

RPLAC – Athens-Clarke County Library – 15 -16 June 2011

RPLAC members in attendance: L. Eubanks, chair, J. Forsee, A. Isbell, P. Edwards, J. McDaniel, A. Mixson, K. Lenz, C. Zeiger. B. Reese attended online.

GPLS staff: L. Veatch, J. Walker, J. Turner

Day 1 RPLAC meeting was called to order by chair Lecia Eubanks. Karen Douglas, technology trainer at ARLS, conducting a mini-training session on the use of the Webex conferencing system. 15 directors participated in the session using Webex.

Secretary Richard Sanders is not in attendance. Julie Walker will handle minutes of meeting.

RPLAC minutes of 7 January meeting were reviewed; motion to approve by Zeiger, second Mixson, approved.

New RPLAC chair and secretary will be elected at the first meeting after July 1, when new members are seated.

Lecia Eubanks briefly reviewed RPLAC by-laws highlighting the tasks of “reviewing, discussing, making recommendations”; “speaking for all Georgians”; “representing all library systems”

RPLAC year in review: Alma retreat, August 2010; Henry County meeting, October 2010; Forsyth County meeting, January 2011. Survey about GPLS grants, May 2011; survey responses reviewed. Majority selected salaries grant as top priority, SSG second.

Dr. Lamar Veatch: What should we ask for in next year’s state allocations? Think about on-behalf services and their value to libraries. New regent representatives will be appointed to RPLAC at next BOR meeting. A. Mixson recommended a new survey covering on-behalf services to be distributed before the next meeting. A. Isbell and J. McDaniel to design, with assistance from GPLS staff. Survey to be out by end of June. Much support for a survey to determine statewide needs; ideas such as statewide technology assistance are mentioned, but need to know how many systems would use.

Ideas regarding “super regional” cooperation discussed. Library systems contracting with each other for services, may need GPLS coordination to get started and perhaps financial incentives, such as collaborative grant if you join with others. Suggestions re: state negotiating for group purchases; inviting vendors to set up “exhibits” outside directors meetings.

Moratorium on new system creation: consensus is that moratorium should continue until new state funding becomes available.

Regional incentives: Important or not? What should we eliminate to fund them?

Jon McDaniel distributed a suggested new salary scale. Different scales for director, assistant director, other state-paid librarians. Different levels of salary depending on population of region/county. Several objections to this idea: population should not determine salary; cost of living is NOT less in rural areas; directors of small systems does the same work, and often MORE work with less support. Some in favor of this plan: Director SHOULD earn more than other staff.

Other ideas: state paid director and assistant director, then block grant for rest of state funds; award a bookkeeper position as a regional incentive; add technology grant based on population (ask for new funding for this).

Topics for tomorrow's discussion: new formula; MOE. Meeting adjourned at 5pm.

Day 2 – 16 June 2011

Formula position paper discussion: Walker explains that GPLS felt a “starting point” document was needed to begin a conversation on formula changes. This paper represents neither a recommendation nor a decision.

Questions, comments: P. Edwards: Why incentive in materials? Way out of line, discriminates heavily against singles, should be allocated by population only. K. Ames: PINES provides access to materials for all. A. Mixson: need reconsideration of conversions. K. Ames: support incentives to participate in super-regional services; shared usage of catalogers, processors, bookkeepers, centralized services. We need a push from the state to try this. More support for discussion of these ideas at directors meetings.

J. McDaniel: move to accept this position paper and put it into effect. A. Isbell seconds. Motion does not pass.

RPLAC representatives will discuss this paper with their constituents, and will discuss at next meeting. Further discussion: we do need to save money, but not like this. If 75,000 population is threshold, hold regionals to it as well as singles. Creating regionals dilutes direct service. Have-nots need MORE services. A. Mixson: conversions are offensive; plan to discuss new plan for conversions at next meeting. L. Eubanks: salary grant should include “allied professionals” P. Edwards: I would give up all materials and SSG and take all state grants in salaries. Local money for materials can be raised. Could there be an incentive for local sources to raise money?

MOE discussion

Veatch and Walker wish to hear opinions on MOE before next ACCG study committee, to be scheduled in July. Prevailing objection to MOE rule is that local entities will not give any extra funding if they will be committed to it forever. Several directors stated that MOE has saved them from significant reductions, even

though local officials hate it. N. Stanbery-Kellam feels that MOE will cause larger issues that will attract legislative attention for all.

Possible MOE changes: hold local to same standards as state; if state reduces x%, then local can do the same. If state comes back up, local is required to follow.

To participate in any new money that may come, local funding must come up as well. Ultimately, it is often ability vs. desire to participate in library funding.

P. Edwards: how are in-kind services counted in MOE? May have been done in several different ways over the years.

K. Ames: tie MOE to Public Library Standards. Share standards with ACCG, encourage locals to help libraries meet standards. (Associated question: do standards need to be revisited now that they are 5 years old? Does RPLAC wish to do that?) A. Mixson suggests that annual report asks about adherence to all standards.

Ultimately, we wish to appear reasonable and fair in any MOE discussions, reasonable and fair in applying any requirements, if you will be reasonable and fair in allocating funds.

Other topics: request that GPLS negotiate purchase of databases such as Chilton's, legal forms, Reference USA; even the playing field. Also, attempt to negotiate statewide cataloging price from B&T

Next meeting, select a date in August with new RPLAC members, location tbd, perhaps Porter Memorial Library in Newton County.