

Agenda
Advisory Committee Meeting – LSSCP Project

Thursday, November 1, Group Dinner, 7:00 pm (place TBD)

Friday, November 2, 8:00 to 4:00

Saturday, November 3, 8:00 to noon

ALA Office, 50 E. Huron
Carnegie Conference Room

Friday November 2
(Continental Breakfast and Box Lunch provided)

Minutes taken by Jenifer Grady
Comments in **red** are by Nancy Bolt

8:00 Introductions; Review of ground rules; Agenda review

Attendees: All but Frank Novak and Sandy Olson

8:15 Review Grant (purpose, timelines, objectives, major tasks, role of advisory committee)

8:45 Reconfirm March decisions **See attached with changes**

9:45 Break

10:00 Review competency criteria **See attached with changes**

10:30 Review draft Competency statements **These have been sent to all the subcommittees for review. Here are some general thoughts.**

- Use of the word “the” when referring to a specific library will be edited to be more generic (national vs specific level)
- Should we include performance expectations or indicators? **Decision not to include these at this time. Nancy and Karen will be working on some examples to share at midwinter.**
- Department of Labor issue with getting educational credit for work
- Is this staff development or continuing education
 - we are providing CE though the library may look at it as staff development and relate it to performance reviews
- Duplications of “bullets” is ok, and worded the same way in different competencies, particularly since every participant won’t satisfy all competencies
- BIG HEADINGS are competency areas (the sets) and the BULLETS are competencies
- Will know seems futuristic, but it means they will know this when they finish and change “is able” to “will be able to”
- Does their have to be correlation between knowledge and abilities? Not in every case but it’s OK if we do.
- Is there a relationship and is it causal between “will know” and “will be able to”? Not necessarily,
- Should they be numbered consecutively? YES
- Initial separation into two sections based on grammar and style. **Nancy is no longer sure what this means. It meant the “will knows” and “will be able tos” were an artificial separation Karen made based on what sounded best and two natural ways to break up the competencies.**
- In some of these, the “how” is not important, it’s important to know that a concept exists
- Will the electives be more detailed? **Not necessarily.**

- Does this group work on advanced electives (see Technical Services)? **No, however, all the competencies will have a more detailed description of what they really mean.**
- Some of the “to knows” in the core may be “able tos” in the electives.
- Which competencies should include diversity? **Did we answer this? Not really**
- Detail/performance indicators will come in the RFP **to providers.**
 - Facilitation of discussion Project Director
 - Foundations Public Programming – it’s so clear, should the others be this way? Should it be combined with Marketing? No
 - Personal Access
 - Reference and Information Reader’s Advisory
 - Services Technical Services
 - Youth Services Management (coaching)
 - Technology Marketing

Noon Lunch
 1:00 Competency Review continued
 4:30 Adjourn; Dinner on your own

**Saturday, November 3
 (Continental Breakfast)
 8:00 am to noon**

- 8:00 Review Friday’s work
 9:00 Survey to validate the competencies
- KS – survey purpose is to validate the competencies; ALA will administer the surveys to those who meet the audience parameters; will also survey those outside the targeted audiences, e.g. state listservs
 - Target audiences reviewed: see notes from 11/1/07 **DO WE WANT TO INCLUDE THIS LIST IN THE MINUTES? Up to you**– how to get to lists in states that are not related to state chapters. Send it to Human Resources.
 - **ADVISORY** Committee members will post to their lists also
 - Each subgroup will work with KS and NB about comments on competencies they worked on
 - What should the question be for competencies? What do we want to know? On a scale of 1-5, is it essential, important, detailed, forced into either/or, do they evaluate the core, is this the right tool (focus groups, qualitative as well as quantitative; some audiences well-represented at conferences like LTA program admins); survey respondents need to understand what the survey means and terminology; do the sections in which you have the most interest so responses are meaningful; state presentations (if states pay for travel and lodging)
 - These competencies are a marketing tool
 - What demographic info will we collect?
 - Ask institutional research people for help with “perfect wording” for survey (Peggy, Diana S)
- 9:45 Evaluation services update (COLORADO update)
 Sent to consultants’ list and got inquiries from three, and one proposal. Not pleased with proposal received (Karen, Rand, Carolyn, Nancy). Trying to find money to raise the money for consultant and expanding recipient lists (*Planning for Results*)

DIANA REESE'S ASSESSMENT PROJECT WILL BE DISCUSSED ONLINE

10:15 Review of Project promotion **ALL I COULD FIND ATTACHED WAS THE FAQ? WAS THERE MORE OF A LIST OF PROMOTION? IT SEEMS AS IF IT IS COVERED BELOW.**

- Website – suggested URL? I love libraries, library divisions, put it on ALA-APA site temporarily?
- One page handout
- Powerpoint **is being revised based on discussion.**
- Where AC members have spoken about the project
- Online community (Jamie)
- When would we want to get articles in library journals? Template to customize in time for survey (Rand, Karen, Diana S)
- Template for board discussions (Diana S)
- Before whom and which groups should the project be promoted?
- Gathering support and getting a groundswell of supporters to ask councilors in their state to approve it.
- FAQ in response to concerns

10:45 Assignments and next steps

Before MW

- Nancy
 - Expense form - **done**
 - Revise FAQ – **done and out for review**
 - Revise PowerPoint - **done**
 - Revising her competencies – **in process**
 - Talk to Loriene – **done and she agreed to add a statement to the power point**
- Karen
 - Revising her competencies – **in process**
 - Developing survey – **in process**
 - Follow up with reissuing RFP for evaluation - **done**
- Karen and Nancy
 - Determine consistent style, language and terminology for comps – **in process**
 - Report for when and where presentations are given about LSSCP- **I think the draft form is done, did we conclude this?**
 - "If I were teaching a course on X Competency area, it would look like X" – **nancy and karen will draft examples by midwinter**
 - Prepare formal letters for every state chapter/library association; library support staff associations; to come talk about the program if they will pay expenses (AC and Directors, CPC, others) – **karen has a draft**
 - Prepare formal letter to state librarians – **in process**
- Karen, Nancy and Jenifer
 - Clean up competency documents and distribute for final review
- Diana and Karen
 - Handout for one-page description of program for board – **distributed and waiting for replies**
- Rand and Karen
 - Template for articles about program - **??**
- Peggy
 - Talk to Jim Rettig **??**
- Frank
 - Rewrite Public Programs comp **??**

- Bob
 - Rewrite Management comp - notes sent to him for review
- AC
 - Review comps and wordsmith quickly – all groups have review
- Jenifer and Jamie
 - Website – working on it. We're on plan G by now.
 - Online communities
 - ALA-APA temp website – waiting to hear from Keith and Mary
 - Send committee narrative in Word - done
 - Logistics for meetings

11:30 January meeting

Tentative Agenda, MW January 2008

Breakfast and lunch and one night's lodging

- Final draft of competencies
- Review draft of survey and discuss focus groups
- Begin assessment discussion (Nancy)
- Review website and online communities
- Evaluation report

Tentative Agenda, AC June 2008

Breakfast and lunch and one night's lodging

- Final competencies
- Continued assessment
- Identify program policies and procedures
- Sub-committees formed
- Survey results
- Preparation for field testing sites

Noon Adjourn

GROUND RULES

- Disagree with tact and grace
- Share the air
- No hidden agendas
- No side conversations
- Honor time limits
- Have fun!

Grant – Year One (began July 2007, through June 2008)

- Competencies developed and finalized
 - Survey
- Evaluator hired
- 3 committee meetings (Fall, MW, AC)
- Website developed

Grant – Year Two (July 2008 – June 2009)

- Assessment expert hired
- Policies and procedures developed
- 3 committee meetings

- Plan for demonstration sites

Grant – Year Three (July 2009 – June 2010)

- Demonstration in five sites
 - Texas Library Association
 - Arizona State Library and Archives
 - NSLS
 - Highline Community College
 - ALA Division (TBD)
- ALA Council approves program

What does “demonstration” mean? Division reps and demo sites may want to discuss this with their boards in January, using that section of the proposal (includes \$5000 for implementing). Need to discuss sooner than later what divisions should be approached and what should be given to the Board.

- Market program
- Recruit
- Form cohorts
- Assist in meeting requirements
- Assist participants in compiling paperwork
- Identify and be providers
- Provide feedback

What is the President (currently Loriene Roy) President-Elect’s (currently Jim Rettig) opinion about LSSCP?

- Peggy will contact Jim about his views and share information about COPE III, LSSIRT, # of support staff meeting growing
- Nancy will contact Loriene about her views when she sees her next month (see October 2007 President’s column in *American Libraries*).

ADD to ROLES – reporting where committee members are speaking about the program and the questions that arise.