity theft, fraud, debt, and much more. There are materials ranging from bookmarks to online games customized for adults and children. The FTC reached out to PLA as a potential distributor/promoter of the information to public libraries.

Public Insight Network at American Public Media
PLA and the ALA Office for Library Advocacy partnered with Public Insight Network at American Public Media (APM) to promote an exciting new initiative, LibrariUS.

LibrariUS is a journalism project in collaboration with libraries. Its goal is to explore the information, social, and civic needs of communities through the lens of local libraries. Through an interactive website, the LibrariUS program collects details from people using the library. Their responses, along with their first name, last initial and location, are displayed on a dynamic map, updated in real time. Contact information is also requested for possible media follow-up.

LibrariUS is designed to easily capture stories from patrons and/or library staff. A simple widget, installed on a library’s website, links patrons to the LibrariUS website and enables them to share why they’re visiting the library or using the library’s website.
2011 Elections and Dues Increase

2011 was an unprecedented year for PLA elections. Not only were eight officer and board positions filled, the voting membership also overwhelmingly approved a dues increase effective September 2011.

Congratulations to Eva Poole, director of libraries for the Denton (Texas) Public Library and the 2012-2013 president of PLA. Poole will become PLA president-elect at the conclusion of the 2011 ALA Annual Conference this June and will assume the PLA presidency in June 2012 for one year.

Poole has held leadership positions in public and community college library settings over the past 30 years. She has been a member of PLA and ALA since 1991, serving on numerous PLA, Library Leadership and Management Association (LLAMA) and ALA committees, including the PLA board of directors and the LLAMA board of directors, and is currently serving as an ALA councilor at-large. In addition, Poole served as president of the Texas Library Association from 2003–2004.

Additional election results are:

- ALA Division Councilor - **Christine Lind Hage**
- Directors At-Large (One-Year Terms) - 1st position: **Gary Shaffer**; 2nd position: **Carol Simmons**
- Directors At-Large (Two-Year Terms) - 1st position: **Tom Fortin**; 2nd position: **Vailey Oehlke**
- Directors At-Large (Three-Year Terms) - 1st position: **Portia Latalladi**; 2nd position: **Georgia Lomax**

PLA membership also voted (71.4 percent) to approve a dues increase. In September 2011, personal and student member dues shall increase gradually at $5 per year for four years, retired member dues shall be set at $60 and organizational and corporate member dues shall be set at $100.

Two additional ballot items, a future dues schedule and an update to the PLA bylaws regarding ALTA were approved.
PLA Partners

**Platinum**
- Baker & Taylor
- Integrated Technology Group
- Gale Cengage Learning
- Midwest Tape
- OverDrive
- ProQuest

**Gold**
- BBC Audiobooks America
- BookPage
- Brainfuse
- Brodart
- BWI
- Demco
- Ebsco
- Highsmith
- Ingram Library Services
- Innovative Interfaces
- JanWay
- Library Journal
- Mango Languages
- Morningstar

**Silver**
- OCLC
- Playaway
- Polaris Library Systems
- Queens Library
- Romance Writers of America
- SirsiDynix
- Userful
- America Reads Spanish
- Audio Publishers Association
- Books On Tape
- CIVICTechnologies
- Hachette Book Group
- HarperCollins
- LSSI
- Macmillan Audio
- Simon & Schuster
- World Book

**Bronze**
- LibraryConsultants.org
Public Library Association
Board of Directors
2011 Spring Conference Call
10 a.m. CT, April 18, 2011

DRAFT Board Actions

Present (on call): Audra Caplan, President; Marcia Warner, President Elect; Sari Feldman, Past President; Directors at Large: Irene Blalock; Sara Dallas, Judy Napier; Mary Ann Hodel; Gary Shaffer; Christine Lind Hage

PLA Councilor: Christine Lind Hage

PLA Staff: Barb Macikas, Executive Director; Linda Bostrom, Manager, Professional Development; Steven Hofmann, Manager, Web Communications; Kathleen Hughes, Manager Publications/ Editor Public Libraries; Mary Hirsh, Project Manager; Melissa Faubel Johnson, Meeting Planner/National Conference Manager; Amy Sargent, Marketing and Communications Manager; Lynn Slawsky, Program Officer; and Julianna Kloeppel, Program Coordinator.

Excused Absence: Luis Herrera

Guests: Emily Sheketoff, ALA Washington Office

1. Welcome and introductions.

2. By consent, approved the adoption of the agenda.


Discussion agenda

4. Reviewed and discussed the following reports:
The Partners Program Status Report (2011.46) was removed from the consent agenda for further discussion. PLA President Audra Caplan pointed out that the Board needs to support fundraising efforts. Barb Macikas will reach out to the Board in order to follow up with vendors and sponsors who need additional prompting.

The Technology Report, (2011.49) was removed from the consent agenda for further discussion. Christine Hage questioned the webinar pricing structure. PLA registration fees are used primarily to cover costs related to the webinar platform leasing. Other costs include promotion and speakers/content development. PLA will keep costs as low as possible and offer free webinars where appropriate. Hage suggested future webinars focus on e-book issues.

Both reports were accepted as presented.

5. ALA Privatization Task Force. Caplan reported on the work of the Task Force; a checklist document should be ready by June. It will be a resource for libraries/communities facing possible privatization. Caplan, Carolyn Anthony and Christine Hage are PLA’s representatives on the Task Force. Content from the 2000 “PLA Outsourcing: A Public Library Checklist” is assisting the effort to develop the new checklist.
6. 2011 ALA Legislative Day. Several PLA board members will be attending ALA Legislative Day in Washington, D.C. on May 12. The ALA Washington Office is developing a schedule of appointments at Federal agencies and Congressional offices for Board members. PLA staff will coordinate appointment assignments and distribute the schedule.

7. ALA Washington Office Report. WO Director Emily Sheketoff reported on current Federal budget status and proposed cuts to LSTA and IMLS budgets.

8. ALA/OITP E-Book Task Force. Hage, who serves on the OITP E-Book Task Force, reported on its work and on the ALA Presidential Task Force on Equitable Access to Electronic Content (EQUACC). She noted that public libraries have many questions regarding e-books and we need to continue to provide the profession with resources on this important issue.

9. PLA Tech Notes. Caplan and PLA president-elect Marcia Warner plan to meet with Tech Notes representatives to respond to their request for funding and to discuss future plans for Tech Notes.

10. Saturday meetings at ALA Annual. The Saturday schedule for Board was reviewed.

   The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. CT.
June 15, 2011

To: PLA Board of Directors
Fr: Barbara Macikas, Executive Director
Re: Official Election Results--2011

The PLA election results were released on April 29, 2011. Candidates were notified of the results prior to PLA and or ALA making the results public.

The results are as follows:

Board Positions

A sincere thank you to all the candidates who stood for election this year. Your leadership and commitment to PLA are critical to our success.

PLA President 2012–2013

Eva Poole

ALA Division Councilor

Christine Lind Hage

Directors At-Large (One-Year Terms)

1st position: Gary Shaffer
2nd position: Carol Simmons

Directors At-Large (Two-Year Terms)

1st position: Tom Fortin
2nd position: Vailey Oehlke

Directors At-Large (Three-Year Terms)

1st position: Portia Latalladi
2nd position: Georgia Lomax

Congratulations to all the 2011 PLA election winners. Terms begin immediately following the 2011 ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans. Find results from the ALA election here.

Additional Ballot Items

On the ballot there were three items requiring a member vote: a member dues increase, an adjustment to the member dues schedule, and an update to the PLA bylaws. Read details of the items here.

Proposed Dues Increase: Approved

Proposed Future Dues Schedule: Approved

Update to PLA Bylaws Regarding ALTA: Approved
Date: June 10, 2011  
To: PLA Board  
From: Amy Sargent, Manager of Marketing and Communications  
Re: Membership Report

Overview

As of April 2011, PLA had 9,404 members. This reflects a significant decrease in membership from April 2011 when PLA had 10,767 members in anticipation of the March 2010 Conference.

Some good signs:
- The decrease in membership from 2010 (conference year) to 2011 is a smaller percentage than it was for the 2008 (conference year) to 2009 cycle.
- Also in comparison to other conference year/nonconference year (2008/2009) data, we currently have better percentages between stats from 2010 to 2011: 17.76% improvement over the decrease in new members between 2008/2009; 14.63% improvement over the decrease in reinstated members between 2008/2009; 58.59% improvement over the increase in dropped members between 2008/2009.
- Membership numbers show a trend of beginning to increase in July preceding a conference year with hundreds joining and reinstating in fall and winter. On average, membership numbers increased by 125 per month from July to February 2010.
  - From September 2009 to March 2010, PLA had 633 new members that registered for PLA Conference.

ALA membership experienced a -3.21% shift from April 2010 to April 2011.

NEWS
PLA membership voted overwhelmingly (71.4 percent) to approve a dues increase. In September 2011, personal and student member dues shall increase gradually at $5 per year for four years, retired member dues shall be set at $60 and organizational and corporate member dues shall be set at $100.

PLA members also approved the future dues schedule. Beginning September 2015, PLA dues increases shall be based on annual average increases in the national Consumer Price Index (CPI), rounded up to the nearest dollar.
PLA Membership Numbers by Type

- Personal: 8,960
  - Regular: 6,263
  - Student: 1,216
  - Trustee: 382
  - Support Staff: 128
  - Retired: 135
  - Other: 836
- Organization: 407
- Corporate: 37

PLA Membership Percentages by Region
The following numbers represent the percentage of PLA personal memberships representing each U.S. region. Please note that these numbers do not include international members of which there were 105 in April 2011.
Regional Potential for Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percent of U.S. libraries located there*</th>
<th>Percent of PLA membership located there</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Bowker, American Libraries list (n: 9,219), does not include branches.

When comparing regional PLA member numbers to the number of libraries located in each comparable area, it becomes evident that our membership fairly represents the Midwest and South, is above average in the West, but significantly below average in the East. PLA 2012 Conference should help even out this discrepancy with the anticipation of high registration (and hopefully corresponding membership) numbers of east coast library professionals.

Division Membership Comparison (As of April 2011)
These numbers reflect the total membership for each division. Percentage reflects percentage increase or decrease from April 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASL</td>
<td>7,869 (-8.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL</td>
<td>12,654 (+4.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCTS</td>
<td>4,199 (+1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALSC</td>
<td>3,992 (-1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTAFF</td>
<td>1,482 (+29.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCLA</td>
<td>781 (-4.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITA</td>
<td>3,443 (+1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLAMA</td>
<td>4,151 (-6.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSA</td>
<td>4,220 (-2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YALSA</td>
<td>5,431 (+2.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities for Membership Recruitment

Membership Incentives
We have two incentives to drive membership recruitment/renewal in the upcoming months.

1. Dues increase – Communications will be focused on renewing and dropped members to renew or reinstate before Sep 1 in order to lock in $50 membership rate for one more year.
2. Member discount on PLA Conference registration – “Join and Save!” communications to member.

ALA Matching Recruitment Campaign, Spring/Summer of 2011: This recruitment campaign is geared toward professionals who have never been members of ALA or PLA and is targeted by name and job title to public from MDR. The messaging is focused on showcasing specific divisional offerings while demonstrating how ALA’s advocacy works for libraries.

Reaching a Larger Market
PLA is working with ALA to obtain a public library “universe” list of libraries and select staff from MDR which will greatly open up our prospects for reaching new member prospects. We were able to request data qualifiers i.e. community size, person’s position in the library to enable more targeted communications.

The Member Perspective

2011 Member Survey
The last comprehensive member survey was completed in 2008/2009. We are in the early stages of creating a new online member survey with the assistance of the ALA Office of Research and Statistics. Some of the goals of the survey include identifying: drivers to join, most valuable benefits, needs of members, threats to maintaining membership, etc. We anticipate launching the survey at the end of the summer.

Mega Issue Discussion
The Mega Issue Discussion at ALA Annual will hopefully offer good insight on what members are looking for from PLA and offer ideas leading to membership benefits and messaging.
Membership Advisory Group Tasks

Upcoming tasks the Membership Advisory Group will be focused on:

1. Developing/reviewing member surveys for new and dropped members to gain a better idea of why they've made the decisions they made (to join or drop).
2. Revision of new member mailings

Current PLA Connections

PLA reaches out to members and nonmembers alike in a variety of media to deliver benefits or introduce/reinforce the value of PLA membership.

- Monthly eNews
- Public Libraries
- www.publiclibrariansonline.org
- www.pla.org
- Welcome to new members from Barb Macikas within a month of registration
- New member mailing (1-2 mos. after registration)
- Renewing member mailing (3 mos. before “expiration date”) (print and email)
- Dropped member mailing (3 mos. after “expiration date”) (print and email)
- Assorted e-mail blasts (one-two a month)
  o Webinars
  o Midwinter Institute
  o New publications
- Monthly Webinar Series “Public Libraries at Work”
- National Meetings – PLA Conference, Virtual Spring Symposium, ALA Annual Conference, ALA Midwinter
- Regional CPLA workshops
- Facebook (3,020 fans, June 10, 2011)
- Twitter (2,006 followers, June 10, 2011)
- PLA Blog
TO: PLA Board
FROM: Barb Macikas, Executive Director
RE: Partners Program Status Report
DATE: June 13, 2011

Budget for FY2011 is $69,000. Total contributions as of today are $62,500. That includes $4,000 in award administration fees and in-kind of $5,000. There is approximately $18,000 in invoices outstanding.

Board member involvement in fundraising is critical. In many cases newer suppliers or those who are expanding outreach to the public library market are good candidates. Several of PLA’s partners are here due to the good work of the PLA board. Sponsorships and vendor support continues to be challenging as vendors cut back on giving and several of our long-time sponsors merge, in many cases cutting by half the contributions we may look forward to in the future.

Please continue to contact me with any suggestions. Thank you for your help.

Details on contributions follow. Please be sure to thank representatives from these companies when you see them here in New Orleans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Tape</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Platinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWI/Follett</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Collins</td>
<td>In-kind</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highsmith</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningstar</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playaway</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaris</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodart</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBSCO</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraryconsultants.org</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award admin (8x$500)</td>
<td>$4000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: June 10, 2011  
To: PLA Board of Directors  
From: Kathleen Hughes, editor  
Re: Public Libraries Report

So far in Fiscal Year 2011, “Public Libraries” ad sales are ahead of budget. Ad sales revenues are at $40,316, currently $13,916 ahead of budget. Ad sales revenues at this point last fiscal year were $37,685.

Our subscription base has shrunk a bit - we currently have 570 subscriptions. At this time last year we had 622 subscriptions. Subscription revenues are on target, currently at $26,028; budgeted to be $25,852. We are planning a subscription drive this summer; in order to shore up our numbers by the end of the fiscal year.

In terms of expenses, we were budgeted to be at $104,962; the actual expenses total is $84,587 making us approximately $20,000 ahead of the budgeted figure for expenses. As for the journal’s net revenue, we are at -$22,161; we are budgeted to be at -$67,592. This makes us ahead of budget by $45,430. This is mostly a timing issue, expenses will be closer to the budgeted figure by the end of the fiscal year.

In other PL news, we celebrated our 50th anniversary with a new design which started with the January/February 2011 issue. We hope the new design presents a more contemporary, sharper, and clearer look. The PL companion website, www.publiclibrariesonline.org continues to grow and evolve, with more exclusive online content including two recent author interviews, and a special E-Books feature article. We have begun to accept advertising on the site and posted our first banner ad in March, 2011.
Date: June 10, 2011
To: PLA Board of Directors
From: Kathleen Hughes, Manager, Publications
RE: Publications Report

Sales
PLA publications sales revenues are at $38,615 as of the April report; currently $1,724 behind the budgeted figure of $40,340. Revenue at this time last year was $67,293. We should be at or near the budgeted sales figure by the end of the fiscal year.

Expenses
We are continuing to hold the line on expenses. Expenses are currently under budget, at $20,068. At this point in the fiscal year, expenses are budgeted to be at $37,388.

PLA Publishing Activities
In addition to our backlist of publications, we are working on making following available:

ECRR
The updated and expanded 2nd edition of Every Child Ready to Read® (ECRR) is nearing completion. The new version incorporates simple practices, based on research, to help parents and other caregivers develop early literacy skills in children from birth to age five. The toolkit includes a series of workshops that demonstrate how parents, grandparents, childcare providers, and preschool teachers can use five simple practices--talking, singing, reading, writing, and playing--to develop language and pre-reading skills in children beginning at birth.

What’s in the kit:

- A Manual consisting of:
  An introduction to Every Child Ready To Read® 2nd edition, with background information and research references;
  A PowerPoint presentation (with instructions and talking points) for eight different ECRR workshops;
  A complete hard copy of each presentation and a CD with each presentation in PowerPoint, ready to use; and
  booklists, resource lists, and handouts.
- One packet of 100 brochures to share with patrons
- One ECRR poster
- One packet of 100 bookmarks to share with patrons
TechNotes
The PLA Technotes are short, web-based papers introducing specific technologies for public librarians. We continue to maintain the PLA Technotes series by updating the older Technotes and preparing new Technotes on emerging topics. They are located at http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/plapublications/platechnotes/index.cfm.

PLDS (Public Library Data Service)
PLA is again offering subscription access to the PLDS Online Database, featuring a dynamic web-based format. By ordering a one year subscription to the database, users are able to search the PLDS datasets and create customized reports. The print version of the PLDS also is available for purchase.

For informational purposes, the subscription databases cost $250; by the end of last fiscal year we had sold nearly 100. So far this year, we have sold 25 new subscriptions and orders continue to come in. In addition, last year’s subscribers are starting to renew their subscriptions so by the end of the fiscal year we should meet or exceed last year’s sales figure.

The subscription database has not appeared to affect sales of the PLDS book. Last year (the 2010 book) the entire printed quantity of 500 sold out almost immediately and the year before (the 2009 book) we sold 567 copies. For the 2011 edition, we have printed a quantity of 700 books, as advance orders are quite steady.

PLA Guide to Film Programming
We are working with ALA editions and a public librarian with expertise in film programming (Kati Irons) to produce a guide for public librarians on creating film programs. The guide will emphasize the selection process, as well as equipment requirements, legal considerations, and marketing. The targeted date for completion of the manuscript is December, 2011.
June 10, 2011

To: PLA Board of Directors

From: Linda Bostrom
Manager of Professional Development

Re: Educational Activities Report

**PLA @ALA Annual Conference Programming**

For the 2011 Annual Conference: one of PLA’s three scheduled preconferences, *Cirque de Peoples*, was cancelled on April 22 due to unusually low registration. The other two preconferences, *The Top Ten Benefits of Tough Times and Interactive Spaces for Families to Play, Learn and Discover* are going forward. Though registration is low (20 and 25 respectively as of this report) for both of them, their costs are low. A schedule of the PLA-sponsored programs and meetings, with their room locations, is posted on the PLA web page at [http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/plaevents/plaatalaannual/index.cfm#schedule](http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/plaevents/plaatalaannual/index.cfm#schedule).

2012 ALA Annual Conference: the Annual Conference Program Subcommittee, chaired by Kathy Sanford, will meet on Sunday in New Orleans to review and approve proposals for PLA sponsorship in Anaheim. Forty-Seven proposals were submitted for 2012, compared with 75 submitted for 2011.

**e-Learning @PLA**

A recap of activities since the Midwinter Meeting:

PLA’s monthly webinar series, “Public Libraries @ Work,” which is coordinated by Kathleen Hughes, continued in January with Right on the Money: Financial Literacy @ your Library. This event drew 75 registrants, including 13 groups. February’s webinar was titled Creating a User-Centered Website for Your Library, presented by Nate Hill (San Jose Public Library). This event drew 242 registrants, 44 of which were groups.

In March, President Audra Caplan and other PLA leaders presented a free-of-charge member-update webinar, that presented information about the dues increase, election and upcoming PLA events. Due to the Virtual Spring Symposium, no “Public Libraries @ Work” webinar was presented. A webinar entitled Cracking QR Codes: What Are They and How Can They Help Your Library was presented by Carson Block on April 20, and drew 168 registrants (33 were groups). In May, Valerie Gross presented a 2-hour follow up on her extremely popular Words that Work webinar, and drew 115 registrants (23 groups).

Informational—and very popular webinars, that were presented free of charge, included an update on the revised Every Child Ready to Read products in May, and a presentation by members of the Leadership Task Force and Leadership Fellows in June.

Upcoming webinars include one on readers advisory with Nancy Pearl, scheduled for July 19; a longer presentation about e-books in September; and customer service will be addressed by Sandra Nelson in November.
PLA held one online 4-week course, The Accidental Public Library Technology Trainer, which sold out quickly (45 was the maximum class size). A second presentation of the class, taught by Stephanie Gerding, is scheduled for August 1-29 and registration stands at 11 (as of 6/10/11).

As of the end of April (most recent report), net revenue for online CE is nearly $30,000 ahead of the budget projection.

**PLA/CPLA Workshops**
Both workshops scheduled to take place in May: Budget & Finance, 17-18th in the Houston area; Fundraising, 24-25th in Seattle had to be cancelled due to insufficient registration. We are scaling back on the number of workshops being scheduled overall. I am negotiating with two new sites in the Midwest to host workshops in the fall.

**Results Boot Camp**
PLA Conference Manager, Melissa Faubel Johnson, and I have planned a scaled down version of this workshop for early fall. It is scheduled to take place October 18-22, 2011 at the Nashville Public Library. Registration is scheduled to open before the 2011 Annual Conference.
June 10, 2011

To: PLA Board of Directors  
From: Linda Bostrom, Manager, Professional Development  
Re: PLA 2011 Virtual Spring Symposium
   March 30, 2011

Overview
The inaugural PLA Virtual Spring Symposium (VSS) was held on March 30, 2011. The schedule of sessions and speakers was developed in consultation with the Continuing Education Advisory Group, chaired by Larry Neal.

Total registration was 225, with 86 of those individuals, 76 groups of 2-3, 32 groups of 4-9, and 31 groups of 10 or more (139 groups total). Using the lowest denominator (i.e., 2, 4 and 10) for the groups would put our actual audience size at a minimum of 679 attendees. This compares with 539 in 2009 (Nashville) and 714 in 2007 (San Jose), both face-to-face events, and registration figures include speakers, guests, and staff.

The day-long event consisted of 4 subject tracks with 2 sessions in each track. Two tracks ran simultaneously in the morning and two in the afternoon. Attendees were able to switch from track to track and group registrants were allowed to stream both tracks being presented at the same time. An author interview, with Diane Ackerman, was presented midday and a closing session, featuring Joan Frye Williams and George Needham, ended the day.

Attendees were treated to music and presentations covering PLA upcoming events and shoutouts from attendees during breaks. Participants were engaged throughout the day, submitting questions, offering presenter feedback, and communicating with other attendees via the online chat window. Additionally, on twitter, a number of people posted quotes from presenters and impressions of programs.

There were technical difficulties during the Track 2 sessions which required a reboot of the server, and this caused issues for some attendees. The problem was resolved for the lunchtime interview and no other technical issues occurred. BlueSky Broadcast, the hosting company, attributed the failure to the servers they were using and the company hosting them. All registrants, individuals and groups, have access to the archived versions of the sessions for one year.

Workshop/Other Event Statistics
Based on logins recorded by the hosting company, BlueSky Broadcast, audience sizes were as follows:

Introduction – 335
Track 1, Session 1: A Mobile Feast: Reaching Library Customers via Mobile Technology – 209
Track 2, Session 1: When School Is Out, the Library Is In – 157
Track 1, Session 2: Can Your Library Provide the Electronic Content That People Want and Need? – 188
Track 2, Session 2: Connecting with Teens @ Your Library – 126
Lunchtime interview – 300
Track 3, Session 1: The Post Recession Library – 171
Track 4, Session 1: I Didn’t Know You Could Do That at the Library! – 201
Track 3, Session 2: Minnesota Library Futures Initiative – 170
Track 4, Session 2: Transforming Life After 50 – 192
Closing session – 200

Evaluations

A total of 256 attendees completed the online evaluation, an excellent response rate. Of those who responded:

- 40% are members of PLA
- 59% are either a Library Director, Assistant/Deputy Director, or a Department Manager
- 58% learned about the VSS from a colleague
- More than 75% attended as part of a group with registration paid for by their library
- Nearly 91% would attend a similar event in the future

The effectiveness and quality of the speakers and the content presented varied. About the session content and speakers:

- The speakers for 4 of the sessions (“A Mobile Feast..,” “When School Is Out..,” “the Post Recession Library,” and the Closing Session) were rated good or excellent by more than 94% of those who completed the survey. The lowest rated speaker(s) were those for “Connecting with Teens..,” 53.5% voted good or excellent; and “Minnesota Library Futurists,” 80%.
- Six of the sessions (“A Mobile Feast..,” “Can Your Library Provide the Electronic Content..,” “When School Is Out..,” “The Post Recession Library,” “I Didn’t Know You Could Do That..,” and “Transforming Life After 50”) were found to be informative by 75-92% of survey participants. Sessions receiving the lowest ratings for informative content were “Minnesota Library Futurists”and “Connecting with Teens..,” which only 40% and less than 48%, respectively, of survey respondents found to be informative.
- 70% or more of respondents plan to use what they learned in four of the sessions (“The Post-Recession Library,” “A Mobile Feast..,” “When School Is Out..,” and “Transforming Life After 50”) at their library, while less than 27% plan to use what they learned in the “Minnesota Library Futurists” session, the lowest rated in that category.

Financials

Based on the April 30, 2011 (most recent available) performance reports, VSS revenues are approximately $66,360 and expenses approximately $35,612, including overhead. This compares with $132,442/$126,176 for the 2009 Spring Symposium.

In Future

This was the first day long online event sponsored by PLA and thus a learning experience. What we learned:

1. Based on how quickly registrations were submitted, and the evaluation results, this event has an audience and fills a need.
2. The majority of the registrations were for groups, so this is likely our target market.
3. Running simultaneous tracks covering different subjects, and being able to switch freely between them, was an attractive feature for attendees.
There were many changes we will keep in mind for future similar events. Among them:

1. Provide more advance training and presentation tips for presenters.
2. Provide more instructions for attendees about the functionality of the presentation platform.
3. Offer only one group rate. This will help us better accurately gauge the size of the audience.
4. Offer a live (at ALA AC or PLA Conference), or an online program about how to present successful virtual programs.
TO: PLA Board of Directors

FROM: Luis Herrera
Leadership Development Task Force Chair

RE: Leadership Development Task Force Report

DATE: June 20, 2011

PLA’s Leadership Development Task Force is continuing its work on leadership initiatives for the association. Below is an overview of our past work and future plans.

PLA Leadership Development Background:

- In demonstrating its commitment to growing future leaders for the public librarianship, PLA established a Leadership Development Task Force in 2006. The vision of the task force was to identify an approach to grow and develop future leaders – both for the profession and association. In a nutshell, what we wanted were change agents passionate about transforming public libraries. Little did we know that the economic recession would make leadership skills an even more compelling need for our profession.

- The Task Force began its work by reviewing the landscape of other leadership development programs to determine whether PLA would partner with another entity or develop its own leadership program. The result has been a multi-pronged approach that I will briefly highlight today and that we hope will have a sustained impact for PLA in growing future leaders.

- One of the initial outcomes was the PLA Fellows program that provided competitive opportunities for PLA members to attend premier executive leadership programs in the nation. These include top notch programs such as:
  - Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government
  - Ross School of Business - University of Michigan
  - Wharton School of Business - University of Pennsylvania
  - Evans School of Management at the University of Washington

- Eight PLA Fellows were selected over the course of two years to attend and came back with rave reviews. Today you will hear from two of our fellows regarding the lessons learned and some takeaways from their experience at these programs.

- In addition to the Fellows program, PLA sponsored two institutes designed to further identify leadership skills and competencies
• In 2008 the task force partnered with 3M to sponsor a leadership institute at the PLA National Conference in Minneapolis. One hundred PLA members attended the all day event and heard from 3M’s senior managers and organizational development officers about their leadership model which focused on learning circles and leadership attributes.

• At the ALA Mid-winter conference in Chicago in 2009, the task force hosted an all day leadership brainstorming session at the Chicago Public Library. The session was led and facilitated by Dr. Adam Goodman, director of leadership development at Northwestern University. The goal of the session was to:
  o identify the key issues and challenges facing our members to become leaders in their communities; and,
  o the leadership abilities that our members would need to successfully meet the challenges.

• Out of this productive session came the genesis for PLA’s leadership model (or framework) that was unveiled as a pre conference at PLA’s National Conference in Portland last year.

• The preconference was called Changing Course: Leadership for Navigating the New Library and led by Adam Goodman.
  • The PLA Leadership Framework includes key elements:
    o A focus on change agents
    o Confronting issues facing public libraries
    o Building skills to respond to these issues
    o Foster and develop community leaders

• With the theme of “Navigating 21st Century Libraries
  o Community – demographic change, helping build strong communities, what services, who are your customers
  o Self – how do we drive change, engage with community, what kind of library will you help create,
  o Organization – how do we manage change, develop organizations that adapt to change and accept the new normal
  o Cross cutting abilities – develop a skills portfolio to be able to do this

• A program titled Leading the Way, PLA Fellows Transforming the Future was held at the ALA Conference in Chicago in 2009. The program included Dr. Adam Goodman and three of PLA fellows describing their experience attending their programs.

• The Task Force organized a leadership webinar, held June 8, 2011, for over 250 registrants. The webinar was held free of charge and included presentations by a panel of four PLA Leadership Fellows who shared highlights from their programs and illustrated how executive leadership lessons make a difference in their work and libraries. Webinar participants received educational resources from the programs and learned how they
can bring outside leadership ideas into their libraries. Preliminary evaluation results are very positive. The archived webinar may be viewed here.

PLA Leadership Development Next Steps:
It’s exciting to know that PLA is fully committed to leadership development – in fact, Leadership and Transformation is a key goal in PLA’s Strategic Plan. The plan specifically states that PLA is the leading source for learning opportunities to advance transformation of public libraries – to that end, increase leadership development and training opportunities to support the ongoing transformation of public libraries.

The Leadership Task Force continues to promote programs on Leadership Development
- PLA Program at ALA in New Orleans – One Person Can Make a Difference: Tips and Techniques for the Lone Change Agent (PLA Fellow Stephanie Chase, Multnomah County) (Saturday, June 25 – 10:30 – 12:00: On leading change at the local and state level
- PLA Pre Conference in Philadelphia Spring 2012, focusing on PLA’s Leadership Model with an emphasis on techniques for organizational change.

All these efforts are building momentum and developing a strong cohort of future leaders. PLA will continue to seek ways to build on these efforts and sustain the impact that these future leaders will have in transforming our libraries.
Date: June 10, 2011
To: PLA Board of Directors
From: Lynn Slawsky, Program Officer
RE: Turning the Page 2.0 Report

Turning the Page 2.0

The first round of Turning the Page 2.0 wrapped up on June 6, 2011. Participation in the course was very engaged. They enjoyed the chance to interact with each other and their facilitators in the online webinars; there has also been great feedback on the content. More than 2/3 of the registrants besides those who notified us of the need to drop participated in the online modules, live webinars, or both. Here are a few comments from the first round:

- “I love this format. It's the first time I've participated in something like this. Short, sweet and to the point!”
- “Thanks again for your skill in leading us, your unflagging enthusiasm, and your genuine interest in encouraging us to unanticipated accomplishments.”
- “I have taken my share of courses and most have not been as interesting as this one. I hope to be able to use the information for both the library and the local nonprofit where I am teaching.”

The Turning the Page 2.0 team is collecting data through a post-survey for Round 1, to gauge how much participants have learned about advocacy in the course. Also being measured is the extent to which participants are engaging in different components of the course, including the live webinars, archived webinar recordings, and the opportunity for team-building within their libraries. All of this data will be evaluated along with subsequent Turning the Page 2.0 rounds, in order to gain a better picture of how this blending learning model stacks up against the in-person model of the original Turning the Page.

Already, PLA has addressed feedback from participants that the time commitment to Turning the Page 2.0 is more than many expected. We’ve heard from many registrants that they need to drop out of the course at this time (nearly 1/5 of the original registrant list). Nearly all of the drops have done so because they do not have the time available for a meaningful experience. Many hope to sign up in the future. To stem the drop rate in future rounds, the Turning the Page 2.0 team is streamlining the coursework in the following ways:

- The language used to promote this course has been updated to ensure that the necessary time commitment is as clear as possible.
- The work plan is now separate from the workbook; the workbook (now referred to as “notebook”) will be described as an optional component of the course.
- There are regular check-ins with the facilitators to ensure that they are communicating effectively with their participants about the weekly assignments.
For Round 2, there are 72 registrants for the Turning the Page 2.0 in-person kick-off event being held June 24, 2011 at ALA Annual. We are expecting about 120 registrants for Round 2, about the same as for Round 1, by the time registration closes on June 15.

The un-facilitated, online only version of *Turning the Page* online is still available free of charge to all ALA members. Although PLA is not actively promoting this program at this time, more than 480 people have at least logged in to the program.

Below are the remaining rounds for Turning the Page 2.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>COHORT MEETING DATES</th>
<th>REG OPENS</th>
<th>REG CLOSE</th>
<th>IN-PERSON KICK-OFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>Week of April 18 - Week of May 23</td>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Texas Library Association, April 12, Austin TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Week of July 5 - Week of Aug 8</td>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>ALA, June 24, New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 5</td>
<td>Week of March 19 2012 - Week of April 23</td>
<td>Jan 30</td>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>PLA, March 14 2012, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 6</td>
<td>Week of June 25, 2012 – Week of Aug 6</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>ALA, TBD, Anaheim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date:       June 10, 2011
To:         PLA Board
From:       Mary Hirsh, Project Manager
RE:         Public Access Technology Benchmarks Report

Technology Benchmarks

PLA’s involvement with the Public Access Technology Benchmarks work group, made up of 11 other organizations and funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, continues apace. Currently, the group is focused on crafting the actual benchmarks content, which are due for beta release at the end of the summer.

The Urban Libraries Council hosted a two day meeting in late May where representatives from PLA, OITP, Lyrasis, OCLC/WebJunction, ICMA, The University of Washington, The University of Maryland, and the Ann Arbor District Library began to draft benchmarks. The current structure of the benchmarks covers five main areas:

- Core Capacities
- E-Government
- Work Force Development
- Education
- Social Networking

In developing the individual benchmarks within each category, the following questions are considered:

- What is the intent of this benchmark?
- What critical library capacities and practices should it capture?
- What are the key activities that this benchmark must encompass?
- What 3-5 indicators best represent the degree to which library capacity and practice is optimized?
- What metrics provide quantifiable evidence of these indicators? What research or experience was used to select these metrics?
- What beneficial patron outcomes are associated with this benchmark and its related indicators and metrics?
Participating libraries will complete a survey (designed by OCLC/WebJunction) to assess where they fall on the benchmark’s continuum. There will likely be four possible levels of achievement. It has yet to be determined how the levels will be set.

PLA’s primary role is to develop training around the benchmarks. It is anticipated that this training will involve coaching libraries on using their benchmarks results to spur advocacy efforts, ultimately resulting in re-investments in public access technology.

During Annual Conference, PLA and OITP will be holding two confidential review sessions for practitioners to offer honest feedback about the current state of the benchmarks. The Board received information about these meetings in an email on June 1; please let PLA staff know if you are interested in attending.

PLA will continue to keep the board appraised as the Benchmark Working Group hits major developmental milestones over the summer.
Date: June 10, 2011

To: PLA Board of Directors

From: Sari Feldman
Chair, PLA Nominating Committee (2012)

Re: 2012 Election Slate

I am pleased to announce the following slate of candidates for PLA office:

President Elect

Sara Dallas, Director, Southern Adirondack Library System

Carolyn Anthony, Director, Skokie (IL) Public Library

Directors at Large (2 positions)

For a term beginning after ALA Annual Conference 2012 and completed at ALA Annual Conference 2015

Position 1

Alan Harkness, Assistant State Librarian for Development, Georgia Public Library Service

Christopher Freeman, City Librarian, Stockton - San Joaquin County Public Library

Position 2

Christine Caputo, Assistant Chief, Office of Public Service Support at Philadelphia Free Library

Lynda Freas, Family Library Service Director, Anythink Library (Colorado)

I want to thank committee members Renee Blalock, Eva Poole, Cathy Sanford, Jay Turner, and Lynn Wheeler for their many contributions. It was a pleasure to work with each of you.
TO: PLA Board of Directors

FROM: Julianna Kloeppel
PLA Program Coordinator

RE: Awards Program Report

DATE: June 10, 2011

In 2009, ALA units added awards to a searchable information database created by a team lead by the ALA Library. It’s available from the Awards and Grants page on the ALA Website. To apply or to nominate a colleague for a PLA Award, users have entered applications to a separate online system since 2006.

The PLA Board is responsible for insuring that the awards program reflects the priorities of the Association.

1. Allie Beth Martin Award
   Sponsored by Baker & Taylor. Award amount: $3000.

2. Baker & Taylor Entertainment Audio Music/Video Product Award
   Award amount: a $2500 grant to a Baker & Taylor account.

3. Charlie Robinson Award
   Sponsored by Baker & Taylor. Award amount: $1000. The jury did not select a winner this year from the pool of nominations.

4. DEMCO New Leaders Travel Grant
   Grant amount: $5000 to be distributed multiple winners. Up to $1500 per winner. 3 winners in 2011.

5. Highsmith Library Innovation Award
   Award amount: $2000.
   Update: Although DEMCO has purchased Highsmith; Highsmith will continue to operate as a separate company and continue support in all the usual sponsorships and awards.

6. EBSCO Excellence in Small and/or Rural Public Library Service Award
   Award amount: $1000.

   Sponsored by LSSI. Award Amount: $1500.

8. Polaris Innovation in Technology John Iliff Award; Pilot award (2008)
   Award amount: $1000.

9. Romance Writers of America Library Grant; Pilot Grant/Award (2010)
   Grant Amount: $4500.

10. The Grow Your Own @ your library (Institutional Scholarships for Public Libraries) have not been funded for the past 3 years.

Awards Presentation will be part of the PLA President’s Program, featuring David Simon and Laura Lippman, Sunday, June 26, 1:00–2:30 PM, Morial Convention Center, Auditorium B. Board members may meet near the stage before the program for reserved seats.

Also at the awards presentation: [Public Libraries Feature Article Contest Winners](http://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/news/ala/pla-2011-award-winners-represent-excellence-public-libraries)

Co-authors Paula Brehm-Heeger, Central Region Library Services Manager, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County (Ohio), and Greg Edwards, Library Services Director, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County (Ohio) received first place recognition and a $500 prize. Their article, “Remaking One of the Nation’s Busiest Main Libraries,” which appeared in the September/October 2010 issue of *Public Libraries*, shows how a busy main library was overhauled to create a dynamic, flexible service model.

Robert Rua, Assistant Marketing Director, Cuyahoga County (Ohio) Public Library received an honorable mention and $300 for his article “Reconnecting With Reading,” which appeared in the January/February 2010 issue of *Public Libraries*. Rua’s article details an ambitious program at Cuyahoga County Public Library that focuses on books and reading as well as increasing circulation of print materials.
Date: June 10, 2011

To: PLA Board of Directors

From: Linda Bostrom
Manager of Professional Development

Melissa Faubel Johnson, CMP
Conference Manager


Plans are progressing on schedule for PLA 2012 to be held in Philadelphia, PA, March 13 – 17, 2012.

Exhibits
Currently, there are 200 exhibitors confirmed in 554 booths and one table top, and additional 26 companies holding 60 booths. This compares to 231 companies in 632 booths and one table top for the 2010 conference. We expect sales to pick up after Annual Conference and into early fall.

Registration
PLA will open “pre-registration” on July 13th in order to meet fiscal year deadlines. This is for main conference registration only. Housing reservations, as well as preconference and special event registration will be available in September.

PLA is outsourcing registration to Experient. Experient has handled conference housing for the past 5 PLA conferences and manages registration/housing for ALA Annual and MidWinter as well as the other division conferences.

Programs
During its meetings at the ALA 2011 Midwinter Meeting and in post-meeting work since then, the PLA 2012 Conference Program Subcommittee approved about 100 programs and 5 preconferences of the 320+ total proposals that were submitted. Since then, an additional 20 new programs and 5 preconferences have been created or are in process. A complete list of the committee-recommended preconferences will be available onsite in New Orleans, for the Board’s approval.

Talk Tables have been renamed ConverStations and applications are currently being accepted for those sessions. Deadline for submission is July 15, 2011.
Special/Meal Events
The following events are confirmed for PLA 2012:

Book Buzz Junior
Wednesday, March 14, 8:30-10am
Open to all conference attendees

Nancy Pearl presents “Book Buzz”
Wednesday, March 14, 10:30-noon
Open to all conference attendees

Adult Author Lunch with Joyce Carol Oates
Thursday, March 15, 12:15-1:45pm
Sponsored by HarperCollins
Ticketed event – pre-registration required

Children’s Author Lunch with Jerry Pinkney
Thursday, March 15, 12:15-1:45pm
Sponsored by Little, Brown Books for Young Readers
Ticketed event – pre-registration required

Audio Publishers Association Dinner with Carl Hiaasen, Wanda McCaddon, Lisa Scottoline & Karin Slaughter
Thursday, March 15, 6-8:30pm
Sponsored by AudioGO, Books on Tape/Random House, Macmillan Audio & Tantor Audio
Ticketed event – pre-registration required

PLA staff is working with publishers and agents to secure speakers for the Opening/Closing Sessions as well as the remaining luncheon slots.
Date: June 15, 2011  
To: PLA Board of Directors  
From: Steven Hofmann, Manager, Web Communications  
Re: Technology and Web Communications

**ALA Drupal Migration**

The rolling migration of the ALA website to Drupal, a modular and incredibly flexible open-source content management system (CMS), from the current Serena Collage CMS, was supposed to have begun by the ALA 2011 Annual Conference. PLA should have been the first division migrated. However, a secure, single log-in appliance—allowing members and other users to transition between content in the old and new sites without having to log into each separately—has been delayed until early August, and the rolling migration cannot begin until this appliance is in place.

Once migrated, the PLA site will display in a new “look and feel” template developed for the divisions by OJC, the Drupal consultancy contracted by ALA to coordinate the customized installation of the new CMS and development of the new website. The new “look and feel” will include a revised top-level, left-hand navigation and underlying information architecture (IA), which is intended to provide a more consistent user experience across all ALA divisions. The PLA Manager of Web Communications co-chaired the internal group of division website managers responsible for the new navigation and IA.

**PLA Communities of Practice**

A number of good recommendations for encouraging activity within the CoPs came out of the PLA Communities of Practice Task Force meeting at Midwinter. The CoP Task Force will sunset after the ALA 2011 Annual Conference and will provide the PLA Board with a recap of recommendations for consideration in its report. Additionally, member engagement will be the focus of the Mega-Issue discussion for PLA leaders and members at this conference. From that discussion, CoP and other member communication/engagement opportunities may be suggested for implementation.

**PLA Webinars**

A how-to manual has been created to document and instruct staff about the technical aspects of setting up, running, and archiving PLA webinars. A document to help staff diagnose and respond to webinar attendee technical issues and a tip sheet to familiarize panelists with the technical aspects of presenting a PLA webinar have also been created. A training session was held on May 26 to familiarize staff with these documents and the webinar platform’s hosting interface.

PLA hosts recordings of its webinars on Vimeo, a video sharing site. Because Vimeo’s terms of service allow for noncommercial use only, PLA is unable to sell access to its recorded webinars hosted there. Staff is researching the possibility of transferring our videos to a commercial video hosting service to allow us to sell access to the recordings and open up another potential revenue stream. The PLA
Manager of Web Communications has identified two possible commercial video hosts that meet our requirements, each with different pros and cons to consider:

**Wistia**

- $67.15/mo. for 100GB of bandwidth (approximately 233 hrs. of viewing) and 20GB of video storage (approximately 40 hour-long videos); or
- $109.65/mo. for 200GB of bandwidth (approximately 466 hrs. of viewing) and 20GB of video storage (approximately 40 hour-long videos);
- Prices reflect 15% nonprofit discount;
- Month-to-month, with an additional 10% discount is also available with a 12-month contract

**Sorenson 360**

- $139.50/mo. for 220GB of bandwidth (approximately 500 hrs. of viewing) and 10GB of video storage (approximately 25 hour-long videos);
- Price reflects 10% nonprofit discount;
- 12-month contract, with 30% premium add-on to price if month-to-month

**PLA 2012 Website**

By the ALA 2011 Annual Conference, the new PLA 2012 Conference website at [www.placonference.org](http://www.placonference.org) will have debuted in a “soft” launch. Prior PLA conference sites were hosted by our abstract/speaker management vendor, eShow, but this new site is a stand-alone Drupal site that will still link to session/speaker information maintained in eShow. The previous eShow site templates limited PLA staff access to content, and migrating all but session/speaker information to this stand-alone site gives us greater control and flexibility. The PLA 2012 site will officially launch in conjunction with the opening of conference pre-registration on July 13.
The Every Child Read to Read (ECRR) Evaluation Task Force has completed the work it began in 2007. What has been accomplished?

**Revision of the Every Child Ready to Read Product**

- The task force prepared and distributed a request for proposal to evaluate the ECRR parent education initiative and conduct a review of recent early literacy research (fall 2007).
- The task force reviewed the proposals received and selected Dr. Susan B. Neuman (University of Michigan) and Dr. Donna Celano (LaSalle University) to conduct the evaluation/literature review (winter 2008). The task force worked with the researchers in an advisory capacity.
- The evaluation report/literature review, which is currently available on the ECRR website, was reviewed by the task force (spring/summer 2009) and recommendations for next steps were presented to the ALSC/PLA Boards in July 2009 for approval.
- With the next step recommendations approved, ALSC/PLA contracted with Dr. Susan Neuman to revise and expand the ECRR curriculum (fall 2009-winter 2011) based on evaluation results/literature review. The task force worked with Dr. Neuman in an advisory capacity.
- The task force sponsored programs at the 2010 PLA National Conference and the 2010 ALSC Spring Institute about the evaluation results/literature review at which Dr. Susan Neuman presented, along with task force members.
- The revised ECRR went into production (winter 2011) and ALSC/PLA are currently accepting pre-orders, which will ship at the end of June 2011.
- A “sneak preview” webinar organized by PLA staff was held on May 4, 2011 on the revised ECRR product. Task force members and Dr. Neuman participated in the webinar. Similar content will be presented at the 2011 Annual Conference in New Orleans by task force members.
• A “soft” launch of a revised ECRR website (prepared by ALSC staff) and an ECRR Facebook page/ECRR Twitter site (prepared by PLA staff) was held on May 20, 2011.
• An ECRR program has been approved for the 2012 PLA National Conference in Philadelphia.
• An ECRR program has been submitted for approval for the 2012 ALA Annual Conference in Anaheim.

Task Force Recommendations:

Recommendation #1: Establish a joint ALSC/PLA Every Child Ready to Read oversight committee and sunset the ALSC/PLA ECRR Evaluation Task Force. The oversight committee should be comprised of 8 members—four from each division. The chair can periodically rotate between the divisions. The composition of the committee should include both directors/administrators and practitioners, similar to the composition of the task force.

For continuity purposes, Clara Bohrer (PLA), Judy Nelson (ALSC) and Kathleen Reif (PLA) have volunteered to serve on the oversight committee. Judy Nelson (ALSC) has volunteered to chair.

Potential tasks for the committee charge may include:

• Initiative oversight
• Provide advice on ECRR issues that may come to division staff and boards
• In conjunction with division staff, facilitate training opportunities (webinars and programs at library conferences)
• Provide marketing suggestions to division staff, including identification of external organizations
• Monitor and promote discussion on the ECRR Facebook page
• Answer content questions posed on ECRR Facebook page
• Recommend to division staff changes to website, as necessary
• Keep reading lists and early literacy activities up-to-date
• Identify individuals to write articles on ECRR for ALSC/PLA journals
• Provide recommendations to the division boards on resources (financial and staffing) required to properly maintain and enhance the product
The task force feels strongly that ALSC/PLA continue to invest in the product, as necessary, in order to maintain and advance the ECRR initiative and provide value to our members.

**Recommendation #2:** Translate the materials into other languages, with Spanish being the top priority.

The field is already requesting translations. It is the top question being asked of division staff and task force members. The ALSC/PLA Boards should consider translating the materials into Spanish as soon as possible. The oversight committee can be requested to recommend additional languages, as necessary.

**Recommendation #3:** The oversight committee and division staff will work together to provide continuing education and training opportunities for the revised product through webinars and programs at conferences. The task force does not recommend the establishment of certified trainers to provide continuing education on the 2nd edition of ECRR at this point in time. The 2nd edition has been designed to be turnkey and should be accessible to library staff without the need for a certified trainer. The concept of early literacy parent education is much more familiar to practitioners now than it was back in 1999.

**Recommendation #4:** The oversight committee will provide regular reports at each Midwinter and Annual Conference to the ALSC and PLA Boards. A full status report and recommendations for next steps, based on two years’ experience with the 2nd edition will be presented at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference.
June 1, 2011

TO: PLA Board of Directors


ACTION REQUESTED/INFORMATION/REPORT:

Information

ACTION REQUESTED BY:

Barb Macikas, Executive Director

DRAFT OF MOTION:

N/A

BACKGROUND:

Report is based on information available through April financial performance reports. This narrative provides context for the attached by project report.

Public Library Association Operating Budget

April 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$633,599</td>
<td>$581,537</td>
<td>$(52,061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Expenses</td>
<td>$1,094,126</td>
<td>$624,109</td>
<td>$470,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Margin</td>
<td>$(460,527)</td>
<td>$(42,572)</td>
<td>$417,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$50,725</td>
<td>$34,264</td>
<td>$16,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Budgeted/Actual/Remaining</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>$264</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue (Expense)</td>
<td>$(511,516)</td>
<td>$(77,100)</td>
<td>$434,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning/Ending Net Asset</td>
<td>$1,189,844</td>
<td>$1,112,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues

As of April, PLA revenues are 8% ($52,062) under budget (actual $581,537 vs. budget $633,599). This is primarily due to: F2F workshops that were cancelled (PLA Bootcamp and CPLA courses) due to low enrollments; publications/products, especially PLDS and the delayed launch of the 2nd edition of Every Child Ready to Read (ECRR); and sponsorships, which are slightly down. The print version of PLDS and ECRR are set to begin selling in June so much of this shortfall will be made up. The PLA Virtual Spring Symposium, the new webinar series and advertising have performed better than expected. In a non-national conference year, PLA’s largest source of revenue is membership dues. Currently, membership dues are performing at budget though it is likely they will slip as the year
continues. By July, when PLA 2012 Conference registration opens, membership should begin to pick up.

**Expenses**
Expenses are 42% ($486,477) under budget (actual $658,638 vs. budget $1,145,115). Salary/benefit savings, professional services, printing and expenses not incurred by cancelled CE events account for much of the savings. There are timing issues related to professional services, catering and some printing for ALA Annual Conference, as well as payment toward the convention center in Philadelphia and other PLA2012 costs will bring expenses closer to budget. PLA has focused on re-building its fund balance and continues to monitor expenses carefully.

**Endowment**
As of April 2011, PLA endowment principle is at $989,355. This is down from a February 2010 high of $1,015,154 but an increase from the low of $726,066 in February 2009. Endowment spending (interest and dividends available to spend) stands at $24,996.

**Gates Grants**
PLA is administering two grants from the Gates Foundation. The Turning the Page2.0 grant launched this Spring and will conclude in Fall 2012. It totals $623,723; $269,031 is budgeted to be spent in FY11. The Technology Benchmarks project began in February 2011 and is funded through January 2013. Total grant is $816,921; $352,440 is budgeted to be spent in FY 11. Overhead is recovered based on both projects over their life spans is $171,327.

**Summary**
Overall, it is projected that our revenues will close the fiscal year slightly under budget ($50,000); expenses will also be under budget by an estimated $50,000 for a projected net fund balance close to our budget of $414,620.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>FY2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY2010 Final Close</th>
<th>FY2011 Budget</th>
<th>FY2011 April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Administration (0000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>$667,878.00</td>
<td>$478,950.00</td>
<td>$435,347.00</td>
<td>$312,314.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$135,275.00</td>
<td>$70,466.00</td>
<td>$105,220.00</td>
<td>$43,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$803,153.00</td>
<td>$549,416.00</td>
<td>$540,567.00</td>
<td>$355,724.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Service to Members (3000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>$487,470.00</td>
<td>$440,783.00</td>
<td>$268,874.00</td>
<td>$269,844.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$487,470.00</td>
<td>$440,783.00</td>
<td>$268,874.00</td>
<td>$269,844.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$253,505.00</td>
<td>$165,454.00</td>
<td>$93,340.00</td>
<td>$32,055.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$233,965.00</td>
<td>$275,329.00</td>
<td>$175,534.00</td>
<td>$237,789.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Regional CE (3007)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$66,500.00</td>
<td>$36,680.00</td>
<td>$12,502.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$66,500.00</td>
<td>$36,680.00</td>
<td>$12,502.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$65,410.00</td>
<td>$75,420.00</td>
<td>$9,224.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,090.00</td>
<td>-$38,740.00</td>
<td>$3,278.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Regional CE-Meal Events (3010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,298.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$202.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Certified Public Library Administrators (3189)</strong></td>
<td>$70,200.00</td>
<td>$47,025.00</td>
<td>$62,394.00</td>
<td>$23,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$69,634.00</td>
<td>$60,359.00</td>
<td>$61,874.00</td>
<td>$24,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$566.00</td>
<td>-$13,334.00</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td>-$1,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Web CE (3040)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$148,500.00</td>
<td>$54,619.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$39,369.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$148,500.00</td>
<td>$54,619.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$39,369.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$67,168.00</td>
<td>$38,303.00</td>
<td>$20,304.00</td>
<td>$14,801.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$81,332.00</td>
<td>$16,316.00</td>
<td>-$10,304.00</td>
<td>$24,568.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 Budget</td>
<td>FY2010 Final Close</td>
<td>FY2011 Budget</td>
<td>FY2011 April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 PLA Partners (3020)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$94,000.00</td>
<td>$144,600.00</td>
<td>$34,500.00</td>
<td>$45,575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$94,000.00</td>
<td>$144,600.00</td>
<td>$34,500.00</td>
<td>$45,575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$52,350.00</td>
<td>$1,415.00</td>
<td>$34,988.00</td>
<td>$4,672.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$41,650.00</td>
<td>$143,185.00</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$40,903.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Preschool Literacy (3120)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$39,375.00</td>
<td>$11,549.00</td>
<td>$25,053.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$39,375.00</td>
<td>$11,549.00</td>
<td>$25,053.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$38,225.00</td>
<td>$33,131.00</td>
<td>$17,935.00</td>
<td>$7,159.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,150.00</td>
<td>-$21,582.00</td>
<td>$7,118.00</td>
<td>-$7,156.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Public Libraries (3030)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>$48,125.00</td>
<td>$37,393.00</td>
<td>$25,886.00</td>
<td>$26,028.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising (Net)</td>
<td>$45,800.00</td>
<td>$44,511.00</td>
<td>$11,484.00</td>
<td>$36,397.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$94,075.00</td>
<td>$81,904.00</td>
<td>$37,370.00</td>
<td>$62,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Manufact./Dist. Outside</td>
<td>$67,190.00</td>
<td>$57,569.00</td>
<td>$64,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$12,756.00</td>
<td>$6,798.00</td>
<td>$3,512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ALA IUT's</td>
<td>$46,550.00</td>
<td>$33,291.00</td>
<td>$29,108.00</td>
<td>$17,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$79,643.00</td>
<td>$35,503.00</td>
<td>$4,125.00</td>
<td>$3,995.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$203,383.00</td>
<td>$139,119.00</td>
<td>$104,962.00</td>
<td>$84,587.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-$109,308.00</td>
<td>-$57,215.00</td>
<td>-$67,592.00</td>
<td>-$22,162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Public Library Data Service (3172)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$118,760.00</td>
<td>$92,274.00</td>
<td>$81,506.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$21,185.00</td>
<td>$9,322.00</td>
<td>$9,989.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns</td>
<td>-$4,563.00</td>
<td>-$4,384.00</td>
<td>-$3,042.00</td>
<td>-$984.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$128,197.00</td>
<td>$109,075.00</td>
<td>$87,786.00</td>
<td>$22,503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>U of I Contract</td>
<td>$72,101.00</td>
<td>$78,630.00</td>
<td>$48,062.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$42,309.00</td>
<td>$34,633.00</td>
<td>$37,986.00</td>
<td>$12,903.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$114,410.00</td>
<td>$113,263.00</td>
<td>$86,048.00</td>
<td>$20,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$13,787.00</td>
<td>-$4,188.00</td>
<td>$1,738.00</td>
<td>$1,673.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11 Publications (3058)

#### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY2010 Final Close</th>
<th>FY2011 Budget</th>
<th>FY2011 April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$53,774.00</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td>$34,898.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment/Returns</td>
<td>-$3,840.00 (776.00)</td>
<td>-$1,920.00</td>
<td>-$202.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>$79,000.00</td>
<td>44,439.00</td>
<td>$4,760.00</td>
<td>$3,919.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$150,160.00</td>
<td>$97,437.00</td>
<td>$40,340.00</td>
<td>$38,615.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/Dist.</td>
<td>$11,400.00</td>
<td>$14,177.00</td>
<td>$3,764.00</td>
<td>$4,637.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
<td>$56,508.00</td>
<td>$17,350.00</td>
<td>$10,145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA IUT</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>$3,950.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$18,927.00</td>
<td>$4,173.00</td>
<td>$12,324.00</td>
<td>$5,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$72,927.00</td>
<td>$75,098.00</td>
<td>$37,388.00</td>
<td>$20,068.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$77,233.00</td>
<td>$22,339.00</td>
<td>$2,952.00</td>
<td>$18,547.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 AC Preconf-MW Inst. (3026)

#### Revenue

No preconf held in FY10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$29,500.00</td>
<td>$1,375.00</td>
<td>$9,652.00</td>
<td>$13,010.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$20,280.00</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
<td>$6,908.00</td>
<td>$9,805.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13 2011 Virtual Spring Sym. (3011)

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$38,952.00</td>
<td>$66,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$39,732.00</td>
<td>$35,612.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14 NC 2012 General Program (3061)

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$933,700.00</td>
<td>$984,724.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$506,185.00</td>
<td>$437,574.00</td>
<td>$8,186.00</td>
<td>$3,590.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15 NC 2012 Exhibits (3062)

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,629,600.00</td>
<td>$1,834,775.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$781,106.00</td>
<td>$870,238.00</td>
<td>$42,494.00</td>
<td>$36,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16 NC 2012 Promotion (3063)

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$105,197.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$96,770.00</td>
<td>$120,287.00</td>
<td>$10,302.00</td>
<td>$4,265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2010 Budget</td>
<td>FY2010 Final Close</td>
<td>FY2011 Budget</td>
<td>FY2011 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17 NC 2012 Registration (3064)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$35,250.00</td>
<td>$45,714.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-$35,250.00</td>
<td>-$45,714.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18 NC 2012 OGS/CGS (3065)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$63,000.00</td>
<td>$127,203.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-$43,000.00</td>
<td>-$127,203.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19 NC 2012 Programs (3066)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$85,075.00</td>
<td>$80,621.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-$85,075.00</td>
<td>-$80,621.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 NC 2012 PLA Store (3067)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$458.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-$458.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 NC 2012 Tours (3068)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22 NC 2012 Meal Events (3069)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$112,500.00</td>
<td>$90,290.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$90,327.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$27,500.00</td>
<td>-$37.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23 NC 2012 Preconferences (3070)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
<td>$110,616.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$52,737.00</td>
<td>$74,612.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$42,263.00</td>
<td>$36,004.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BALANCE SHEET STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010 Budget</th>
<th>FY2010 Final Close</th>
<th>FY2011 Annual Budget</th>
<th>FY2011 8 months- Actual</th>
<th>FY2011 8 months-Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$142,552.00</td>
<td>$142,552.00</td>
<td>$1,189,841.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$4,201,777.00</td>
<td>$4,150,712.00</td>
<td>$968,407.00</td>
<td>$581,537.00</td>
<td>$633,599.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$3,468,168.00</td>
<td>$3,103,422.00</td>
<td>$1,743,630.00</td>
<td>$658,637.00</td>
<td>$1,145,115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td>$733,609.00</td>
<td>$1,047,289.00</td>
<td>-$775,223.00</td>
<td>-$77,100.00</td>
<td>-$511,516.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer to Endowment</strong></td>
<td>-$100,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>$776,161.00</td>
<td>$1,189,841.00</td>
<td>$414,618.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Endowment Principle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Principle</strong></td>
<td>$989,355.00</td>
<td>$1,134,321.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Endowment Interest/Dividends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Interest/Dividends</strong></td>
<td>$30,953 *</td>
<td>$24,996.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rolled into PLA operating budget; not into endowment.
TO: PLA Board of Directors

RE: Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget

ACTION REQUESTED/INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/REPORT

ACTION

ACTION REQUESTED BY:

Marilyn Boria, Budget & Finance Committee Chair

DRAFT OF MOTION:

BACKGROUND:

Attached is the summary overview of the FY2012 as well as an overview of the budget by project. The PLA Budget & Finance Committee recommends that the PLA Board of Directors adopt the FY2012 budget. Budget assumptions are:

1. The rate of economic recovery for public library funding in FY2012 will be slower than the general economy; the PLA budget is conservative, reflecting a slow recovery.

2. Increased competition within and outside ALA for public library professional development dollars continues. We are encouraged by the initial success of webinar series and the first Virtual Spring Symposium but need to continue to explore virtual models and options.

3. Staff and member capacity is stretched during a national conference year.

4. Membership dues revenue will grow due to PLA2012 and because the dues increase passed but the rate of growth of previous years will slow. PLA dues are budgeted based on actual from FY10, the last conference year. They will be adjusted upward by $70,000 to accommodate the dues increase.

5. PLA will continue to grow its fund balance toward an ALA recommended goal of a minimum of 25% of average operating funds available (approx. $600K; FY10 began with a fund balance of $142K). PLA is projected to begin FY12 with a fund balance of approximately $500K, the first time fund balance has increased in a spend-down year since 2000.

6. PLA will research and seek grant funding where appropriate.

7. The budget will reflect the strategic plan.

Other key points:

- Related to the PLA conference, higher revenues than FY10 (due to East Coast site) will be offset by higher costs in Philadelphia. Staff will work to contain costs in Philadelphia as much as possible.
- The unfilled 1.5 FTE staff vacancies will remain unfilled.
PLA will continue to develop new or grow existing products and services, such as the Every Child Ready to Read product and online education.

Producing self-supporting f2f training outside of PLA and ALA conferences continues to be a challenge. Registration fees are traditionally low and overhead requires a minimum attendance that we often cannot achieve to break even.

On-going, gradual decline in PLA publication program revenue is a concern. New publication proposals must be carefully considered and blended with online education. Decisions about moving forward with publications will be closely evaluated in terms of value to members.

Public Libraries magazine, a primary member benefit, will continue to operate at a loss. A beta-version of the magazine is available online.

At Midwinter 2011, PLA Board voted to use interest income from LTI for special initiatives. In FY2012, initiative will focus on leadership. A project has been created in the FY12 budget, using the PLA LTI interest and dividends (less costs) for a leadership initiative.

PLA has not budgeted to add to its LTI in FY12.
FY2012 Projected
Operating Fund Balance Summary

2011 Projected Fund Balance:
- 2011 Beginning Fund Balance: $1,189,843
- 2011 Budgetary Ceiling: $2,158,250

2011 Projected Closing Fund Balance: $414,620

FY11 represents a ‘spend down’ year in our two year conference cycle, spending down -775,223.

2012 Projected Fund Balance:
- 2012 Projected Opening Fund Balance: $414,620
- 2012 Revenue Budgeted: + $4,501,730
- 2012 Projected Budgetary Ceiling: $4,916,350
- 2012 Expenses Budgeted: - $3,926,215
- 2012 Projected Year End Balance: $990,135

Note:
For financial planning purposes, ALA uses the budget submitted for the previous fiscal year as the basis for projecting the year-end fund balance for the 2012 fiscal year that is in development. Actual revenues and expenses are noted as of April performance report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 12 BUDGET-PROJECTS</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000 Administration</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$895,244</td>
<td>-$895,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 Service to Members</td>
<td>$441,100</td>
<td>$165,605</td>
<td>$275,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3007 Regional CE</td>
<td>$52,650</td>
<td>$51,986</td>
<td>$664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010 Regional CE Meal/Tkts</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020 Partners</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$10,850</td>
<td>$93,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3026 AC Preconference</td>
<td>$14,625</td>
<td>$13,804</td>
<td>$821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030 Public Libraries Mag</td>
<td>$81,904</td>
<td>$171,326</td>
<td>-$89,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040 Web Based CE</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$22,845</td>
<td>$15,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3058 Publications</td>
<td>$59,960</td>
<td>$61,179</td>
<td>-$1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061 NC12 General Program</td>
<td>$1,255,291</td>
<td>$626,147</td>
<td>$629,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3062 NC12 Exhibits</td>
<td>$1,838,000</td>
<td>$1,048,180</td>
<td>$789,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3063 NC12 Promotion</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>$124,315</td>
<td>-$18,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3064 NC12 Registration</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$67,900</td>
<td>-$67,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065 NC12 Opening/Closing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>-$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3066 NC12 Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$108,925</td>
<td>-$108,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3069 NC Meal Events</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$86,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3070 NC12 Preconf</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$90,250</td>
<td>$49,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3073 NC12 Virtual Conf</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$46,741</td>
<td>$4,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120 Preschool Lit Kit</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$28,313</td>
<td>$46,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3172 PLDS</td>
<td>$119,700</td>
<td>$128,737</td>
<td>-$9,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3174 Leadership Initiative</td>
<td>$11,273</td>
<td>$11,273</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3189 Certified Pub Lib Admin.</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
<td>$33,541</td>
<td>-$2,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$4,501,730</td>
<td>$3,926,215</td>
<td>$990,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overhead is 25.2% on confs; 12.75% on publications and online CE. Total PLA OH (included in total expenses) = $870,620

FY 11 Year End Projection

- Net Assets at beginning of year: 1,189,843
- Revenues (budgeted): 968,407
- Expenses (budgeted): 1,743,630
- Net: -775,223
- Net Assets at year end: 414,620
Since the mid-winter conference the main activities have included staying in communication with the Washington Office about the various funding challenges and continuing to work with DHHS staff to create the IM (Information Memorandum) between public libraries and Head Start. Noteworthy updates include:

- Communication with Emily Sheketoff has been excellent. She has scheduled telephone meetings with me to update me on significant events and has sent us email alerts and requests. I have then sent these email alerts and requests out to the PLA Leadership listserve. We need to continue to urge our leaders to respond to these emails.

- Emily arranged for a meeting with DHHS staff Joan Lombardi and Richard Gonzales during National Library Legislative Day in May. This was attended by various PLA leaders and IMLS Director Susan Hildreth. I could not attend this meeting due to scheduling conflicts. After this meeting it was agreed that IMLS would take the lead in trying to get this IM finalized.

- The next chair of this committee will be Victoria Yarbrough. She has been an engaged member of the committee for the past 2 years. I believe this has been her first PLA committee experience. It is heartening to see a new member appointed to be the Chair….I am confident that she will do a great job. I will remain on the committee and provide support as she requests.

Thank you to Sari Feldman and Audra Caplan for giving me the opportunity to serve as Chair of this very important PLA committee.
REPORT TO PLA

FROM: EMILY SHEKETOFF
WASHINGTON OFFICE

DATE: JUNE 14, 2011

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Appropriations FY2010

On April 14, 2011, after vigorous partisan debate, behind-the-scenes haggling and a nation wondering if the federal government would shut down, Congress finally approved the FY2011 budget for its final five months, ending September 30. Congress made a .2 percent across-the-board cut to all federal programs and made $38.5 billion in additional cuts to both mandatory and discretionary spending compared to FY2010.

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)

IMLS received a 10.7 percent cut from FY2010 levels. Its FY2011 funding is $237,393,262, down $28 million from the FY2010 total of $265.8 million, which does not include the $16 million IMLS lost with the elimination of all federal earmarks from the FY2011 budget. The cut to the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) is $24,487,678 for a total of $189,035,322 in FY2011. This is an 11.47 percent cut from the previous fiscal year. The LSTA Grants to States was appropriated at $160,032,000, a $12.5 million or 7.26 percent cut from FY2010. The Laura Bush 21st Century Library Professionals program that was just authorized last December was cut by 47.7 percent from $24.5 million in FY2010 to $12,817,822 in FY2011. These FY2011 cuts to IMLS and LSTA were based on the cuts recommended by President Obama in his FY2012 budget request, which was released on February 14, 2011.

(See program chart on next page.)
**LIBRARY APPROPRIATIONS, FY 2011 (Amount in Thousands)**

(Last updated May 17, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding for Selected Programs</th>
<th>FY 2010 Final</th>
<th>FY 2011 President’s Request</th>
<th>FY 2011 HR 1 (Defeated in Senate March 9, 2011)</th>
<th>FY 2011 Final</th>
<th>FY 2012 President’s Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Services and Technology Act</td>
<td>213,523</td>
<td>213,323</td>
<td>213,523</td>
<td>189,035</td>
<td>193,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to State Library Agencies</td>
<td>172,561</td>
<td>172,561</td>
<td>172,561</td>
<td>160,032</td>
<td>161,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Library Services</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Leadership</td>
<td>12,437</td>
<td>12,437</td>
<td>12,437</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>12,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Library Professionals</td>
<td>24,525</td>
<td>24,525</td>
<td>24,525</td>
<td>12,817</td>
<td>15,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archive and Records Administration</td>
<td>339,770</td>
<td>460,287</td>
<td>336,372</td>
<td>434,000</td>
<td>422,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPO Total</td>
<td>147,461</td>
<td>166,560</td>
<td>147,461</td>
<td>135,300</td>
<td>148,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPO Superintendent of Documents</td>
<td>40,911</td>
<td>44,208</td>
<td>39,911</td>
<td>39,911</td>
<td>42,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
<td>643,337</td>
<td>674,785</td>
<td>602,500</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>707,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking Book Program</td>
<td>13,990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I, Grants to Local Education Agencies (ESEA I-A)</td>
<td>14,492,401</td>
<td>15,846,770</td>
<td>13,798,875</td>
<td>14,492,401</td>
<td>10,841,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Start (ESEA I-B-3)</td>
<td>66,454</td>
<td>***0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>***0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading First State Grants (ESEA I-B-1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Reading First (ESEA I-B-2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving Readers Initiative</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>***0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>***0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Literacy Through School Libraries (ESEA I-B-4)</td>
<td>19,145</td>
<td>***0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>***0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Technology (ESEA II-D-1 &amp;2)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>***0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Community Learning Centers (ESEA IV-B)</td>
<td>1,166,166</td>
<td>1,166,166</td>
<td>1,066,000</td>
<td>1,153,854</td>
<td>1,266,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Ed. Prog. Strategies (ESEA V-Part A)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexpensive Book Distribution (RIF) (ESEA V-D, 5)</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>***0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>***0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl D. Perkins State Grants</td>
<td>1,160,911</td>
<td>1,264,000</td>
<td>1,160,900</td>
<td>1,123,659</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education &amp; Literacy State Grants</td>
<td>628,221</td>
<td>612,320</td>
<td>628,221</td>
<td>596,120</td>
<td>635,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education National Leadership</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>41,350</td>
<td>11,346</td>
<td>11,323</td>
<td>23,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute for Literacy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Research</td>
<td>200,196</td>
<td>260,700</td>
<td>200,196</td>
<td>199,796</td>
<td>260,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Statistics</td>
<td>108,521</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>108,521</td>
<td>108,304</td>
<td>117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Assessment</td>
<td>138,844</td>
<td>143,800</td>
<td>138,844</td>
<td>138,566</td>
<td>143,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start (HHS)</td>
<td>7,234,783</td>
<td>8,224,000</td>
<td>6,151,783</td>
<td>7,575,000</td>
<td>8,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>161,316</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>146,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>161,315</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>146,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Programs proposed for consolidation or elimination in the President’s FY2011 and FY2012 budgets.
--- Programs eliminated.
Workforce Investment through Local Libraries (WILL) Act (H.R. 1616)

On April 15, 2011, U.S. Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ-12) introduced the Workforce Investment through Local Libraries (WILL) Act (H.R. 1616). This legislation proposes including libraries in the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Ironically, in the House of Representatives, the WIA reauthorization proposal has not yet been introduced, and it is unclear at this time when that may occur.

H.R. 1616 would amend WIA to include library representation on state and local workforce investment boards and assure coordination of employment, training, and literacy services carried out by public libraries. Further, H.R. 1616 also recognizes public libraries as an allowable “One-Stop” partner and authorizes new demonstration and pilot projects to establish employment resources in public libraries. This will allow library users access to workforce activities and information related to training services and employment opportunities including (but not limited to) resume development, job bank Web searches, literacy services, and workshops on career information. The goal of the WILL Act is to allow libraries the access to WIA funds to continue to provide job search support in communities all across America.

The Washington Office is also working with Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) to introduce comparable legislation in the Senate.

ALA, ARL send letter to House and Senate Appropriations Committees urging support for Statistical Compendia Branch

On May 2, the American Library Association (ALA) and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) sent a joint letter to the Appropriations committees of the House and Senate urging them to support funding for the Statistical Compendia Branch. As the letter states, “The Statistical Compendia Branch compiles and releases reports such as the ‘Statistical Abstract’ and the ‘County and City Data Book’ that include important and usable data routinely used by the American public. Closing this Branch would mean the end of these reports and access to this valuable data.”

Accompanying the letter was a letter of support from the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA), a division of ALA. The letter is available at: http://www.districtdispatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/RUSA-Statistical-Abstract-letter_5-2-11-2_.pdf

Faster FOIA Act of 2011 (S. 627) passes the Senate

The Faster FOIA Act of 2011 sponsored by Senators Leahy (D-VT), Cornyn (R-TX), Tester (D-MT), and Whitehouse (D-RI) by passed the Senate by unanimous consent. This bill will establish a bipartisan commission to discover what causes delays in processing FOIA requests and will then make recommendations to improve the procedure and reduce backlog.
The ALA Washington Office has lobbied in support of this legislation and will continue to push for House passage.

**Library Copyright Alliance releases statement on copyright reform**

The ALA, as part of the Library Copyright Alliance (LCA) along with ACRL and ARL, released a statement in May describing the key features copyright reform proposals should include in order to constitute significant improvement over current law for librarians and their users. Interested parties have been discussing with renewed vigor the issues of orphan works, mass digitization, and even modernization of Section 108 of the U.S. Copyright Act in the wake of the Google Books settlement rejection by Judge Denny Chin of the Southern District of New York. The LCA statement (available at [http://www.librarycopyrightalliance.org/bm~doc/lea_copyrightreformstatement_16may11.pdf](http://www.librarycopyrightalliance.org/bm~doc/lea_copyrightreformstatement_16may11.pdf)), which represents the needs of library stakeholders in these debates, provides helpful guideposts for discussion.

**U.S.A. PATRIOT Act Reauthorization**

The most notable development during this recent period is the reauthorization of the three expiring sections of the U.S.A. PATRIOT Act for four more years without any reforms. Congress reauthorized Section 215 on business records (often referred to as the “library provision”), lone wolf and roving wiretap sections that would have expired at 12:01 a.m. May 27 without reauthorization. By establishing the next sunset deadline of June 1, 2015, Congress has kicked the ball out-of-bounds rather than effectively addressing the troubling issues in the USA PATRIOT Act.

ALA actively worked for USA PATRIOT Act reform during the last two years as Congress kept extending the sunset deadline. Most recently ALA has worked with the American Civil Liberties Union, the Association of Research Libraries and the Coalition for Reader Privacy pushing for reforms, especially to Section 215. The final vote was frustrating and encouraging at the same time.

During the week leading up to the vote, ALA supported Senators Patrick Leahy and Rand Paul who continued to seek the opportunity to submit amendments, including ones targeting improved reader privacy protections. In the end, the Senate was allowed some opportunity for amendments – but all failed. Three other Republicans voted with Paul, and the 19 Democrats against the extension. Those voting “aye” on the extension included 31 Democrats and 41 Republicans. The final Senate vote, late in the day, was 72 to 23.

On the House side 54 Democrats joined 196 Republicans to vote “aye.” But 31 Republicans voted with the 122 Democrats against the extension. Meanwhile 29 members did not vote.

President Obama “signed” the bill from France by authorizing his electronic signature. The three provisions are now extended for four years.
New Reforms Already Proposed

Immediately after the PATRIOT vote, Senators Leahy, Akaka, Bingaman, Boxer, Cardin, Coons, Durbin, Franken, Gillibrand, Harkin and Wyden introduced the USA PATRIOT ACT Improvements Act of 2011 (S. 1125). ALA is reviewing this new bill and working with supporters and allies. Further analysis will be conducted in the coming weeks.

National Library Legislative Day

On May 9 and 10, 2011, ALA hosted National Library Legislative Day (NLLD). This event, which was held at the Liaison Hotel in Washington, D.C., consisted of briefings on Monday followed by a reception with members of Congress and their staffs. Additionally, 101 congressional staffers from a variety of House and Senate offices attended the reception. Representative Raul Grijalva (D-AZ) and Senator John Boozman (R-AR) also attended.

On Tuesday, participants met with their federally elected officials. 361 people from 47 states participated. Over 5,000 individuals participated in Virtual Library Legislative Day. OGR staff and advocates also met with a variety of congressional committees and outside groups, including the Senate Health, Education, Labor, & Pensions (HELP) Committee, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), House Education and Workforce Committee, the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA).

Each year, participants are asked to fill out an evaluation form, which includes space for feedback on individual sessions as well as overall planning. As an incentive to fill out the form, the forms are used in a drawing for an American flag flown over the Capitol. 64 people, or 18 percent of participants, filled out the form this year. Participants are asked to rank the overall event and each session on a scale of 1-5. 1 is “very poor,” and 5 is “excellent.” The following table reflects the average rank from this year’s participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (Overall Session)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided Congress: Surveying the Landscape in the 112th Congress</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations – Plenary Session</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom and Copyright: Overview and How to Deliver the Message</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Surveillance</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Issues</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Libraries</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up: Now What?</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advocacy E-mails to Congress

Between January and June 2011, ALA members sent over 13,376 email messages to Congress. While many of these messages were focused on protecting library funding, members also wrote to their elected officials on whistleblower protection, the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, and the PATRIOT Act.

OGR holds two webinars

There were two webinars in the first part of 2011: “New Ideas for Connecting with the 112th Congress Legislators” and “Budget and Appropriations 101: Understanding the Process and Timelines.” These two webinars focused on building relationships with federally elected officials and understanding the budget process. Over 150 people participated in these two online events.

ALA, Sen. Reed secure FEMA provision to include libraries as temporary relocation facilities

Collaboration between the American Library Association (ALA) and Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI) has resulted in a change to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) policy that will designate libraries as temporary relocation facilities during major disasters and emergencies under the FEMA Public Assistance Program.

Section 403 of the Stafford Act authorizes FEMA to provide federal assistance to meet immediate threats to life and property resulting from a major disaster. According to the provision, the act allows for the provision of temporary facilities for schools and other essential community services, when it is related to saving lives and protecting and preserving property or public health and safety.

Prior to this policy change libraries were not specifically included in the list of eligible public facilities. The Office of Government Relations worked with Senator Reed, who recognized what a tremendous oversight that was. FEMA’s list of eligible public facilities now includes facilities for police, fire protection/emergency services, medical care, education, libraries, utilities and other essential community services.

Rep. Fortenberry reintroduces bill to amend Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act

In January 2010, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) released their Report to Congress regarding difficulties encountered with enforcing the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act (CPSIA).

The report reaffirms the Commission’s belief that Congress did not intend to impose the strict lead ban — as imposed by section 101(a) of CPSIA — for ordinary books. However, the report states that the CPSC does not have the flexibility needed to grant exclusion for ordinary books.
“In order to address this issue, Congress may, with some limitations, choose to consider granting an exclusion for ordinary children’s books and other children’s paper-based printed materials,” the report states.

On January 12, 2011, U.S. Rep. Fortenberry (NE-1) once again recognized the need for ordinary books to be exempt from the law by reintroducing a bill to do so. The bill, H.R. 272, would amend CPSIA to exempt ordinary books and paper-based printed material from the lead limit in CPSIA. The bill has been referred to the House committee on Energy and Commerce.

**ALA presents 2011 James Madison Award to Patrice McDermott**

American Library Association (ALA) President Roberta Stevens presented the 2011 James Madison Award to Patrice McDermott, director of OpenTheGovernment.org, during the 13th annual National Freedom of Information Day Conference celebration on March 16 at the Knight Conference Center at the Newseum in Washington, D.C.

McDermott also previously served as deputy director of the ALA Office of Government Relations, where she led the office’s work on government information and privacy policy and e-government policy issues, and as the assistant director of the Office for Intellectual Freedom of the American Library Association in Chicago.

**ALA urges House Energy and Commerce Committee to preserve FCC’s net neutrality decision**

The American Library Association (ALA) along with the Association for Research Libraries (ARL) and EDUCAUSE, sent a letter (http://www.wo.al.org/districtdispatch/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/ALA-ARL-EDU-House-NN-Ltr-FINAL.pdf) to the members of the U.S. House Energy and Commerce Committee on February 16, expressing opposition to using the Congressional Review Act or any other legislation to overturn or undermine the December “net neutrality” decision by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).
OFFICE FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Benchmarks Initiative Formally Launched

An unprecedented national coalition has formed to design and pilot a series of public access technology benchmarks for public libraries with $2.8 million in funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. OITP, with other library and local government leaders (which includes PLA), will provide leadership in developing guidelines that support continuous improvement of and local re-investment in public technology access at libraries. OITP will be most actively engaged in the early stages of the effort, co-leading benchmark development with the Urban Libraries Council and creating a foundational literature review of benchmarking efforts within and beyond the library community. Read more on the ALA Washington Office blog, the District Dispatch, at: http://www.wo.ala.org/districtdispatch/?p=5847

ALA Submitted Comments on USF Reform to the FCC

ALA submitted comments to the Federal Communications Commission in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking regarding reform of the high-cost program within the Universal Service Fund and creation of the Connect America Fund (CAF). We support the transition of the high-cost program to support broadband and highlighted the need for affordable, high-capacity broadband for libraries – particularly those serving rural communities.

The ALA urges that funding to serve rural areas, whether from the CAF or another funding mechanism, should carry with it the obligation to ensure that public libraries receive adequate broadband connectivity. The comments also note that the proposed CAF and current E-rate program would complement each other to help ensure the promise of the 1996 Telecommunications Act.

Read more on the ALA Washington Office blog, the District Dispatch, at: http://www.wo.ala.org/districtdispatch/?p=6005

ALA announces 2011 winner of L. Ray Patterson Copyright Award

OITP named Peter Suber, J.D., Ph.D., this year’s winner of the L. Ray Patterson Copyright Award. The annual award recognizes contributions of an individual or group that pursues and supports the Constitutional purpose of the U.S. Copyright Law, fair use and the public domain. Professor Suber is being recognized for his work in the open access movement that began in academia in response to increasing costs of scholarly journals.

Suber is a professor of philosophy at Earlham College, a senior researcher at Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), and a Fellow at Harvard University Library’s Office for Scholarly Communication. He also is member of the Board of Enabling Open Scholarship and serves as Open Access Project Director at Public Knowledge.
Other Notable OITP News

- OITP co-sponsored a conference investigating the intersection of journalism and librarianship organized by Journalism That Matters and held at the MIT Center for Future Civic Media.

- ALA submitted comments on the Lifeline and Link Up programs to the FCC. Our comments encouraged the inclusion and participation of libraries and library researchers as partners in any pilot program developed to evaluate whether and how Lifeline/Link Up can effectively support broadband adoption by low-income households.

- ALA participated and supported a national summit on BTOP hosted by the Schools, Health & Libraries Broadband (SHLB) Coalition. More than 100 representatives of community anchor institutions, telecom policymakers, and broadband providers convened in Washington, D.C. The ALA is a founding member of the coalition.

New Publication Series – OITP Perspectives – Introduced

OITP launched a new publication series – OITP Perspectives – that complements OITP Policy Briefs. The new series provides an outlet for topics that are more specialized than those covered by policy briefs. Publications in the OITP Perspectives series enable OITP to make a more rapid response to current issues. Additional publications for the OITP Perspectives series are already in the works in the areas of cutting-edge technology services, copyright, and e-books. The focus of OITP Perspectives No. 1 is on the digitization challenges facing small and medium-sized libraries. It presents options for large-scale digitization projects, and suggests ways to share newly created digital collections.

Article on E-rate

OITP’s Marijke Visser published an article on the E-rate program in the current issue of American Libraries. Visser consulted with the E-rate Task Force during the writing process. The E-rate program provides public libraries with the opportunity for financial support for their telecommunications services. Recent changes to the program have made it more attractive to applicants.

Developments on Digital Literacy

During the past months, OITP has been collaborating with the U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration on the DigitalLiteracy.gov portal (www.digitalliteracy.gov), which was launched in May at a Maryland College. A special launch for ALA members and library bloggers will take place at the Annual Conference on June 25 at...
12:15 p.m. In addition, OITP has appointed its new task force on digital literacy, chaired by Michael Borges, executive director of the New York Library Association. This new task force includes representatives from ACRL, LITA, OIF, AASL, OLOS, PLA and Chapters.

Program on E-rate during Midwinter Conference

OITP hosted an informational session on E-rate, featuring expert, John Noran from the Schools and Libraries Division of the Universal Service Administrative Company, who explained recent changes to the E-rate program and took questions from the audience.

Second annual cutting-edge services contest

The American Library Association (ALA) Office for Information Technology Policy (OITP) has selected programs at Creekview High School in Canton, Ga.; Orange County Library System in Orlando, Fla.; North Carolina State University Libraries in Raleigh, N.C.; and OhioLINK in Columbus, Ohio, as the winners of the association’s second contest to honor cutting-edge technologies in library services.

The winners are:
- The Unquiet Library, Creekview High School Media Center in Canton, Ga.
- OCLS Shake It! Mobile App, Orange County Library System in Orlando, Fla.
- Web Design Project, North Carolina State University Libraries in Raleigh, N.C.
- Digital Resource Commons, OhioLINK in Columbus, Ohio

OITP will host a program about these four services during the ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans on June 25 and will make detailed descriptions of each available online in order to share successful models for delivering quality library service in new ways.

OITP provides report of key changes to the E-rate program, ALA outreach efforts

The Office for Information Technology Policy (OITP) released a report on January 25, 2011, (http://www.wo.ala.org/districtdispatch/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Sixth-Report-Order-summary_final.pdf) of key changes to the E-rate program that will take effect under an order issued by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in September. The report also outlines the American Library Association’s (ALA) efforts to review the rule changes, compare these changes to the previous program rules, and inform the library community of the resulting impact on the eligibility of various services and the application process.

United States Unified Community Anchor Network taps OITP Fellow Bob Bocher for new task force

Bob Bocher, Technology Consultant for the Wisconsin State Library and ALA/OITP Fellow, was selected to serve on a new task force under the United States Unified Community Anchor
Network (U.S. UCAN). U.S. UCAN is a Broadband Technology Opportunities Project (BTOP) project dedicated to connecting community anchor institutions (CAIs), including public libraries, schools, community colleges, research parks, public safety, and healthcare institutions with advanced broadband capabilities.

**Equitable Access to Electronic Content (EQUACC) holds retreat coordinated by OITP**

The Equitable Access to Electronic Content (EQUACC) Presidential task force held a retreat March 7-8 in the ALA Washington Office. The group was established in June as the result of an ALA Council resolution that called for the formation of a Presidential Task Force primarily charged with studying challenges and potential solutions in libraries for improved electronic content access, distribution and preservation systems, and infrastructure in response to the creation and migration of materials from print to electronic access.

Given the developments in the e-content marketplace at that point in time, the retreat gave the group the opportunity to develop short-term and long-term strategies for guiding ALA members and engaging them in this critical issue.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the group released the following statement:

Recent action from the publishing world in the e-book marketplace has re-ignited interest and sparked many questions from librarians, publishers, vendors, and readers. Two ALA member groups – the presidential task force on Equitable Access to Electronic Content (EQUACC) and the E-book Subcommittee of the OITP Advisory Committee – were recently created to address complex and evolving issues.

EQUACC met this week in Washington D.C. to provide ALA with guidance and recommendations for a coordinated ALA response to the challenging issues.

In light of recent publisher changes affecting libraries’ ability to provide e-books to the public (e.g., restricting lending of e-books to a limited number of circulations) and the refusal of some publishers to sell e-content to libraries entirely, the task force will:

- Establish mechanisms for interactive and ongoing communication for ALA members to voice concerns and pose questions to ALA leadership.
- Establish communication and solicit input with other ALA member divisions and units, including the Office for Intellectual Freedom.

In addition to the above, the task force recommends that ALA pursue the following:

- Conduct an environmental scan to understand the current landscape and project future scenarios.
- Work with appropriate partners within and outside of ALA to improve access to electronic information for all, with a particular focus on people with disabilities.

- Identify and support new and emerging model projects for delivering e-content to the public.

- Develop a national public relations and education campaign highlighting the importance of libraries as essential access points for electronic content.

ALA members and the public can communicate with ALA on these issues through a new website dedicated to the challenges and potential solutions in libraries for improved access to electronic content (http://www.equacc.ala.org/) These efforts reflect on libraries’ long-standing principles of equitable access to information, reader privacy, intellectual freedom, and the lawful right of libraries to purchase and lend materials to the public.

ALA calls upon all stakeholders to join us in crafting 21st century solutions that will ensure equitable access to information for all.
WASHINGTON OFFICE

Washington Office releases summary on FCC’s network neutrality order


The document highlights issues raised by the order, the ALA’s position, and the language in the order for each issue.

Library Copyright Alliance releases paper on Costco v. Omega non-decision

The ALA, as part of the Library Copyright Alliance (LCA), released a paper in early February, exploring the Costco v. Omega non-decision. The document, titled “The Impact of the Supreme Court’s Decision in Costco v. Omega on Libraries” (http://www.librarycopyrightalliance.org/bm~doc/lcacostco013111.pdf). The paper was prepared by Jonathan Band and details legal options in the copyright law that support libraries who lend foreign-made copies in their collections.

ALA, SHLB plan Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP) Summit

The Schools, Health and Libraries Broadband (SHLB) Coalition (of which the American Library Association is a member) hosted a national convening of community anchor institutions and BTOP grantees to discuss and showcase successful BTOP projects on March 28 and 29. Larry Strickling, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, served as keynote speaker.

The SHLB BTOP Summit:
- brought voices from the field to Washington to educate policy-makers on BTOP early progress
- showcased how BTOP projects are supporting digital opportunity and economic recovery through work in and with Community Anchor Institutions
- discussed with policy-makers additional steps that can be taken to promote broadband to community anchor institutions, and
- shared best practices among leading grantees.

SHLB demonstrated strong support for the BTOP program with presenters including libraries, community colleges, K-12 schools, research and education networks, municipalities and commercial companies.
DATE: May 23, 2011
TO: Board of Directors, Public Library Association
FROM: Nann Blaine Hilyard and Jo Ann Carr, co-chairs
AASL/PLA/AAUP University Press Books Committee (Advisory Group)
RE: Committee Reauthorization

ACTION REQUESTED/INFORMATION/REPORT:

ACTION REQUESTED
We are requesting that the PLA Board re-establish committee status for the AASL/PLA University Press Books Committee.

When PLA restructured its committees and created communities of practice the Public Library presence on the AASL/PLA University Press Books Committee was hampered. AASL uses the traditional committee format and appointment process but there was no way for PLA members to find out about the committee or volunteer to serve on it.

For two decades PLA, AASL, and the American Association of University Presses have collaborated to select suitable titles for public and high school libraries from the current publications of members of AAUP. A bibliography of the selections is published as a collection development tool.

PLA and AASL committee members select their subject preferences (by Dewey). Each person receives about 50 books. They evaluate the books according to suitability for public or high school libraries: “outstanding,” “general audience,” “special interest,” “regional general,” “regional special interest.” Publication and mailing are paid by AAUP so there is no cost to either PLA or AASL. (It is also available online at www.aaupnet.org/librarybooks)

“Best of the Best” is a panel presentation at the ALA Annual Conference. Committee members have the opportunity to give oral reviews of “outstanding” titles. The presentation is broadcast on Book TV. (http://www.booktv.org/Program/11705/The+Best+of+the+Best+University+Presses.aspx)

These testimonials from current PLA-side committee members attest to the value of the committee.

##
Tina Beaird
Plainfield Public Library
Plainfield, IL
I have been a member of the University Press Books Committee for several years and have contributed and directly benefitted from the work that has been done within the committee. This Committee is designed to offer unbiased, authoritative annotated reviews of hundreds of university press titles that are not reviewed in Booklist, Library Journal, or Publishers Weekly. We offer librarians a chance to discover new titles in under-reviewed subject areas such as sciences and foreign languages. The titles aren’t typically glamorous or our stories scandalous, like often chosen in the more popular review journals, but they are vital resources for both school and public libraries. Our job is to bring these resources to the masses in a quick and reliable way.

1 of 3
As Committee members, we’ve done the heavy lifting, so other librarians don’t have to and we do this by establishing professional standards and guidelines for each and every title selected. I am not saying that our word is infallible, but using established and time-tested guidelines we offer a breadth and scope to our peers that are not found anywhere else. We are a group of dedicated, well read individuals and so is our targeted audience. The guide to the Best of the Best of University Presses that we print every year and the program we host at ALA each year are well received and utilized. Often we are stopped and told at conferences how important our Committee’s work is and how it helps both new and seasoned librarians’ alike find useful, age-appropriate, core titles for their patrons. I am grateful for the opportunity to be a member of this worthwhile committee and I hope that PLA and ALA will continue to support and promote our work in the future.

---

Dr. Teri Maggio  
Assumption Parish Library  
Napoleonville, Louisiana
I have been a member of the University Press Committee for a number of years off and on. It has been an invaluable resource for all the public libraries that I have worked for to be able to review these titles. Furthermore I have mentioned to other public librarians that the university presses often have excellent titles to include in their collections as well as using the University Press Recommended books for Public Librarians. This is a committee that really works and it would be a loss to public librarians who depend on the bibliography. The program is also very well attended and it is also broadcast. For these reasons, I feel it serves a real need for public and school librarians.

---

Saul Amdursky  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
(formerly, Des Moines Public Library, Iowa)
Many of the titles I have been sent to review do not receive a wealth of mainstream reviews. Public and school librarians don't usually read Choice. I'd guess 20-25% of the titles I get most years simply do not get reviewed at all. Therefore the committee's work brings attention to some books that might be overlooked entirely.

I like the idea of a committee roster generated from two divisions. I tend to think, especially on a committee devoted to book reviewing, that this fosters some very interesting discussions and helps us understand different priorities.

---

Angela Green  
Texas A&M University at Qatar
This committee provides the opportunity for librarians to read and recommend books for other libraries and librarians. From a librarian’s standpoint, being able to read reviews and opinions from fellow librarians is extremely useful in choosing which books to purchase for the library. The major benefit of the bibliography is it provides information about which library and age group would benefit the most from the book. This small amount of information greatly assists librarians in the selection process.
From a personal standpoint, this program provides me with the opportunity to read many interesting and great books. I like how these books can then be placed in our library for others to read and since I have read some of them I can pass on that knowledge to our patrons.

##

**Steve Norman**  
**Belfast Free Library**  
**Belfast, Maine**

Please authorize the continuation of PLA’s AAUP (Association of American University Presses) Committee, a joint committee with AASL.

The charge of the committee for many years has been to highlight for public and school libraries the best books published by university presses. Although much of the output of university presses is academic or technical and even esoteric to a degree that makes it unsuitable for most public and school libraries, a significant number of university press books still are written for a more general audience.

Usually, such university press books with more general appeal are not reviewed in selection guides used by public and school libraries. The annual bibliography published by the AAUP Committee draws attention to these meritorious books that otherwise would get overlooked. In doing this, the committee performs a function not duplicated elsewhere.

University press books also as a rule cover topics less commercially appealing than trade houses would consider for publication, even though the books’ content normally meets rigorous standards and often has enduring value. Again, the committee’s bibliography helps libraries to find these hidden gems.

For these reasons, the AAUP Committee is worth continuing.

##
TO: PLA Board of Directors

RE: Communities of Practice Task Force Report

ACTION REQUESTED/INFORMATION/REPORT:

ActionRequested: Vote to sunset the current Task Force

Discussion: Next steps for member engagement

REQUESTED BY: Jay Turner, Chair

BACKGROUND:

CoP Task Force Board Report

Task Force Members: Jay Turner, Audra Caplan, Betsy Diamant-Cohen, Cathy Sanford, Marcia Warner, Mary Anne Hodel, Sari Feldman. Staff Liaison: Steven Hofmann, Manager, Web Communications

Summary of Progress
The CoP Task Force met at ALA Midwinter 2011 to discuss ways to invigorate the communities. We spent time defining what constitutes a successful community; what are some concrete objectives we would like to see the communities complete in 2011; and what PLA communication channels are available to help CoPs share knowledge with the rest of the public library profession, as well as to help recruit new members. The recommendations from the task force’s Midwinter meeting are attached separately.

On March 2, 2011, Jay Turner presented briefly during the PLA Member Update Webinar about ways members could get involved within the association by joining and contributing to a community of practice.

Moving Forward
The CoP Task Force meeting at ALA Annual 2011 will be its last, since the task force has met its charge of making recommendations for improving member communities. The task force will spend its last meeting discussing lessons learned, and other models, methods, and tools to encourage community building and virtual participation. A summary of any recommendations that come from the task force as a result of this meeting will be forwarded to Audra Caplan.
ALA Midwinter 2011 CoP Task Force Meeting

Attendees: Jay Turner, Betsy Diamant-Cohen, Audra Caplan, Mary Anne Hodel, Judy Napier, Steven Hofmann, Amy Sargent, Saroj Ghoting

Collective Vision of a Successful Community:

- Regular communication, projects, and results (CPR).
  - Projects could include ideas for program proposals, webinars, or even webinar summaries posted to the CoP’s page.
  - People learning from people
  - Results as concrete evidence of success

- Communities should have regularly scheduled meetings
  - Board Liaison should follow up with CoP Leader if this is not happening.
  - Consider removing CoP leader for recurring violations of not holding regularly scheduled meetings. There is a need for rules and structure with accountability.

- Leaders should have more prominent recognition within and outside of the community.

- Communities should be more involved in the discussion of PLA mega-issues (items from the strategic plans, discussion of dues increases, etc)

- Leaders work with community members to create short-term and long-term goals for the CoP.

- The community generates a monthly report for its Board Liaison, so that the Board and PLA staff is aware of community happenings.

- The community has developed a unique charge.
PLA Communication Channels

- PLA e-News: goes only to PLA members; currently promotional, but want to make it more educational. CoP members, projects, and happenings can be showcased here.

- New member mailing: letter that goes out to new members, and includes information sheet about CoPs.

- PLA Website: maybe make CoP page more robust

- Facebook: can be used to showcase things that individual CoPs are currently doing.

- Twitter: promotional avenue for CoP

- Blog: promotional avenue for CoP

- Cross promotion with other divisions and roundtables since you don’t have to be a member of PLA to join a CoP
CoP Objectives for 2011

- Objective 1: By March 31, 2011, each community will have created a unique charge.
  - Board liaisons will contact their communities that do not already have a unique charge and remind them of this requirement.
  - Communities that do not comply by the deadline risk being disbanded.

- Objective 2: By June 30, 2011, each large community will complete at least one tangible project.
  - Board liaisons will work with their community leaders to come up with a project.
  - PLA staff will use appropriate communication channels to highlight and market the projects set forth by the communities.

- Objective 3: By December 31, 2011, large communities will meet monthly.
  - Community leaders can find resources for virtual collaboration here.
  - Community leaders will post meeting dates on the community’s ALA Connect calendar, as well as to the PLA Communities of Practice Leaders and Liaisons ALA Connect calendar.

- Objective 4: By December 31, 2011, smaller communities will meet quarterly.
  - Community leaders can find resources for virtual collaboration here.
  - Community leaders will post meeting dates on the community’s ALA Connect calendar, as well as to the PLA Communities of Practice Leaders and Liaisons ALA Connect calendar.

- Objective 5: By December 31, 2011, all community leaders will submit a quarterly report to his or board liaison.
  - The CoP Taskforce will work with PLA staff to determine quarterly report deadlines.
  - PLA staff will post report deadlines to all applicable web channels.
  - Board liaisons will send a personal reminder email to their community leaders at least two in advance of deadlines.
Large Communities
Communities that currently have 10 or more actual members.

- Collection Development
- Library Management
- Marketing
- Readers Advisory
- Reference Group
- Technology

Small Communities
Communities that currently have fewer than 10 actual members.

- Branch Libraries
- Buildings and Facilities
- Cataloging
- Digital Librarianship
- Intellectual Freedom
- International Relations
- Public Library Services for Children
- Rural Libraries
- Services for Spanish Speakers
- Small and Medium Libraries
- Staffing Issues
- Strategy for Public Libraries
- Urban Libraries
- Volunteers
KEEPING PUBLIC LIBRARIES PUBLIC

A Checklist for Communities Considering Privatization of Public Libraries

PLA Board of Directors Annual Conference 2011 2011.80

ALA American Library Association
Keeping Public Libraries Public
A Checklist for Communities Considering Privatization of Public Libraries

June 2011

Permission granted to libraries, other groups, and individuals to reproduce this publication for nonprofit use.

This publication was created by the 2010–2011 ALA Committee on Library Advocacy’s Task Force on Privatization:

- Patricia A. Tumulty, Chair, Committee on Library Advocacy, Task Force on Privatization, Executive Director, New Jersey Library Association
- Carolyn Anthony, Director, Skokie (Ill.) Public Library
- Audra Caplan, 2010-2011 President, Public Library Association
- Peggy Danhof, Board Trustee President, Fountaينdale Public Library, Bolingbrook, Illinois
- Kathleen Hage, Youth Services Librarian, West Palm Beach (Fla.) Public Library
- Christine Lind Hage, Director, Rochester Hills (Mich.) Public Library
- Donna McDonald, Director, Arkansas River Valley Regional Library; Trustee, Arkansas State Library Board
- Barb Macikas, Executive Director, Public Library Association
- Marci Merola, Director, ALA Office for Library Advocacy
- Sally Reed, Executive Director, Citizens for Libraries

The Task Force acknowledges the contributions of Nancy Bolt, President, Nancy Bolt and Associates, and Dr. Karen Strege, Consultant, in creating this document.
Introduction

Privatization of public services, including libraries, has been an issue for many years. In the 1980s, the federal government began to contract with private companies to manage and operate federal libraries. Other special libraries also have a history of privatization. However, only in the last 10 years have city and county governing bodies considered privatization of public libraries.

For over 200 years, public libraries have earned the respect of the residents they serve. It is interesting to note that public library service began in the colonial United States through “subscription libraries,” available only to those who could afford to pay the fee necessary to support their existence. With the development of a free education system in the U.S., many communities expanded the concept of public education by establishing public library services for their residents through tax support. Public libraries were viewed as a public good—a common resource available to all, funded by public dollars and governed by local residents. These governing boards were given unique responsibilities within a municipality to act on behalf of the community. Trustees were charged with a public trust: overseeing the collective, public assets of the library and hiring the library director, who makes operational decisions for the good of the community and who is directly accountable to the governing body. Even in cases where trustees serve in an advisory capacity only, there is a strong recognition that libraries must be accountable to the residents that fund them. Has the view of the library as a common public good changed in the 21st century?

Recently, questions about the role of government have become the center of national debates. These questions have prompted some government officials to search for options to deliver public services. Officials may entertain the notion of privatization because the presumed cost savings and other efficiencies gained are appealing. Experience has shown that privatization of public services has not necessarily produced substantial cost savings.

As local officials review these choices, they should understand the full scope of services their libraries offer, and the impact that libraries have on their communities. They must also answer the following questions:

- Can a private company maintain the level of public trust that has been earned by the local library?
- Will the library director always make the operational decisions that are in the best interest of the community, even if those decisions reduce or do not contribute to the private company’s profit?
- Can or should library services be provided through private companies?
- Does the relationship between a public library and its community change when a library is privatized?
- Does the role of the library as a public good change when the library is privatized?
The American Library Association affirms that policymaking and management oversight of public libraries should remain securely in the public domain. This report is designed to help librarians, trustees, Friends, and other library supporters address the issue of privatization and prepare for any discussions about privatization that might arise in their communities. The report includes:

I. **Current ALA Policy** .................................................. 5

II. **Definitions** ........................................................... 5

III. **Major Issues in Library Privatization** ......................... 6

IV. **Key Messages and Talking Point** ............................... 7

V. **A Checklist for Considering Privatization** ..................... 9

VI. **A Checklist for Contract Consideration** ..................... 11

VII. **Action Steps for Libraries and Their Supporters** ........ 12
I. Current ALA Policy

In 2001, after considering the issues of outsourcing and privatization, ALA Council voted to adopt the following policy:

“ALA affirms that publicly funded libraries should remain directly accountable to the public they serve. Therefore, the ALA opposes the shifting of policymaking and management oversight of library services for the public to the private for-profit sector.”

II. Definitions

The Public Library Association used the following two definitions in its report Outsourcing: A Public Library Checklist, issued in August 2000. (For more information, visit: http://www.pla.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/placareers/outsourc.pdf.) The definition of “privatization” was derived from the 1998 deliberations of the American Library Association’s Outsourcing Task Force.

**Outsourcing** involves transfer to a third party, outside vendor, contractor, independent workers, or provider to perform certain work-related tasks involving recurring internal activities that are not core to the mission of the library.

**Privatization** is the shifting of library service from the public to the private sector through transference of library management and operations from a government agency to a commercial company.

The distinction between outsourcing and privatization deserves some additional discussion. Some people suggest that there is no difference between outsourcing and privatization. After all, they argue, in outsourcing, a third party provides a service and makes a profit, just as in privatization.

One of the main differences between the two is that in outsourcing, the contract is typically narrow and for a specific service that can be easily defined and monitored. For example, a library might contract with a regional cooperative for cataloging, standing orders, or continuous services with a book jobber. In each of these cases, the private company decides how a service is delivered but the publicly funded library staff controls what that service is through a contract.

Privatization takes outsourcing to another level. Privatization encompasses all library services and controls not only how services are delivered but what services are offered and delivered. Privatization brings to light a variety of issues that will be covered in the following section of this document. All of these issues hinge on the premise that any and all contracts entered into should ensure that profits do not supersede the needs of the community.
III. Major Issues in Library Privatization

**Quality of library services**: How will a private company maintain or increase the level of service to the community and still make a profit? Who will make the final decision about the addition, reduction, or elimination of services?

**Loss of local community control**: Community control of the library, its services, and expenditure of tax dollars is at risk. Decisions about library service, operations, and budget are transferred from the public sector to a private, for-profit company. Will a private company be receptive to community feedback about the library?

**Governance**: Will policy remain under local control? What is the role of the board of trustees? Will existing trustees continue to have whatever authority is given them in state law?

**Loss of control of tax dollars**: Public money will go to a business with little or no transparency and accountability. What is the company’s profit margin, and how does this impact library service?

**Intellectual freedom**: Will the company adhere to local polices such as protection of user privacy, requiring a court order prior to reveal user information, a collection development policy, intellectual freedom, and the Library Bill of Rights? (See the Library Bill of Rights: http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/index.cfm.)

**Collection development**: Library staff buys materials that reflect the needs of its local communities. In many privatized libraries, off-site staff at the company’s headquarters selects materials. Will a provision for local input be part of the contract to ensure that local needs are being met?

**Loss of community involvement with foundations, nonprofits, Friends groups**: Will the library have difficulty receiving grants from private foundations or soliciting donations from private individuals because the library is now managed by a for-profit company and thus the contributions help a private company make a profit? Will Friends, foundations, and other bodies continue to raise funds for the local library if it is privatized? Will any percentage of funds raised go to the for-profit company? Is donated money under the control of the governing board or the for-profit company? If it is under the control of the for-profit company or management, is a Friends group’s 501(c)3 status in jeopardy?
IV. Key Messages and Talking Points

These key messages and talking points are for use by library staff, trustees, and other library supporters in talking to media representatives and others about privatization. (See www.inthepublicinterest.org/whats-at-stake for an example of how this can be graphically presented.)

Key Message 1: There are certain community services that should be held by the public. Libraries are one of them.

Talking point: Democracy depends on a well-informed and well-educated society in order to be self-governing. Public libraries provide access to an infinite array of ideas both present and past, our world’s history, our literary heritage, and learning resources for people of all ages. Today, access to 21st-century technologies has become increasingly critical for global networking, information access, and the routine tasks of individual commerce. Public libraries provide this access to all who use them without regard to means or background. Without access to these technologies, the digital divide grows deeper; more people are left further behind, and the gap between the “haves” and the “have nots” widens. Libraries continue their traditional role of connecting people with the resources they need to be fully participating members of society. Because libraries are critical to the public good, they should remain in the public domain.

Talking point: Public libraries are accountable to the public for the money they spend and the way they operate. They are governed by officials who answer to the voters. Private companies answer to the need to make a profit.

Talking point: A resident can see exactly how much money is spent on public library services. Depending on the contract, this same accountability may not be available under a private company, which shields its profits from public view. Use of public funds should be transparent.

Key Message 2: Will privatization save money?

Talking point: These are tough times for cities and counties, but library privatization has hidden and uncontrolled costs and may not save money in the long run.

Talking point: Like all contracts, privatization contracts for the public library must be carefully scrutinized to ensure that the community is receiving top service for a fair price. For example:

- Administrative costs and other fees should be clearly stated, including potential handling fees on materials or staff recruitment.
- The contract should address capital improvement and replacements, and address who is responsible for unexpected costs that may occur mid-contract, such as utility increases, repairs, or unexpected maintenance needs.
- Check to see if the company takes a percentage of any grants received.
- Who is responsible for administrative errors and associated penalties?
Key Message 3: Apparent reductions in labor costs may be offset by increases in legal costs resulting from employment actions.

Key Message 4: The public should be kept in public libraries. Privatizing the library threatens two pillars of public control: accountability and transparency.

Talking point: Private companies may not be obligated to disclose earnings. Governing bodies should insist on seeing current audited financial statements and information on the profit margin of a privately held company in order to maintain transparency.

Talking point: Public libraries are subject to the Freedom of Information Act. This same level of accountability is not required in privately held firms. Private companies can shield vital information from public view by claiming that such information is “proprietary.”

Talking point: Public officials make decisions about library operations in public meetings open to everyone. Privatization may close the door on public meetings and shut the public out of decision-making.

Key Message 5: Decisions made regarding public library services should be driven by the best interests of the community and not driven by profit.

Talking point: Public librarians view the control of public assets as a trust that must be managed for the long-term interests of the community, not driven by immediate private commercial interests.

Key Message 6: Professional standards and maintenance of quality service may be at risk with privatized service.

Talking point: Private companies have a primary interest in making profit, which can create incentives to let quality slip and assets degrade by cutting corners on maintenance of the community’s buildings and other assets, such as computing equipment and furniture.

Talking point: Private companies interested in keeping staff costs low may hire library workers who lack the necessary training or experience needed to provide quality library service.

Talking point: Some city and county governments cancelled or did not renew their privatization contracts after officials realized that they could save money by keeping library services in-house, or that the company failed to pay bills on time or requested to increase the budget.
V. A Checklist for Considering Privatization

Deciding to privatize public library management and operations is a critical decision that can have unforeseen consequences or an impact beyond what is expected, and be divisive within a community. It is important that a governing body (library board, city council, or county commission) consider multiple aspects of this decision. This checklist presents issues that should be discussed by a governing body prior to making this crucial decision. Governing boards should consider each question in light of its relevance to their local communities.

Funding
- How much money will the contract save? Has the library staff been asked if they can produce an equal amount of savings?
- How much profit margin will the company expect?
- Could profit paid to the company, combined with new library efficiencies, preserve public control of the library?
- How will the governing body monitor and verify that the anticipated cost savings occurred without damage to library services?
- Does the proposed contract include costs to fully manage the library—for example, the costs of rent, building and ground maintenance, and utilities?
- What are the costs of exiting any existing vendor or other cooperative contracts if the private company cancels them?
- What are the costs of cancelling the contract if the privatization service is not satisfactory? Can the city retain staff hired by the private company?

Library Services
- Will the same range of services be offered? Will services (including hours and locations) be decreased in number of offerings or frequency?
- Some services incur greater expenses for resources while others are very staff intensive. If forced to reduce, eliminate, or initiate services, will the private company be able to make informed decisions, mindful of the needs of the community? Will community input be solicited?
- What specific improvements in public service will result from the contract? How will the company pay for these improvements?
- Who, specifically, will evaluate that the library is providing the same or better library service? What specific criteria will be used in this determination?
- Will reciprocal borrowing (the ability to borrow from other libraries in the region) be continued, or will local library users be denied quick access to materials in other libraries? If these privileges are removed, will the library still participate in interlibrary loan agreements?
- Will the company engage in strategic planning?
- Will current library staff be retained? Experienced and dedicated library staff is the heart of library services to a community. Staff costs are the largest percentage of any organization's budget. Therefore, how a private company will handle staff costs must be understood before a contract is signed. What will the staffing patterns of the library be when it becomes privatized? How many full- and part-time staff will be employed?
- Will the hours and benefits of current staff be reduced? If so, by how much? Will existing employment contracts be honored?
Community Control

- Will there continue to be a library board, and will it continue to have the same level of authority and responsibility authorized in state law? Who will make library policies regarding such areas as the ability of children to use the Internet, or the setting of fees and fines?
- Will policy remain under local control? What is the role of the board of trustees? Will existing trustees continue to have whatever authority is given them in state law? To whom is the director of a privatized library accountable?
- Who will develop the library’s collection to meet the needs of the local community? Will corporate staff at the company’s headquarters make decisions about what goes in the library’s collection? What input will the public and library staff have?
- What input will the community have when the contract is up for renewal? How will community satisfaction be determined? How will the community be informed of library plans, budgets, and performance? Will Friends, foundations, and other entities be able to continue to operate and provide financial support under their present structures?
- How will the community know where their library tax money is spent and what amount goes to company profit?

Political Questions

- Have library governing or advisory boards been involved in planning and decision-making? Does the library governing or advisory board support the privatization decision?
- Has the local community been involved in the privatization decision-making process? Has the community been asked what library services they prefer? Does the community support privatization of the library?
- How will the library reestablish public management of the library if the private company is not satisfactory?

Organization and Staff

- Does the company propose a change to the organizational structure of the library? Will library staff be retained?
- If current employees are not rehired by the company, what is the city’s financial or human resource obligation to them? Who pays unemployment, retirement, or other termination costs? How will the city or county pay for legal defense arising from employment issues?
- Will volunteers replace existing trained staff?
- How will the company train volunteers and pay for any associated workmen’s compensation insurance?
- Will company hiring practices include recruiting a diverse population to match the make-up of the community?
- If the contract with the private company ends, can the governing body retain library staff without paying a finder’s fee to the company?

Legal

- How will compliance to all library-specific federal, state, and local laws and regulations be addressed?
- How will current collective bargaining contracts, employee benefits, and related issues be handled?
- Has a search of legal records been done to determine if there are any liens or judgments against the company?
- Has the potential impact on directors and officers insurance been investigated?
VI. A Checklist for Contract Consideration

What should be considered when soliciting a proposal and developing a contract for a public library? A private company may indicate that it cannot answer these questions until it has begun to manage the library. However, a discussion with the private company should include the governing authority's intentions. The same questions should be asked of the local library as a competitor for the contract, which would keep the library fully under public control.

Contract Provisions

- Frequency and content of regular reports to the governing body
- Oversight of the contract by governing body staff or officials
- Performance measures to ensure quality performance such as:
  - Circulation and circulation per capita (print, electronic, CD/DVD, etc.)
  - Community presentations
  - Number of individuals served through outreach services
  - Registration as percentage of population
  - Reference transactions and reference transactions per capita (on-site, phone- and virtual reference)
  - In-library use, visits (walk-in traffic, computer usage)
  - Web visits, database usage
  - Interlibrary loan statistics
  - Program attendance
  - Number of programs by month and year
  - Growth or decline of existing services
  - Establishment of new services to meet community needs
  - Hours open, total and by day
  - Status in relation to any state standards
  - The ratio between full-time and part-time staff
  - The ratio between librarians with an MLS degree and staff without MLS degrees
  - Number of volunteers and volunteer hours
  - Holds-to-copy ratio
  - Return on Investment
  - Services offered to different demographics (i.e., teen services, emergent literacy, ESOL)
- Criteria governing cancellation of the contract for performance issues
- Areas of library service where profit may be realized at the expense of quality. Degree to which any state standards must be met, i.e., no less than before privatization or above average for peer libraries
- Ability to retain library staff without paying a finder's fee to the private company if the contract is cancelled
- Company adherence to all applicable state library law, including privacy of library records and use
- Any protections for current library staff jobs, salaries, or benefits
- Degree of transparency that the private company will provide about its financial operation of the library, particularly its profit margin
VII. Action Steps for Libraries and Their Supporters

If Privatization Is Being Considered

Privatization of public libraries has become an option that is being considered by some cities and counties (governing bodies). The American Library Association has taken a position against such privatization, particularly on a long-term basis. Library staff and their supporters—boards of trustees, Friends groups, library foundations—play a major role in keeping public libraries public. Here are four steps one can take if privatization is being considered.

- Be an advocate.
- Be informed.
- Be prepared.
- Be competitive.

Be an Advocate

The best defense against privatization of public libraries is for the library staff and supporters to maintain a good relationship with the library’s governing body and operate the most efficient library possible while providing the best possible service to meet the community’s needs. Libraries maintain good relations by:

- Demonstrating the value of the library in addressing community needs
- Delivering quality customer service to meet community needs
- Cultivating vocal community support for the library
- Being in regular, positive contact with governing officials
- Sharing good news about library successes
- Involving governing officials in library activities
- Regularly improving library operation and letting the governing officials know about these improvements

Learning advocacy skills is the first step in becoming an effective advocate. The American Library Association, the Public Library Association, state associations, and state libraries offer training and other resources. If governing officials are pleased with the library and aware of strong public support, the issue of privatizing the public library is not as likely to arise.

Be Informed

The legal authority of a library board of trustees may vary depending on specific state statutes. However, as guardians of a public trust, all trustees have an obligation to understand their duties and obligations to the communities they serve. Citizens for Libraries: The Association of Library Trustees, Advocates, Friends and Foundations has developed a list of 10 trustee competencies that are essential to performing the job of a trustee. The question of privatization is less likely to occur if the library trustees demonstrate their knowledge and expertise of these competencies. The competencies are: general knowledge; board operation; advocacy; decision-making; strategic planning; finance; fundraising; policy-making; lobbying; and professional development. (For more information, visit http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/altaff/trustees/tipsheets/tipsheet9.pdf.) Ongoing board development and education are essential to maintaining a knowledgeable board.
Be Prepared
All library advocates must be prepared for the question of whether or not privatizing the local public library could be in the best interest of the community. In these days of limited financial resources, every public service must justify its value to the public it serves. Transparency and accountability are paramount. Library trustees and administrators must continually document and validate library services and expenditures. This documentation may also prove essential in providing an accurate comparison between the cost of current library service and privatized service.

When the idea of privatizing public libraries arises, library advocates should be prepared to counter the idea in a timely manner and thoroughly analyze why privatization is being considered. Do governing officials lack key information about the library? Do governing officials know the extent of library services?

Some public officials are intrigued with the idea of privatization but do not really understand all that privatization entails or what its implications can be. Library staff should share ALA’s Checklist for Considering Privatization. This checklist will give a better understanding of what should be considered in privatization decisions.

The better prepared a library is to show its value to the community, the better the chance of deflecting privatization before governing officials seriously consider it. Advocates should collect and update the information listed below. If one waits until privatization is at hand, there might not be enough time to gather the necessary documentation to show the value of the library. An additional benefit of gathering this information is that it can support current advocacy efforts with governing officials, the public, the press, and other stakeholders. Here are the kinds of information to have readily available:

- A long-range or strategic plan of service that shows that the library continually considers the best way to provide library service for the community
- Recent audits showing improvements in fiscal management that have saved the library money and how the saved money was spent to improve library service
- Staffing levels and responsibilities of professional and support staff
- Data on library use over time for common library uses such as resource circulation, reference, and programming
- A complete list of all library services, including use over time and any information on favorable reception by the public
- Any data profile that is required by the state
- Comparisons of the local library to its peers showing its success in providing service with limited resources, if possible
- Testimonial from library users about their satisfaction with the local library and the quality of service they receive
- Accomplishments of the library over the last two or three years
- Cooperative ventures and partnerships in place to better serve library users
- Involvement of Friends, foundations, and other support groups.
If governing officials are philosophically in favor of working with private companies or cooperative ventures to save money, library staff and trustees might show that they are already seriously involved in outsourcing, but that library governance and policymaking should remain in the public sector. Libraries commonly outsource services in the following areas:

- **Collection development**: Materials may be ordered already processed from a private vendor so that library staff does not have to do this; similarly, databases may be provided by private companies, saving the library money in print magazine subscriptions. However, library staff still have the critical responsibility of collection development.
- **Programming**: The library contracts with private performers and speakers to provide programming for adults and youth.
- **Building maintenance**: Janitorial and building maintenance might be outsourced.
- **Ancillary services**: Technology support, accounting, payroll, benefits management might be outsourced.

**Be Competitive**

If the library’s governing body has released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for library services, a response on behalf of the library should also be submitted. If the library responds to the RFP:

- Read the RFP thoroughly. Be ready to respond to every section in the RFP as comprehensively as possible. Try to determine the reason for the interest in privatizing the library. Is it to save money? If so, demonstrate that the current library administration and trustees can be responsive to the continuing need for efficiency in library operation. Is it lack of awareness of the performance of the library in the community? If so, document this performance in the RFP response.
- Review the documents collected in “Be Prepared” to see if they contain information necessary to respond to the RFP. Add whatever additional information is missing.
- Review the RFP and responses to ensure that the proposal answers all the questions in the RFP.
- Create a calendar and a work plan to respond to the RFP. Pay attention to deadlines. Also plan to implement any changes in library services and operations that are mentioned in the RFP.
- Solicit letters of support from influential community members, representatives of important community groups, Friends groups, the library trustees, and demographic groups. Follow the RFP process closely. If a private company is given an opportunity to submit additional information or a revised budget, ask for the same privilege for the library. If possible, obtain legal advice on the required RFP process and procedures and verify that the governing body is following these correctly.
If Privatization Is Being Pursued

If the governing authority has decided to privatize the local public library, the new goal is to ensure quality library service for the community. Here are two steps one can take if privatization is being pursued.

1. Insist on accountability in the contract
First, share the checklist on what should go into a contract with governing officials, executive staff, and appropriate legal counsel. Assuming the contract is a public document, library supporters can raise issues about the contract content to ensure the highest possible library service.

Second, the contract should specify performance-measurement indicators prior to privatization and require that those measurements are compared in regular increments throughout the contract period.

2. Monitor all new library policies and administrative activities.
Monitor any privatization contracts to make sure service to the public does not suffer. The contract should specify areas that should be monitored on a regular basis, including:

- Adherence to and adoption of library policy
- Payment of bills
- Adherence to all library contracts
- Adherences to state library law and standards
- Adherence to or development of a strategic plan
- Appropriate use of grants
- Cost-cutting measures do not negatively impact service
- Community comments or suggestions and the company's responses to them are forwarded to the governing board

If the state library or state library law have standards for public libraries, monitor the company's performance to ensure that the library meets or exceeds these standards, and that library performance in relation to the standards does not deteriorate after privatization.

Make sure that each board member has a copy of any recently developed long-range or strategic plan and watches to see that all elements of the plan are being addressed and that positive progress is being made, or that the for-profit company is providing information relative to any deviations. Be sure that the governing board is involved in any revisions in the plan.
In addition:

- Be sure that staff receives continuing education or on-the-job training to ensure quality public service.

- The company should receive an annual performance review based on the contract. If deficiencies are found, an action plan for remediation within a specific time frame should be developed.

- Watch for cost-cutting measures such as employing mostly part-time employees and/or using volunteers for work that should be done by paid staff. When such measures are noted, be cognizant of how they affect library services and activities.

- Require that the for-profit company provide monthly copies of all community input received and an explanation of actions taken by the company in relation to each. Develop other methods for monitoring community response to the new library set-up and related actions taken by the company.

- Review all points above and determine exactly what action will be taken by the board or by city or county government in the event that the for-profit fails to meet requirements and expectations. How long will the company be given to correct any problem? Will there be any penalty fee charged to the company if there is a problem but it is corrected? How will the board establish an appropriate level of correction in each case?

**Conclusion**

This report is designed to help communities understand the implications of public library privatization, and to provide the tools to help assess the issues surrounding it. There are many other resources available about such privatization. We encourage additional research.

Remember, no decision is ever final. At the time this document was created, approximately 20 privatization contracts for libraries or library systems had been signed nationwide. Six of those were later terminated or not renewed.
Coming this fall!

Privatizing Libraries

by Nancy Bolt, Jane Jerrard, and Karen Strege

This timely special report from ALA Editions provides a succinct but comprehensive overview of the “privatization” of public libraries. It provides a history of the trend of local and state governments privatizing public services and assets, and then examines the history of public library privatization right up to the California legislation introduced earlier this year to restrict cities in the state from privatizing library services.

The report also examines what happens when a private, for-profit organization takes over essential management tasks and decisions of a public library, including the effects this can have on services, patron satisfaction and staff, as well as legal issues.

It provides in-depth recommendations for librarians who want to retain control of their own institutions. Complete with case studies, statistics, and a valuable checklist of to-dos for libraries that are facing partial or complete privatization.

$45.00 | ALA Members: $40.50 | 96 Pages | 8.5" X 11" | ISBN: 978-0-8389-1154-4

ALA Editions purchases fund advocacy, awareness and accreditation programs for library professionals worldwide.
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Draft Outline: 06/11

Foreword by Patricia Tumulty, Chair, ALA Committee on Library Advocacy, ALA Task Force on Privatization; and Executive Director, New Jersey Library Association; and Marci Merola, Director, ALA Office for Library Advocacy

Introduction
• Definition of privatization
• Touch on growing trend in general and in public libraries
• Outline contents/flow of report

Chapter 1: Privatization and the Public Sector
• Examine general trend toward privatizing public services/sectors/assets
• Reasons, theories behind trend toward privatization of public functions
• Costs, savings, results of general privatization

Chapter 2: Privatizing Public Libraries
• Overview of trend in library industry, history (up to CA legislation)
• Definitions of library practices: Outsourcing, contracting, privatization
• ALA policies
• How/why it happens
• Most recent figures of privatized libraries (if available)

Chapter 3: A Closer Look at Privatization: Case Studies
Six consistent case studies of public libraries that have been privatized; that tried privatization and abandoned it; or that considered privatization. Include statistics, comparison to other libraries in the state

Chapter 4: Key Issues for Libraries Facing Privatization
• Considerations of what this means for libraries
• What it means for community served
• How to fight privatization within your library system – include some tips, talking points from ALA checklist

Bibliography/Resources

Appendices
• Keeping Public Libraries Public: A Checklist for Communities Considering Privatization of Public Libraries
• Statistics on privatized libraries from 2008 report [tentative]
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Berkman Center for Internet & Society

About

Mission

The Berkman Center's mission is to explore and understand cyberspace; to study its development, dynamics, norms, and standards; and to assess the need or lack thereof for laws and sanctions.

We are a research center, premised on the observation that what we seek to learn is not already recorded. Our method is to build out into cyberspace, record data as we go, self-study, and share. Our mode is entrepreneurial nonprofit.

- Frequently Asked Questions (/about/faq)
- Funding & Support Policies (/about/support)

The Center in Brief

The Berkman Center was founded to explore cyberspace, share in its study, and help pioneer its development. We represent a network of faculty, students, fellows, entrepreneurs, lawyers, and virtual architects working to identify and engage with the challenges and opportunities of cyberspace.

We investigate (/research) the real and possible boundaries in cyberspace between open and closed systems of code, of commerce, of governance, and of education, and the relationship of law to each. We do this through active rather than passive research, believing that the best way to understand cyberspace is to actually build out into it.

Our faculty (/people/faculty), fellows (/people/fellows), students, and affiliates engage with a wide spectrum of Net issues, including governance, privacy, intellectual property, antitrust, content control, and electronic commerce. Our diverse research interests cohere in a common understanding of the Internet as a social and political space where constraints upon inhabitants are determined not only through the traditional application of law, but, more subtly, through technical architecture ("code").

As part of our active research mission, we build, use, and freely share open software platforms for free online lectures.
We also sponsor gatherings (events), ranging from informal lunches to international conferences, that bring together members of our diverse network of participants to swap insights – and sometimes barbs – as they stake out their respective visions for what the Net can become. We also teach (teaching), seeking out online and global opportunities, as well as supporting the traditional Harvard Law School curriculum, often in conjunction with other Harvard schools and MIT.
Main Page

From Digital Library of America Project

Welcome to the Digital Public Library of America planning initiative wiki!

Introduction

The Berkman Center will convene a large and diverse group of stakeholders to define the scope, architecture, costs, and administration for a proposed Digital Public Library of America (http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/research/dpla). This initiative was launched in December 2010 with generous support from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

Planning activities will be guided by a Steering Committee of library and foundation leaders, which promises to announce a full slate of activities in early 2011. The Committee plans to bring together representatives from the educational community, public and research libraries, cultural organizations, state and local government, publishers, authors, and private industry in a series of meetings and workshops to examine strategies for improving public access to comprehensive online resources.

The initiative stems from an October 2010 meeting held at the Radcliffe Institute to discuss the possibility of creating a Digital Public Library of America. That meeting, attended by leaders from research libraries, foundations, and a variety of cultural institutions, resulted in a statement that will serve as a jumping-off point for the initiative.

In March, 2011, the Steering Committee drafted a Concept Note to describe the initiative, on which they seek comment.

- Video update from Steering Committee Chair John Palfrey on the DPLA (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vwpZyuNPmL8), May 19, 2011

Contributing to the Wiki

The evolution and success of this initiative rely on inputs from a diverse range of stakeholders and community members; we very much hope that this wiki will be the embodiment of a consensus-based and peer-produced approach.

This is just a starting point, which we hope will grow with your input and suggestions. Please help us to develop these resources and conversations by creating an account (http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/dpla/?title=Special:UserLogin&returnto=Main_Page) and contributing links and resources directly to the wiki, or by e-mailing Rebekah Heacock (mailto:rheacock@cyber.law.harvard.edu) at the Berkman Center with your contributions.

Not sure where to start? Check out the most active pages or the pages with the fewest
contributions so far.

Research Tracks in Support of Workstreams

The DPLA Steering Committee initially established 5 workstreams: Content and Scope; Financial/Business Models; Governance; Legal Issues; and Technical Aspects for our initial planning phase. Community members have suggested a sixth research track, which has since been added into the DPLA effort: Audience and Participation. Please feel free to contribute to any of these research tracks and propose new ones. The Steering Committee will consider adding new workstreams for the next planning phases based on suggestions here on the wiki. (A note on what follows: on behalf of the Steering Committee, I've added "Big Issues" under each track based on conversations, in person on 3/1/11 in Cambridge, MA. As ever, consider them editable all the same. - John Palfrey)

Audience and Participation

This workstream will collaborate with each of the other workstreams to ensure that decisions are being made that will best support the current and future needs of the broadest possible user group. Specifically, it will examine models to establish and serve communities of users and stakeholders and to define the privileges and benefits the DPLA will offer to them. This track is focused on examining models to establish and serve communities of users and stakeholders, and to define the privileges and benefits the Library will offer to them. How interactive should the library system be, what forms of interactivity should it offer, what policies should cover them, and how much freedom should individual topic communities within the system have in setting policies and practices, such as procedures for selecting moderators? Would the Disqus service (http://www.disqus.com) be worthy of study?

Big issues: We need to define clearly who is being served by the DPLA. We need a series of use-cases across a range of members of the public. If "public" is included in the title, we need to make good on the implied promise associated with using that term. We need to aim for broad and continuing involvement, both in planning and in implementation. The workstreams may be the right mechanism for tapping into energy, skill, and enthusiasm.

Content and Scope

This workstream will make recommendations for a collection development policy for the DPLA. One primary goal is to begin to identify and articulate the criteria for including materials in a proposed DPLA. This workstream will also confront questions regarding management of and access to distributed materials. This track is focused on issues such as case studies of key collections, bibliographic data, metadata, interoperability and international cooperation. We will explore the intrinsic features of digitized content and their interrelations, as well as questions regarding management of and access to distributed materials. Other areas for research may include an investigation of how many books and other materials exist in U.S. libraries, their degree of overlap and copyright status, analyses of already-digitized collections in the U.S. and abroad.

- Potential Content
- Analysis of Digitized Works
- March 1, 2011 Workshop Notes
- March 1, 2011 Workshop: Meeting Coverage and Thoughts (http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/dpla/Media_and_Blog_Mentions#March_1_Meeting_Coverage.2FThoughts)

Big issues: How much content do we need in order to get to critical mass? Even if we start with public domain materials, getting to in-copyright materials will be essential if this is to be a "public" enterprise. Some specific collections, including government documents (e.g., in Michigan), could be a way to add value quickly with some useful content. We need to learn from Europeana and other projects that have come before or are ongoing, both successes and failures, in terms of content acquisition among many other
issues. We must distinguish between the idea of libraries, and what they do, and collections. And we must also carve out things we are not seeking to do with respect to content (i.e., preservation).

Financial/Business Models
This workstream will make recommendations for a sustainable business plan for the DPLA. It is clear that any effort to greatly increase the scope of public access to digital resources will require partnerships among many entities, public and private, including government institutions, foundations, libraries (public, academic, and special-purpose) and (probably) publishers, both for-profit and nonprofit. The set of business models and mechanisms required to support a successful effort is likely to be complicated and varied, reflecting substantial differences in the primary missions of the participating institutions. How much the effort costs will depend on both technical and organizational considerations, and the financial/business models track will have to consider these aspects simultaneously.

**Big issues:** We need to ensure that there is a sustainable model for the DPLA. Philanthropy will be a good starting point, but the effort must have a business model and a means of drawing on core funding from libraries and governments in order to get to scale. Working with publishers is also a necessity as part of this project.

Governance
This workstream will make recommendations for a system of decision making and management for the DPLA. The DPLA must be as broad, open, and non-partisan as possible. Suggestions that have already been raised include a federated model similar to the Internet Engineering Task Force, a lightweight coalition, a government commission, a new 501(c)(3), or a new project at any one of a number of pre-existing organizations.

**Big issues:** The governance of the DPLA should be broad and inclusive, and must also have a means of moving forward.

Legal Issues
This workstream will make recommendations regarding how to approach and influence the legal and copyright environment in order to support equitable knowledge distribution in a digital world. This track is focused on assessing legal and copyright issues such as digital lending, orphan works, international works, and strategies for tiered access, or how to deal with vendors and materials under various kinds of restrictions.

**Big issues:** We need both to get done what we can today, as well as to consider a package of law reforms that will help. Issues that had the most energy around them: the doctrine of first sale in a digital era, as well as orphan works. But we also must set aside issues that are out of scope (e.g., the work-for-hire issues associated with faculty work in universities).

Technical Aspects
This workstream will explore the desired architecture for the DPLA and will make recommendations regarding technology to be used for its development and to build or facilitate building the discovery environment. This track will also examine the state of the art for digitizing books, video, audio, and other types of documents and determining how much it might cost to greatly increase the scope of current digitization efforts.

- May 2011: Global Interoperability and Linked Data Workshop
  - Notes (Download Notes as PDF [http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/dpla/sites/dpla/images/GloballInteropLinkedDataNotes_May2011.pdf])
- June 2011 Technical Workshop
- Beta Sprint
Big issues: The project may be helpful at the level of standards, interfaces, APIs, and so forth for already and to-be digitized content for public usage. It also may be helpful insofar as we can help to nudge toward better access via current digital means of accessing books, including eBooks.

(Research Uses)
This potential workstream, closely related to the Audience and Participation workstream, will make recommendations regarding how the DPLA might support various forms computational research, teaching functions, both large- and small-scale humanities projects, etc.

Possible Models

Federated Repositories and Providers (Jeremy York)

Suggestions for the DPLA (Terry Fisher)

Considerations for the DPLA Scope (Mary Lee Kennedy)

Americana Online Web Project (Amy Drayer)


Public Discussion Listserv

We hope this list will help bring together publishers, authors, and interested parties from the educational community, public and research libraries, cultural organizations, state and local government, and private industry in an open dialogue regarding strategies for improving public access to comprehensive online resources.

Join the DPLA discussion listserv (http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/lists/subscribe/dpla-discussion)

Listserv archives (https://cyber.law.harvard.edu/lists/arc/dpla-discussion)

Additional Information

Digital Public Library of America (http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/research/dpla)

Sign on to the initiative

DPLA Steering Committee (http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/research/dpla/steering)

Suggested Resources

Media and Blog Mentions

Help
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TO: PLA Board of Directors  
FROM: Christine Lind Hage, ALA Division Councilor  
DATE: June 13, 2011  
RE: E-Books (OITP's preferred way of referring to electronic books)  

ACTION REQUESTED/INFORMATION/REPORT:

REPORT

- Page 3 - Rationale For Publishers and Vendors To Sell Popular E-Books To Libraries to Lend to the Public  
- Page 5 - E-Book FAQ  

As a result of an ALA Council resolution (pdf), the Presidential Task Force on Equitable Access to Electronic Content (EQUACC) was created to study challenges and recommend potential solutions in libraries for improved electronic content access, distribution and preservation systems. The charge (pdf) calls on the Task Force to work collaboratively with the Office for Information Technology Policy (OITP) Advisory Committee’s E-book Task Force (pdf), another member group working exclusively on e-books. The OITP E-book Task Force’s focus (pdf) is studying the public policy implications of the growing e-book marketplace and will provide informational and educational materials to the membership. In addition, both the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) and the Urban Libraries Council (ULC) also are working on these issues, and the plan is to work collaboratively with them as well. 

I serve on the OITP E-Book Task Force and we have been focusing on issues of concern to libraries specifically related to e-books. There are three documents that we have discussed and hopefully they will be posted somewhere on the ALA website soon. A piece by Charlie Parker of Florida will be published in an upcoming issue of PUBLIC LIBRARIES. There is also a FAQ, which may be posted on the web by the time you get this memo. The FAQ’s are still underdevelopment so if you have questions you’d like to be answered, please forward them to me and I’ll make sure they are included. The third document, which I’ve given to Barb Macikas are some talking points that I have found helpful when talking with the local press.

Programs of Interest at Annual Conference on E-Books:

**NISO / BISG Changing Standards Landscape Forum**  
Friday, June 24, 2011 - 12:00pm - 4:00pm  
Location: Convention Center Rm 277

Speaker: Angela Bole, Book Industry Study Group, Inc. (BISG)
Speaker: Michael Cairns, Information Media Partners
Speaker: Peter Brantley, Internet Archive
Speaker: Phil Madans, Hachette Book Group
Speaker: Todd Carpenter, National Information Standards Organization (NISO)

Description:
"E-books: Intersections Where Libraries and Publishers Can Learn from Each Other." Electronic books have exploded in the past 18 months, and publishing and library communities alike are struggling to deal with the constantly shifting ground. This program will explore how both the publishing and library communities are facing the new digital marketplace, with a special focus on the standards that underlie the e-book supply chain. Both organizations support, promote, and maintain standards and best practices in the information community. NISO focuses on publishers, libraries and the systems suppliers in information distribution. BISG focuses on the book supply chain of publishers, manufacturers, wholesale and retail suppliers. Although this forum is free, prospective attendees are asked to register for logistics and planning purposes. [http://www.bisg.org/events-0-701-bisg-niso-at-ala-annual-conference-2011.php](http://www.bisg.org/events-0-701-bisg-niso-at-ala-annual-conference-2011.php)

OITP is presenting a program entitled:

**The Future is Now! E-books and Their Increasing Impact on Library Services** on Saturday, June 25, 2011 - 4:00pm - 5:30pm in the Convention Center Rm 392

Program Description:
Over the past 2 years e-books have become an important, but controversial part of library services. This program will focus on the increasing significance of e-books and their impact on libraries. The speakers will: (1) Provide an overview of the current e-book landscape; (2) Address e-book devices, including technical support; (3) Highlight a successful library e-book program; and, (4) Explore the relationships between publishers and libraries. Presenters: Tom Peters, CEO of TAP Information Services. Chris Harris, Coordinator of School Library Systems, Genesee Valley BOCES Jamie LaRue, Director, Douglas County (CO) Libraries Peter Brantley, Director of the Bookservr Project for the Internet Archive Program Sponsor: ALA, Office for Information Technology Policy, E-book Task Force.

There will also be three presentations that are part of the Networking Uncommons (Convention Center, Main Floor near registration) that focus on e-books. OITP will be soliciting questions from members regarding e-books that will then be addressed in the E-book FAQ. Also Robert Miller and Brewster Kahle (Internet Archive) will be talking about “In library digital lending - Modern e-books” from 2 – 3 on Saturday and from 12:30 – 1:30 on Sunday.

I continue to serve on the E-Book Task Force and would be happy for your input on how e-books and impacting public libraries.
Rationale For Publishers and Vendors To Sell Popular E-Books To Libraries to Lend to the Public

Public libraries are excited about the emergence of popular e-books and many are working hard with the public to help them understand the new technology and how to use it. Public libraries and book publishers and vendors have a long standing, mutually supportive relationship based on the book, but currently this relationship needs attention because, with one exception, book publishers and vendors are not offering popular e-books to libraries to in turn lend to the public. This issue was underscored yesterday with Google roll out of its E-Book Store.

Libraries add a lot of value to the world of popular books and reading and it is important to that world’s future for libraries to be able to purchase and lend popular new e-books to the public. The library community is calling on book publishers and vendors to make their popular e-book titles available for sale to public libraries and for lending to the public. The library community is very impressed by the manner in which Google worked with the American Booksellers Association to come up with ways for the public to purchase books through book store websites and share in the Google E-Book sales and profits. Libraries have a great deal to offer publishers and vendors and look forward to engaging in similarly productive discussions about how they can buy and lend popular e-books.

Here are just a few of the strengths libraries already contribute to the e-book market place

- Library staff help the public make sense out of the complicated e-book and e-book reader market place.
- Library staff help the public learn how to make diverse e-book formats work on their particular readers.
- Libraries provide public access computers with Internet connections that much of the public relies on to access e-books.
- Those libraries that can afford popular e-books through the one vendor who will do business with libraries are reporting incredible public response and popularity. A one vendor market place does not work for many reasons, but the popular response to popular e-books in libraries is overwhelming.
- Libraries have established relationships with the public built around books that begins when parents bring their very young children to the library and these relationships provide exposure for e-book products and access to millions of library users.
Some of our largest libraries have actively participated in projects like Google Books Library Project and the Internet Archive’s Open Library Project and have supported endeavors like Project Gutenberg. It seems only fair that if libraries are helping companies digitize library collections to make available over the web that libraries should also be able to buy and lend new popular books.

Libraries support publishers and vendors by promoting and providing books to the public. Public libraries circulate around 2.1 billion items annually and this generates huge interest and encourages the public to buy books.

Libraries buy a lot of books, spending around $2 billion annually, and libraries will certainly be good e-book customers if given the chance. Libraries can buy more e-books than hardbound copies with the same investment because they cost less to maintain, so e-book purchase makes good sense for and libraries and the public. It is also cheaper for publishers and vendors to produce and sell e-books to libraries than it is to create and sell hard copies.

In the e-book environment public libraries provide free advertising and if the creator/library relationship is properly developed, the public library can serve as a point of sale.

These are indeed exciting times for books and book lovers – popular e-books are creating wonderful excitement and are re-energizing the world of reading. Just think how much better the new emerging world of e-books and reading can be if publishers, vendors, and libraries worked together!
E-Book FAQ

1. How many libraries offer e-book service?
   In 2011 two-thirds of U.S. public libraries now offered e-books, up from 38 percent only two years before. According to Library Journal, of libraries that do not currently offer e-books, 60% expect they will offer ebooks within two years. (Source: LJ/SLJ Virtual Summit: eBooks at the Tipping Point, October 2010.)

2. Why do libraries offer ebooks?
   Libraries have established relationships with the public built around books, that begin when parents bring their very young children to the library and continues until the end of life. As users age their needs may change and e-books offer the visually impaired options not previously available. Library users want books in regular print, large print, audiobook and e-book formats. Libraries want to offer the user the right book, in the right format at the right time. E-Books are now part of that service.

3. What advantages do e-books offer over traditional print books?
   - E-book readers are compact in that a single -book reader can hold hundreds of e-books.
   - E-book readers are pretty light weight and very portable
   - Since library loaned e-books time out on a patrons reader there are never any overdue fines
   - Patrons can download e-books from places other than the library, thus saving time and gasoline
   - E-book readers are environmentally friendly (no trees die for e-books)
   - E-books don’t wear out, or get chewed by kids or pets
   - E-book readers help to meet the accessibility requirements of some library users. Many have built-in screen reader and screen enlargement programs
   - There is a definite “cool factor” associated to e-books

4. What are the disadvantages of e-books?
   - Not all titles are available in digital format
   - Not all publishers are releasing digital at the same time as print. So, libraries cannot easily select which titles they would rather have in digital format at the time of publication.
   - Libraries often pay a premium (hosting fees) for e-books rather than getting a discount
   - The patron must purchase an e-book reader, which may not be affordable for everyone
   - Some e-book sellers use proprietary digital rights management (DRM) software to control access to the e-book
   - A standardized file format for e-books is still evolving
   - E-book usage usually cannot be tracked within the library ILS system.
5. How do libraries acquire e-book service?
   Some libraries provide the service as individual libraries, while others participate in a consortium which leases the books. Most libraries use a vendor that hosts a site to store the e-books and manages the portal that library patrons use to borrow the e-book. There are also several sites online that offer free e-books directly from authors, publishers or genre-based interest groups.

6. What does impact does a vendor’s platform have on e-books?
   In the reading of the e-book there is very little if any impact, but the procedures for downloading vary, which makes it more difficult for libraries to offer and support e-book service to the public.

7. Do libraries loan e-book readers?
   Some libraries do, but the majority of libraries do not loan the readers. Readers are constantly being updated, can be broken or stolen and are pricey. Libraries have focused more on providing the content rather than the appliance.

8. Which e-book reader is best?
   It all depends on what you are looking for and what the customer is willing to pay. Appliances/ e-book readers vary in weight, screen size, resolution and digital rights management controls. Library patrons are reading e-books on a variety of electronic devices (phones, computers, e-book readers). Some publishers use digital rights management schemes that make it difficult for library users to download library e-books.
   What types of books a reader likes will also have bearing on the device they choose. Novels and nonfiction that are primarily text are well suited to black & white e-readers; while full-color or graphics-intensive books, such as children’s and lifestyle books, are best presented on multi-function tablet-style devices and computers.

9. So how are libraries responding to patrons’ questions regarding e-book readers?
   Libraries are working hard with the public to help them understand the new technology and how to use it. Staff help the public make sense out of the complicated e-book and e-book reader market place and have offer classes and provide handouts on how to make diverse e-book formats work on the patron’s particular reader. Libraries also provide public access computers with internet connections that much of the public relies on to access e-books.

10. What would libraries offering e-books like to see happen in the future?
    - Interoperability of e-book readers and platforms so that all library e-books could be downloaded to any device.
• The option to purchase rather than to lease e-books, in much the same way libraries purchase print books and other audiovisual materials.

• Full integration of e-books into library catalogs in that the vendor’s site is transparent to the user.

• Integration of e-book usage data into the ILS circulation module so that there can be a single place to generate circulation statistics for both print and digital material.

• Integrated acquisitions workflow so that e-books can be selected and made available to patrons through the established materials ordering process.

• Vendor collection development programs for digital that mirror programs now used for physical materials acquisitions, such as new title notifications plans and standing order programs.

• Discounts on all e-books, or at least when multiple copies are purchased, comparable to those given on traditional print books.
June 15, 2011

To: PLA Board of Directors  
Fr: Barb Mackas, Executive Director  
Re: ALA Digital Literacy Task Force Status Report

The ALA Office for Information Technology Policy recently formed the Digital Literacy Task Force. Sari Feldman and John Taube are PLA’s representatives to the task force. America’s libraries in national, regional and local digital literacy initiatives will ultimately enhance the information [and literacy] capacity of individuals so that they can fully engage in a democratic society. Task force objectives are to gather, develop and share information, resources and best practices related to library engagement in promoting and supporting digital literacy, in order to:

- Continuously improve library services and practices that support digitally literate communities
- Enable libraries to anticipate and respond effectively to the impact of emerging technologies on information literacy
- Influence federal policy related to supporting a digitally literate population.

Other representatives task force are here.

Target outcomes for the taskforce may include but are not limited to:
- Information sharing and cross-pollination across library types to establish a profession-wide approach to supporting digitally literate communities that will result in:
  - A report (or series of brief reports) outlining libraries’ vision and approaches to digital literacy, including case studies and a view to the future.
  - A model (or multiple models on specific topics) toolkit that would include resources for practitioners to develop digital literacy programs for use in their individual libraries.
  - A national convening of experts representing a variety of disciplines (e.g., LIS, education, technology) to help determine ALA strategy for anticipating and meeting the next phase of literacy so that ALA can develop a sustainable response.

ALA Annual Conference Events
The Task Force is holding a program, Saturday, June 25 at 1:30. The keynote speaker is Rebecca Reynolds, Assistant Professor of Library and Info Science at Rutgers, (http://comminfo.rutgers.edu/directory/rbreynol/index.html). Her area of focus is school libraries, and instructional design. Panelists will include: Michael Borges, Kevin Cherry (IMLS), and Stacey Aldrich (California state librarian).

Additionally, the NTIA digital literacy portal event planned for Saturday 12:15-1:00 p.m. in the Networking Uncommons. NTIA wanted to highlight the important role they feel libraries can have in further developing their digital literacy portal. Emily Sheketoff from the Washington Office, Susan
Hildreth (IMLS), and Tony Wilhelm (NTIA) will speak. NTIA would like to raise awareness of the portal in the library field and gather feedback from participants.

Agenda for task force business meeting on Sunday at 1:30 p.m.:
- Agenda items will include reviewing the task force charge; discussing activities and priorities; (e.g., reports/toolkit, webinars, recommending digiliter standards or principles, etc.), along with setting some benchmark deadlines; and communications within ALA and to external audiences.

Use of Connect and the wiki:
- Wiki link http://digitalliteracytaskforce.wikispaces.com/
- Connect Link http://connect.ala.org/node/140464

NTIA Portal feedback and future engagement:
- Larra Clark and Marijke Visser asked TF members to try out the portal and provide feedback that can be shared back to NTIA.
- Quick feedback from the call included:
  - Portal contains some good information, but the challenge is getting the word out to front line staff and helping them use it as easily and effectively as possible – perhaps a webinar?
  - Concern that portal is lacking K12 and academic library info, and information is not integrated with information literacy. Is it really for educators, professors and librarians?
  - Concern the front page does not give a clear picture of what digital literacy is, and the featured examples are mostly focused on computer mechanics rather than cognitive skills.
  - Make sure the portal includes the joint school/academic library standards created by AASL and ACRL.
  - Possibility of adding new digital literacy standards in development now with ACRL. Deb will check status.
- “Frequently used resources” are dynamically generated based on user feedback/ratings. We discussed that with this type of crowd sourcing the “best” resources might not be the ones that show up on the front page. At the development stages, ALA and IMLS voiced concerns with NTIA over this, but crowd sourcing was one way they thought people would feel inspired to engage with the portal.
- Clark and Visser will provide task force feedback to NTIA.

Additional task force members:
- Originally we had wanted to have representation from ALISE and COSLA. Larra and Marijke will pursue this to get a recommendation.
- YALSA has expressed interest in having a representative. Task force members on the call agreed that this would be ok. Larra and Marijke will contact Beth Yoke to ask for a representative.
- We also discussed the importance of including ALA units not officially on the task force once the group starts producing documents/projects/etc… We agreed to solicit input regularly. This might also take the form of doing “drop bys” to committees meetings during Annual and Midwinter.