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Section 1: Executive Summary

Periodically, the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) works with the library community to review the State Aid to Public Libraries program’s requirements, policies, and guidelines. On June 5, 2014, nine Commissioners approved the charge, and time-line of the State Aid Review committee.

Charge: The committee will assess the role of a state aid program in improving library services through a review of components of the current program and a review of approaches in other states, and will make recommendations for the State Aid to Public Libraries program to the MBLC.

On July 10, 2014 the Commissioners approved twenty-two appointments to the State Aid Review Committee. The Committee was made up of librarians and trustees from the public library community and represents small, mid-size, and large libraries and library systems across the Commonwealth. The committee included members from the state’s regional and network partners and three Commissioners. This group met six times between December 16, 2014 and June 23, 2015.

At the initial meeting, committee members were asked to share their “joys and concerns” about the current State Aid program. The members also discussed the “charge to the committee” as approved by the Commissioners and considered the process and timeline for the work of the review. The Committee began a preliminary discussion of the State Aid to Public Libraries White Paper (Appendix A) produced by the Edward J. Collins Center for Public Management at the University of Massachusetts – Boston campus, starting with an examination of the themes.

Details of the Committee’s findings and recommendations are presented in this report.
Section 2: Current Program Components

The stated purpose of the current State Aid to Public Libraries program is to encourage libraries to meet certain minimum requirements and develop improved services, while assisting those municipalities with less revenue raising capability and those who lend materials to the residents of other municipalities. In FY2015, State Aid totaling $8,847,300 was distributed to 344 municipalities who applied to and were certified in the program. (Five municipalities in the Commonwealth did not apply. One municipality does not provide public library services.)

The current program consists of three grants, each based on a different disbursement formula (Appendix B), that are awarded to municipalities whose public libraries meet statutory (MGL c.78, ss.19A and 19B) and regulatory requirements (605 CMR 4.00). The three grants are the Library Incentive Grant (LIG), based on population, the Municipal Equalization Grant (MEG), based on the state lottery formula, and the Nonresident Circulation Offset (NRC), based on the number of direct circulations to nonresidents from municipalities certified in the State Aid to Public Libraries program.

The minimum requirements of free public library service in the current program include:

1. Comply with Municipal Appropriation Requirement (MAR) in current year [MGL c.78, s.19A]

2. Comply with Minimum Standards in prior year [MGL c.78, s.19B(1-6)]
   a. Open to all residents of the commonwealth [605 CMR 4.01(1)]
   b. Make no charge for normal library services [605 CMR 4.01(2)]
   c. Be kept open a minimum number of hours per week [605 CMR 4.01(3)]
   d. Employ trained library personnel [605 CMR 4.01(4)]
   e. Expend a reasonable portion of the library's total budget on library materials [605 CMR 4.01(5)]
   f. Lend books to other [certified] libraries in the commonwealth and extend privileges to holders of cards issued by other [certified] public libraries in the commonwealth on a reciprocal basis [605 CMR 4.01(6)]

3. Submit State Aid to Public Libraries application and Annual Report Information Survey [MGL c.78, s.19B(7); 605 CMR 4.01(7) and 4.02]

4. Apply for and receive state certification for Library Director: either certificate of professional librarianship or certificate of subprofessional librarianship [MGL c.78, s.22-31; 605 CMR 3.01 - 3.06]

The current State Aid Cycle is outlined in Appendix C.
Section 3: White Paper

As stated in “State Aid to Public Libraries White Paper”:
In Spring 2014, the Executive Director of the MBLC invited staff of the Edward J. Collins, Jr. Center for Public Management at UMass Boston to discuss how the Center could assist the MBLC. After reviewing the Center’s capabilities, the Executive Director of the MBLC invited the Center to prepare and submit a Scope of Service for the preparation of a White Paper on the State Aid program. The White Paper concept focused on taking a fresh look at the State Aid program. Rather than serve as a study that would make formal definitive recommendations, the White Paper was conceived of as input to the work of a State aid Review Committee that would be formed late in 2014 and be composed of members of the Massachusetts Library Community. In August 2014 the MBLC voted to approve the Project. The preparation of the White Paper was carried out by staff of the Collins Center, specifically Richard Kobayashi, Senior Associate, and James Sutton, Associate. Mr. Kobayashi has extensive knowledge of state-local relations in Massachusetts and Mr. Sutton was formerly the Director of the Memorial Hall Library in Andover.

The proposal for a White Paper was presented to Commissioners for consideration and approval at the September 4, 2014 Board meeting. A final Scope of Work was agreed upon in September. The work was finished in December, 2014 and presented to the Board at the January 8th meeting by Mr. Kobayashi and Mr. Sutton. The Final Scope is included in Appendix D and the White Paper is included in Appendix A.

After reviewing State Aid formulas and requirements, waiver histories, and interviewing 22 public library directors around Massachusetts, the consulting team proposed five main themes that they considered would enhance the State Aid program:

- Redefine the MAR so that it bears some relation to adequate service provision rather than simply to historic appropriation levels.
- Secure additional money from the legislature and governor to incent struggling communities to prioritize bootstrapping their library budgets. Focus would be on communities below the new MAR or in the lowest quartile of per capita library expenditures.
- Consider a library consolidation pilot program that would consolidate libraries particularly in areas with small towns/small libraries. Consider partnering with Administration and Finance’s Community Incentive Grant program which provides funding for inter-municipal cooperation and functional regionalization.
- Be proactive about educating librarians, library trustees, town officials, and legislators about the State Aid program, ensuring they understand the Program’s four main goals. Educate town officials about the value of Commonwealth-wide reciprocity and the threat to reciprocity that may result
from severe cuts to their own community’s library:

- to encourage municipalities to support and improve public library service
- to encourage reciprocal resource sharing among libraries across Massachusetts
- to compensate for disparities among municipal funding capacities
- to offset additional costs to municipalities whose libraries circulate materials to patrons from other certified Massachusetts municipalities

Ensure State Aid Awards are used as intended. Require that town accountants sign off that the money is being put in a separate account for direct expenditure by the library.
Section 4: Overview of the State Aid Review Committee’s Work

4.1: Committee Charge

On June 5, 2014, the Board of Library Commissioners approved the charge, and time-line of the State Aid to Public Libraries Review committee.

Charge: The committee will assess the role of the state aid program in improving library services through review of the current state aid program and review of approaches in other states, and will develop a next generation program for recommendations to the Board of Library Commissioners.

Goals of the Review:

- Review of current state aid program (Appendix C)
- Review of state aid programs in other states (Appendix E)
- Communication of the progress of the review committee process to the Board of Library Commissioners and the library community (Appendix F)
- Development of a final committee report of recommendations for a next generation State Aid to Public Libraries program for the Board of Library Commissioners

4.2: Anticipated Time Line:

June 5, 2014 Approval of committee charge and timeline
July 10, 2014 Appointment of committee members
September, 2014 – May, 2015 Schedule Up to 6 full committee meetings
June, 2015 Present Final report to Board

4.2.1: Changes to the Timeline:

The MBLC staff was undergoing personnel changes. Dianne Carty had recently been hired permanently as the Agency Director and the Board was actively seeking a replacement for the Head of State Aid, Construction and Technology / Government Liaison position. In addition, the White Paper, which was not part of the original charge, was commissioned, delaying the initial committee meeting until December 2014.
June 5, 2014    Approval of committee charge and timeline

July 10, 2014    Appointment of committee members


October, 2015    Final report to Board

October, 2015    Hold four - five meetings with library stakeholders around the Commonwealth to gather feedback on the Committee’s recommendations.

4.3: Committee Members

On July 10, 2014 the following appointments to the State Aid to Public Libraries Review Committee were approved by the Board:

Public Library Directors (12)
Directors are the most likely public library staff to be conversant with the current State Aid to Public Libraries program. This group includes directors from small, medium, and large public libraries from all parts of the state. Some have had recent experience as waiver applicants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebba Hierta</td>
<td>Chilmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Wheeler</td>
<td>Shelburne Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Inglis</td>
<td>Nahant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Carpenter</td>
<td>Barre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Gaspar</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Mahoney</td>
<td>Mashpee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette Rivard</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Marshall</td>
<td>Bourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Rich</td>
<td>Acton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Adamczyk</td>
<td>Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Pilkington-Smyth</td>
<td>Attleborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Donaghey, CFO</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Fogerty</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Library Trustees (2)
Trustees will be selected for their knowledge of the State Aid program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat O’Leary</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karis North</td>
<td>Hull</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional and Network Representatives (2)
Regional and Network staff interact with their public library members over aspects of the State Aid program giving them another perspective on the program.
4.3.1: Changes to the Group:
1. Mary Rose Quinn filled the TBD opening when she joined the Agency in September, 2015.
2. Jen Inglis left the Group in September, 2014 when she resigned from Nahant Public Library. She was not replaced.
3. Nancy Rea was hired as group facilitator and began meeting with the group in March, 2015.
4. Deb Hoadley left in April, 2015 when she resigned her position at MLS. She was replaced by Kristi Chadwick.
5. Laurie Wheeler left in May, 2015 due to a busy schedule during library renovation. She was not replaced.

4.4: Discussion of Committee’s Work

The Committee met a total of six times. Work by the committee was delayed by the hiring of the Head of State Aid, Construction and Technology/Government Liaison, and the commissioning of the White Paper. The State Aid Review Committee met on December 16, 2014 for the first time. The sixth and final meeting was held on June 23, 2015. The meeting in January 2015 was cancelled due to poor weather conditions.

The initial meeting focused on how the current State Aid program is working for the libraries represented by the Committee. Subsequent meetings looked at themes identified by the White Paper and moved on to investigating current state aid programs in other states. The group continued with discussion of components it identified in successful programs. The group next imagined an ideal program. This exercise was followed by discussion of implementation of the most favored elements. Next, the group returned to a focus on the MBLC’s current waiver program. The Committee discussed its pluses and possible improvements. Finally, Committee
members were asked to each submit two recommendations to the Board for consideration in a future program.

Meetings consisted of both small group and large group discussions and exercises. For each meeting, the group was given an assignment to consider and come prepared to discuss at the next meeting. In all discussions, the Committee was asked to consider issues broadly and beyond their own library perspective. It was made clear to participants that no changes could result in a decrease in State Aid awards to any library, and no library would be required to increase their hours or materials expenditures outside of the requirements of the BLC statutes, regulations, or policies that are currently in place.

Assignments to consider outside of the Meetings are presented in Appendix G and results of the small group exercises are presented in Appendix H.

**4.5: LibGuide**

A LibGuide was created by Liz Babbitt, State Aid Specialist, to share information with the Committee as well as to collect meeting minutes and small group activities.

The LibGuide can be accessed at: [http://guides.mblc.state.ma.us/state_aid_review](http://guides.mblc.state.ma.us/state_aid_review)
Section 5: Areas of Recommendation to the Board

Committee members were asked to submit two recommendations at the last meeting to be included in the report to the Board. They were to keep in mind that in the end, what matters most about the State Aid program is that it improves the lives of every resident of the Commonwealth by creating incentives for municipalities to invest in their public libraries. Strong libraries build strong municipalities by supporting formal education and lifelong learning, by supporting economic development and literacy, and through the public library’s role as a center of civic engagement that strengthens our democracy. The recommendations listed below are distilled from the in-meeting work of the committee and comments to agency staff from library directors over the past few years. A full list of all the recommendations of the committee is available in Appendix I. The recommendations are presented in context with regards to the equivalent piece of the current State Aid to Public Libraries Program in chart form in Appendix J. That chart also includes the statute, regulation, or policy that would require appropriate changes or new additions to achieve the recommendations.

5.1: Hours

1) Compliance Period = Any consecutive nine months
More flexibility was sought in regards to the compliance period. Changing the current requirement for Hours Open from Labor Day to Memorial Day to any nine consecutive months would provide this flexibility. This would be beneficial for libraries that have a large change in the number of residents during the summer months or libraries that have increased attendance due to summer programming.

5.2: Materials Expenditure Requirement

1) Materials Expenditure = Cost of technology for patron use
In order to keep up with the latest resources for patrons, committee members felt it was important for libraries to update public access computers on a regular basis. Permitting libraries to count a percentage (to be determined) of the cost of providing technology for direct use by patrons as a Material Expenditure would be allowable.

2) Materials Expenditure = Calculation based only on budget lines in common
Library budgets vary greatly in what the line items the municipality includes. In order to determine a more equitable arrangement, the Materials Expenditure Requirement should be based on only those budget items that most libraries have in common such as materials, and salaries and wages.

5.3: Municipal Appropriation Requirements (MAR)

1) MAR calculation = 3 year average of Total Appropriated Municipal Income (TAMI) multiplied by 2.5%
The Administrative Policy for calculating the Municipal Appropriation Requirement (MAR) would be retired and the MAR would be calculated solely according the MGL, c.78, s.19A:

No city or town shall receive any money under this section in any year when the appropriation of said city or town for free public library services is below an amount equal to the average of its appropriation for free public library service for the three years immediately preceding, increased by two and one-half per cent of said average.

For example, FY2017 MAR= (FY2016 appropriation + FY2015 municipal appropriation + FY2014 municipal appropriation) / 3, plus 2.5%.

2) **MAR calculation = Calculate the MAR without including municipally appropriated revolving funds**
   
   It was suggested that municipally appropriated revolving fund accounts be eliminated from the MAR and the current MAR for those municipalities that use revolving fund accounts as part of their municipal appropriation be re-calculated.

3) **MAR calculation = Re-calculate the MAR to adjust for staff changes impacting salaries**
   
   When long-time staff retire, a library may see a drop in its personnel line. It has been suggested that the MAR be re-calculated to reflect this. (This is a common occurrence when a municipality starts paying utilities from a central budget and the library budget drops accordingly.)

**5.4: Waivers**

1) **Waivers = Assistance for communities with repeated waivers to meet the MAR**

   Cities and Towns vary greatly in their ability to recover from cuts to their operating budgets. Often several years are needed after the initial budget cuts to restore and increase funds, resulting in repeated, annual requests for waivers of the MAR. Create a process that establishes steps and a timeframe for waiver communities to meet the MAR.
Section 6: Areas of Recommendation in Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Recommendation</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Hours Open Requirement:</td>
<td>1 Compliance Period = Any consecutive nine months</td>
<td>Compliance Period 605 CMR 4.01(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Materials Expenditure Requirement</td>
<td>1 Materials Expenditure = Cost of technology for patron use</td>
<td>Current definition of library materials does not include technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Current Statutory language: MGL c. 78, Section 19B. The board of library commissioners, in setting up minimum standards of free public library service and in certifying such libraries for aid under section nineteen A shall require the filing of an annual report and shall require that such public libraries Be kept open a minimum number of hours per week” means that library service should be available to the community a minimum number of hours per week. These hours of service should be planned in relation to local community needs, and the hours and days selected for service should reflect the maximum potential use. In communities which have more than one independent library unit supported in whole or in part by public funds and in communities which have branches or stations of a central library, the qualifying number of hours open will be considered as the total number of hours during which library service is available to the community or any of its parts without overlapping or duplication.

In order to be eligible to apply for State Aid to Public Libraries, a library must be open the minimum required hours, days, and evening hours for its population group between Labor Day and Memorial Day of each fiscal year. Summer hours are not used in measuring compliance, but the library must be open at least some hours each week, with posted weekly hours, during the summer period. The Minimum Hours Open requirement is defined in statute and regulation (MGL, c.78, s. 19B and 605 CMR 4.01(3)).

Current Regulatory language: 605 CMR 4.01(3) “Be kept open a minimum number of hours per week” means that library service should be available to the community a minimum number of hours per week. (see the tabulation in Appendix J). These hours of service should be planned in relation to local community needs, and the hours and days selected for service should reflect the maximum potential use. In communities which have more than one independent library unit supported in whole or in part by public funds and in communities which have branches or stations of a central library, the qualifying number of hours open will be considered as the total number of hours during which library service is available to the community or any of its parts without overlapping or duplication.”

2 Current Statutory language: M.G.L., 78, Section 19B. “The board of library commissioners, in setting up minimum standards of free public library service and in certifying such libraries for aid under section nineteen A shall require the filing of an annual report and shall require that such public libraries...(5) expend a reasonable portion of the library’s total budget on library materials.”
Current Regulatory language: 605 CMR 4.01(5) "Expend a reasonable portion of the library's total budget on library materials" means that the Board of Library Commissioners in determining "a reasonable portion" will be guided by the tabulation given in Appendix J below. Total budget is defined as the total municipal appropriation to the library for operations. All sources of income to the library's operating budget may be used to meet the materials expenditure requirement. Monies received as state or federal aid funds for the operation of a regional library system program must not be used to meet a local library's expenditure requirement for books and related materials.

Current Policy Language: The minimum materials expenditure standard is computed for all municipalities using the amount appropriated by the municipality to the library for operations and the percentage requirement as stated in regulation. (MGL, c.78, s.19B; 605 CMR 4.01(5)). Materials expenditures include:

“Library Materials - The cost of books, serials, audio materials, and other non-print materials that circulate to library patrons or are used by library patrons in the library. Included are CD-ROM and online costs, (including money paid to networks for electronic content), and museum passes. Supplies used to prepare library materials for circulation are not included (e.g. bar codes, book pockets, etc.) and the monetary value of donated books may not be included.”


3 Current Statutory language: M.G.L., 78, s.19A: “No city or town shall receive any money under this section in any year when the appropriation of said city or town for free public library services is below an amount equal to the average of its appropriation for free public library service for the three years immediately preceding, increased by two and one-half per cent of said average. Said board may, upon petition of a community, waive aforesaid requirement upon demonstration of fiscal hardship. Said waiver may only be granted by said board in a given fiscal year to not more than ten cities and towns in the commonwealth.”

Current Approved Policy:
The Municipal Appropriation Requirement (MAR) for each award year is computed using figures for the three prior fiscal years. For each of those three years that a municipality received a State Aid to Public Libraries award, the figure used will be either the MAR or Total Appropriated Municipal Income (TAMI), whichever is higher. If the municipality was not certified for State Aid to Public Libraries in any year, the actual TAMI for that year will be used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 MAR calculation</th>
<th>Calculate the MAR without including municipally appropriated revolving funds</th>
<th>Currently included as part of the municipally appropriated money.</th>
<th>Make changes to the terms and definitions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 MAR calculation</td>
<td>Recalculate the MAR to adjust for staff changes impacting salaries</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4 Waivers:**

| 1 Waivers | Assistance for communities with repeated waivers to meet the MAR | Waivers are governed by Statute and budget language. [MGL c. 78, s. 19B (change) [Policy new]] |

---

4 Current Statutory language: M.G.L., 78, s.19A: “No city or town shall receive any money under this section in any year when the appropriation of said city or town for free public library services is below an amount equal to the average of its appropriation for free public library service for the three years immediately preceding, increased by two and one-half per cent of said average. Said board may, upon petition of a community, waive aforesaid requirement upon demonstration of fiscal hardship. Said waiver may only be granted by said board in a given fiscal year to not more than ten cities and towns in the commonwealth.”

Budget Language:

**Chapter 46 of the Acts of 2015 7000-9501**

For state aid to public libraries; provided, that notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, no city or town shall receive funds from this item in any year when the appropriation of the city or town for free public library services is below an amount equal to 102.5 per cent of the average of the appropriations for free public library services for the three years immediately preceding; provided further, that notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, the board of library commissioners may grant waivers in excess of the waiver limit set forth in the second paragraph of section 19A of chapter 78 of the General Laws in fiscal year 2016 for not more than 1 year; provided further, that notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, of the amount by which this item exceeds the amount appropriated in chapter 194 of the acts of 1998, funds shall be distributed under the guidelines of the municipal equalization grant program, the library incentive grant program and the nonresident circulation offset program; provided further, that notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, any payment made under this item shall be deposited with the treasurer of the city or town and held in a separate account and shall be expended by the public library of that city or town without appropriation;
Section 7: Going Forward

With the Commissioners’ approval, the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners staff will hold five public meetings around the Commonwealth in October of 2015 to present the White Paper and the work of the State Aid Review Committee to stakeholders in the library community. The meeting dates and locations are listed below:

10/08 – Flint Public Library, Middleton 10:30am - 12:00pm
10/13 – MBLC Office, Boston 10:30am - 12:00pm
10/14 – CLAMS Office, Hyannis 12:00pm - 1:30pm
10/19 – MLS Office, Marlborough 10:00am - 11:30am
10/20 – Chicopee Public Library 10:30am - 12:00pm

Feedback from attendees at these events and from others in the library community will be accepted until October 30, 2015. The results will be presented to the Commissioners who will ultimately decide which recommendations will be implemented.

Recommended changes approved by the Commissioners at the end of the review process may require alteration to statute, regulation, and/or policy before they can be adopted and implemented as part of the State Aid to Public Libraries program.

Changes to statute require a vote of the Massachusetts Legislature and can take at least two years to be completed; regulations require a series of public hearings and can take at minimum a year; policies are voted on each October by the Commissioners but can be brought forth at any scheduled meeting. Recommendations that require changes to both Statute (MGL) and Regulations (CMR) could take at least three years to implement.
Appendix A: White Paper

The White Paper is available as a PDF through this link:

Appendix B: Disbursement of State Aid to Public Libraries Awards

After a municipality is certified to receive State Aid to Public Libraries, the agency disburses 3 awards in several payments:

- *Library Incentive Grant (LIG)* - disbursed to all certified municipalities based on population. Encourages municipalities to support and improve public library service.
- *Municipal Equalization Grant (MEG)* - disbursed to all certified municipalities using a calculation based on the state lottery formula. Compensates for disparities among municipal funding capacities.
- *Nonresident Circulation Offset (NRC)* - disbursed to offset additional costs to municipalities whose libraries circulate materials to patrons from other certified Massachusetts municipalities.

Additional funds, if available, are distributed by the end of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year.
Appendix D: Final Scope of the White Paper

Scope of Services

Review of the State Aid to Libraries Program
Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
July 15, 2014, Revised September 9, 2014
The Context.
The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (MBLC) is planning to review the State Aid to Libraries Programs with the objective of developing administrative, programmatic and legislative approaches to

- conforming the programs to the current context
- Simplifying the administration of state aid programs and
- Developing the basis for increasing and sustaining state and local funding for municipal public libraries.

The MBLC staff has asked the Collins Center for Public Management at UMASS Boston to assist in the deliberations relating to improving the state support system for local public libraries by preparing a White Paper that establishes the current context and suggests directions to pursue.

The purpose of the White Paper is to frame discussions that will occur between and among MBLC staff, MBLC Board members and an advisory committee that will be established by the MBLC. The MBLC engaged in a similar evaluation in 2007 with most of the work performed by an advisory committee. However, the financial exigencies that affected the Commonwealth in subsequent years denied the library community the resources required to implement many of the recommendations. The 2007 Advisory Committee required most of a calendar year to complete its work. In the current context the MBLC contemplates that the Advisory Committee to the 2014/2015 review of the state aid program will function more along the lines of a reaction panel to the concepts advanced in the White Paper and that the MMBLC (actual members) will be able to make beneficial changes to the regulatory regime in a timely way while concurrently seeking statutory and budgetary changes that help improve the Commonwealth’s effectiveness in incenting municipalities to provide library services.

Members of the library community, the MBLC staff and the members of the MBLC are all familiar with the severe budget cuts that affected the Commonwealth, its municipalities and hence public libraries since 2007. Similarly it is well known that the period of financial exigency has started to recede. The $2.2 million dollar increase in the State Aid to Public Libraries appropriation in the FY2015 state budget is the hallmark of this trend.

The Scope of Work
Collins will prepare a White Paper that documents the current State Aid Program and identifies significant changes in the program since the last review in 2007. The White Paper will identify major changes in public library funding between 2007 and 2014 and attempt to tease out the reasons for those changes.

The sources of information that Collins will use in preparing the White Paper are
- MBLC records
- MBLC member and staff knowledge
- Interviews with selected members of the Massachusetts Library community
- Interviews with selected legislators, state officials, and local officials (including Library Directors)

**Task 1.** Confirm and Refine the work plan and schedule. Identify the availability of quantitative and narrative information that can contribute to the White Paper.

**Task 2.** Acquire written data and narrative information and conduct a preliminary assessment based on data.

**Task 3.** Using the information obtained in Tasks 1 and 2 plan, schedule and conduct interviews of up to twelve knowledgeable people.

**Task 4.** Based on information obtained in earlier tasks prepare a draft of the White Paper for review and comment by MBLC staff. (5-day turnaround)

**Task 5.** Prepare the final draft for review by MBLC staff (written comments only – 5 day turnaround).

**Task 6.** Prepare the final version of the White Paper and submit it to the Executive Director in pdf format.

**Assumptions:**

1. The subject matter range will be limited to the State Aid Programs and regulatory requirements related directly to the state aid programs. The construction program is not included in the scope of the White Paper. Interstate comparisons are outside the scope of this project.

2. MBLC staff will assist the consulting team by facilitating access to MBLC data and to the data of other state agencies that is relevant.

3. The MBLC staff has the capability to meet the rather rapid turnaround schedule for review and comment.

4. The work of the consulting team will be limited to the production of the White Paper and does not include any work related to the presentation of the White Paper to the Board of Library Commissioners or to an advisory committee or any similar body.
5. The style of the White Paper will be designed for rapid reading and focus on the essential elements of the State Aid programs with emphasis on the three aspects mentioned in the context section above.

6. A common thread that will run through the White Paper is the recognition that the Commonwealth’s library assistance programs are mainly designed to incent the expenditure of municipal resources to benefit library users and potential users and maintain/attain quality. Similarly they serve to support local public library advocates.

Tasks one through six will be completed in a time frame of approximately three months.

Schedule (to be confirmed during Task 1):

Assumes authorization to commence work in place by October 1.

Task 1. Confirm and Refine work plan. Complete by October 10
Task 2. Preliminary Assessment. Complete by November 8
Task 3. Interviews. Complete by November 1
Task 5. Final Draft. Complete by December 2
Task 7. Supplemental Effort. tbd

Deliverables:
- Final work plan
- Preliminary assessment (oral)
- Draft report
- Final draft
- Final report

All deliverables will be in electronic form (pdf or docx, as specified in the final work plan)

A tentative Table of Contents is attached to this Scope to illustrate the Project Team’s current concept of what the White Paper will cover. Please refer to Appendix 1.

Project Consultants:
Team Leader: Richard Kobayashi, Senior Associate.

Mr. Kobayashi has over thirty years of public management experience including service as a manager in a Massachusetts state agency, planning and development director for an economically distressed
Massachusetts city, chief planner for a major water/wastewater utility and as chief aide to the Mayor of a densely populated urban city. For eleven years he managed the Commonwealth’s technical assistance services to municipalities. He is expert in state-local relations in Massachusetts. Mr. Kobayashi has also served as an elected official in his hometown of Belmont, Massachusetts and as a consultant under USAID auspices in Eastern Europe.

Mr. Kobayashi holds a BA in Economics from UMass Amherst, a Masters degree in Public Administration from Northeastern University and was a Loeb Fellow at Harvard University.

Mr. Kobayashi has served as Senior Associate with the Collins Center since 2008 and has managed over forty projects for the Collins Center.

**Project Consultant: James Sutton, Associate.**

Mr. Sutton was formerly Director of the Andover Public Library and Director of the Library in Natick. Mr. Sutton holds an AB Degree from Dartmouth College, an MPA from Framingham State University and an MLS from Simmons College. He was a Board member and President of the Massachusetts Library Association, 2001-2002. He also served terms as president of the Minuteman Library Network while Director of Natick’s Library and president of the Merrimack Valley Library Consortium while Director of Andover’s Library. While Director in Andover, he served several years as a member of the State Advisory Council on Libraries.

**Professional Fees, Expenses and Payment Schedule**

The professional fee for carrying out Tasks One through Six is $16,000.

The MBLC will be responsible for the Center’s out of pocket expenses (printing, travel costs including mileage, tolls and parking, lodging if required to efficiently carryout the work, and similar costs). These costs are not included in the Professional Fee. The Center may also recover certain administrative fees where that is consistent with UMass Boston policy. The Center will arrange to have these expenses submitted to the MBLC with the final invoice.

Payment: $4,000 is payable when Task 2 is complete, $6,000 is payable when Task Four is complete, $4000 is payable when Task 5 is complete and $2000 is payable when Task 6 is complete. The Center will bill reimbursable expenses when the engagement is complete.

**Presentations:**

Collins will present the White Paper to the Advisory Committee or the Board of Library Commissioners for a supplemental Professional Fee of $1600, and present to subsequent audiences for a supplemental Professional Fee of $800, if requested to do so by the MBLC staff.

Presentations of any kind are not included in Tasks 1 – 6. It is assumed that during Tasks 4-6 the consulting team will have extensive interaction with members of the MBLC staff so that they will be fully conversant with the approach, content and rationale for the White Paper.
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Appendix E: State Aid to Public Libraries in the United States

Part of the initial work of the State Review Committee will be to examine the state aid programs of other states. The staff used two sources when researching state aid to public libraries in the United States. The first is the most recent survey of all state library agencies conducted by the Institute of Museum and Library Services. The second is an online survey conducted by Liz Babbitt, State Aid Specialist at the MBLC. Each has its pluses and its minuses. The first source provides data from all 50 states, but it is very limited and is two years old. The second includes current data about state aid, but does not include responses from all 50 states.

State Library Agency Survey
State Library Agency Survey: Fiscal Year 2012 Data Set (Excel spreadsheet), reported a total of $320,938,487 (column RW Line 53 Data element AIDIPLB) going to individual public libraries as aid from state sources, (including the District of Columbia).

The following twelve states reported distributing no state aid in FY2012: California, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

The following thirteen states reported less than $1,000,000 in FY2012 state aid: Arizona, Arkansas, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah.

The following nine states and the District of Columbia reported over $10,000,000 in FY2012 state aid:

Electronic Survey of State Aid to Public Libraries
State Data Coordinators were surveyed in the January of 2015.

30 States responded to the survey.

Seven states responded that there is no state aid to public libraries in their state: Idaho, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

The following states did not respond to the survey: Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia.

Summary of surveys:
Of all States reporting in either survey, New York had the largest appropriation at just over $40 million. Ohio had the least amount at $81,000. Two of the states (Colorado and Minnesota) reporting no State Aid to Libraries in FY2012 had begun offering State Aid by FY2015.
TABLE 1
The following table includes all states, in either survey, reporting at least half of the amount Massachusetts was initially appropriated in FY2015 ($9,000,000) but less than twice that amount. The three states most similar to Massachusetts in requirements are Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># of public libraries (IMLS)</th>
<th>SLAS survey—FY2012 $ for State Aid to Individual Public Libraries</th>
<th>Online survey responses dollars reported for FY2015</th>
<th>Are there requirements in statute and regulation?</th>
<th>Must state aid be expended in the year received?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$5,588,400</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>$11,242,424</td>
<td>$15,200,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>$6,823,657</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>$13,570,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$8,864,450</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$13,558,824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$7,698,252</td>
<td>$7,698,411</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, but carryover should be minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$5,103,976</td>
<td>$5,365,581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$14,313,954</td>
<td>$15,031,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$9,219,635</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information about State Aid around the United States can be found on the State Aid Review LibGuide.
Appendix F: Communication with the Board of Library Commissioners

To: Bill Morton
From: Mary Rose Quinn
Re: State Aid Review Update
Date: May 26, 2015

State Aid Review Update, 2015

The State Aid Review Committee met for the first time in December of 2014. The Committee is made up of librarians and trustees from the public library community and represents small, mid-size, and large libraries and library systems across the Commonwealth. The committee also includes members from the state’s regional and network partners and 3 Commissioners.

At the initial meeting, committee members were asked to share their “joys and concerns” about the current State Aid program. The members also discussed the “charge to the committee” as approved by the Commissioners and considered the process and timeline for the work of the review. The Committee began a preliminary discussion of the White Paper produced by the Collins Center, starting with an examination of the themes.

Work began in earnest in March with meeting facilitator, Nancy Rea after the January meeting was canceled as a result of snow and the committee met via conference call in February to finish a discussion of White Paper themes. The Committee is meeting monthly through June to develop recommendations for the State Aid Program that will become part of the report which will be written over the summer and submitted to the Board in August or September.

The Committee has researched, reviewed and discussed:

- The state aid practices in several other states
- The components of a successful State Aid program
- The creation of an “ideal” program
  - Components
  - Requirements
  - Implementation
- Current laws, regulations, policies, and waivers

All of the work of the Committee has been shared with the committee members and with the Commissioners on a LibGuide created by Liz Babbitt which will be made public once the work of the Committee is completed. The LibGuide contains the “charge” to the committee, the details of the current program, state aid programs in other states, meeting notes for the monthly meetings, and “homework” assignments for past/future meetings.

Once the Board has had time to review and react to the findings, the report will be presented to the library community in a series of meetings at the end of September and early October.
Appendix G: Assignments Outside of Meetings

For the April Meeting:
Think about what your ideal state aid program would look like.
- Think about the program statewide.
- Try not to be influenced only by your situation.
- Feel free to think creatively.
We'll be discussing your ideas in small groups at the April meeting.

For the May Meeting:
Take a look at the Policies and Waivers links and think about their 'pluses' and possible improvements:

For the June Meeting:
Create two recommendations for the Report to the MBLC by considering the following:
- What category does this fall under (MAR, Hours, etc.)
- What would be the requirement(s)?
- Would there be modifications, if needed?
- What would be the limit to any modification(s)?
- How would you phase in any changes to the requirement?
Appendix H: Small Group exercises

March Meeting:

Components of a Successful State Aid Program

Cooperation:
- Additional funding to libraries for providing services regionally or cooperatively

Power:
- Continued threat of loss of certification gives us “teeth” when talking to local boards

Equity:
- Equal opportunity among the libraries regardless of population
- Fair, equitable minimum standards of effort, based on more than population, that also recognize varying economic conditions
- Take benefits and utilities out of library budget equation

Materials Requirement:
- Keep the collection current
- Materials Expenditure Requirement
- Require number of items per capita vs % of total budget (or some range in between)
- Materials Spending Requirement

State’s Part:
- Funding that keeps up with an equitable share of the state budget (when the state budget goes up, so does library aid)

Staffing and Education:
- For directors, requirement of MLS or some certification (BLT classes for under 10,000 pop.)
- Director Ed.
- Director Education Standard
- Minimum staff education requirements
- Staffing standards based per population
- Continuing Education requirement
- Staffing FTE requirement based on budget and population
- Continuing education requirements per year
- Requirement for Trustee training/education
- Requirement not only for directors but for staff including continuing education

Pro-MAR:
- Consistent funding
- MAR requirement
- Minimum or recommended Municipal appropriation
- Municipal Appropriation Requirement
- Local Funding Requirement
- Maintenance of effort of local funding
- MAR - The requirement to support increased local funding

MAR Flexibility:
- Maintain the library’s ability to leverage the need for funding while still allowing for flexibility when circumstances do change and library services are not dramatically affected (retirement payouts, building projects, overall town budgets staying low)

Anti-MAR:
- Alternative requirement to the MAR
- Funding based on level to previous year or better (Not the MAR)
- Eliminate MAR – Change formula – base on % of taxes

Additional Standards:
- Expanding the standards beyond just hours and material expenditure
- Examples:
  - Technology Assessment or Complete Technology Plan for the library
  - IT assets
  - Meeting Space for community, and total activity support

Components of an Ideal State Aid Program: Three Possibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours – Libraries with branches report total hours open in addition to unique hours open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials: Include a 5% of technology and all network fees towards the requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keep the education requirement</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Components: |
| Reset MAR for waiver and libraries not receiving certification |
| Continuing Education for Trustees |

| Implementation: |
| Phase in with the option to use the old system for 3 (7) years |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Components:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average weekly hours or variable seasonal hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology counts towards Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep teeth in the program to ensure standards are known and met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrots for libraries going above and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better than average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Requirements: |
| Set hours based on population, not unique hours |
| Libraries can be busiest period of the year (which 6 or 9 months) |
| Open to all (as in current program) |
| No change to basic services (but maybe redefine in light of technology) |
| Staffing FTE based on population with standards for education |
| Technology counts for materials |
| Define what is a material expenditure |

| Implementation: |
| Educate Municipal officials as to what State Aid can be spent on |
| Keep UG/MEG/NRC for 80% of State Aid funds with 20% as carrots for incentives |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Components:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Requirements: |
| Allow for equipment in materials |
| Long Range Plan |
| MLS education for specific population groups |
| Continuing education for Trustees and staff |

| Implementation: |
| Base award would consist of UG and NRC – The MEG would become incentive funds for libraries who go above and beyond |

Final Report of The State Aid Review Committee
October 1, 2015
May Meeting:

**Discussion of Current Policies and Waivers**

**Group 1**
- Open to all - No charge - helpful for explaining to funding
- Hours open - shift of the time period; seasonal influx of the residents 6-9 month period
- Population grouping - Cape, how to count the increased population?
- Branch discussion of unique hours
- Hire trained personnel - director - opportunity for BLT classes to be offered more often (5 years) throughout the state - possibly more distance learning. Need the interaction with colleagues.
- Staffing requirements - professional staff needed based on population - Unfunded mandate from the state? Minimum requirement?
- Library materials - based on population? Based on budget? Based on leveled budgets?
- More materials covered under materials - technology related to access

**Group 2**
- Hours based on location
- Materials include technology - % of the budget 20%? 25%?
- MAR needed but reset? Is it fair to those who meet all the time?
- When staff leave, positions are funded at less. Should this require a recalculated MAR?

**Group 3**
- What is normal library service? - definition Communities want revenue so how do we keep services free?
- Union contracts - add to MAR but does not provide much in terms of expanding services.
- Library materials need a definition update not so much format specific
- Network membership % for the materials access
- Decertification can hurt surrounding towns. Getting back into the program takes too long.
- Part time personnel can weaken staff if personnel is all part time.
- Staffing ideal should include more FT; more turn over with PT people
- 1-1 state requirements have more teeth to show that libraries are important - however it is very political - too many waivers
- Information/marketing of the information about the State Aid program and other state library programs
- Town budget in April; long process at the local level - Concern about time between a cut to the library budget and actual decertification, eg, your budget is cut in May at Town Meeting. Your services based on the budget are cut in July but you don't feel any consequences until February.
- Need a more immediate response to disproportionate cuts.
Appendix I: Recommendations from the State Aid Review Committee

Municipal Appropriation Requirement (MAR):
- Libraries should have the option to average up to six years to determine the MAR
- Add Other Expenditures - Operating Paid from another Town Department Budget "for Technology and custodial costs to the TAMI to level the playing field for all libraries.
- Allow a reset of the MAR after five years of being granted waivers if the municipality can prove that the library has been proportionally increased.
- Take into account budget decreases due to staffing changes and adjust the MAR accordingly.
- Adjust the MAR to reflect staffing changes.
- Base the MAR on FTE staffing levels.
- Adjust the MAR to reflect staffing changes.

Waivers:
- Allow libraries that have been granted a waiver (but not disproportionately cut) then have their budgets increased by the minimum percentage in subsequent years not to have to apply for a waiver in those years of increases.
- Allow municipalities to use the TAMI or MAR (whichever is lower) to calculate the MAR if a waiver has been in effect the prior year.
- Limit waivers to three years then have the municipality state they will restore the budget to the first year MAR level or lose certification.
- After five years of waivers, a library can apply for full-certification (the new normal) if the library has seen increases of 2.5% per year after the initial cut year.

Materials Expenditures (MX):
- MX determined by population groups with a set dollar amount rather than population group percentage of the TAMI.
- Eliminate population based requirement for MX and replace with the same percentage for all libraries.
- MX should be based on only those budget items that most libraries have in common such as materials and personnel.
- Use prior year TAMI to determine MX amount rather than population groups.

Technology:
- Technology (such as computers, wireless modems, and printers) should be allowable as an MX
- Technology for direct use by patrons would be allowable as an MX amortized over five years. Items that generate revenue such as copier and printers would be excluded.
- Permit libraries to count a percentage of the cost of providing public access computers towards the MX.
- Allow libraries to count up to 25% of the MX for technology.
- Allow a percentage of technology expenditures as part of the MX.

Hours:
- Remove the 'unique' hours requirement.
- Adjust the time period when hours open are assessed.
- Use an average number of hours open over the entire year.
• Phase out the 'Compliance Period' and use an average of hours open.

Technology Plan:
• Submit a technology plan for 3-5 years duration that covers all aspects of effective and efficient utilization of current and future technologies.

Continuing Education:
• Hours of Continuing Education should be required based on population groups for Directors and sometimes staff or trustees
Appendix J: Recommendations in Context

Please note: Recommendations were not included from Commissioners or Agency staff. The following tables put the Committee's recommendations in context in regards to the equivalent piece of the current State Aid to Public Libraries Program and indicate whether changes would be required or new additions made to statute, regulation, or policy to achieve that recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Appropriation Requirement (MAR):</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries should have the option to average up to 6 years to determine the MAR.</td>
<td>Municipal Appropriation Requirement</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Other Expenditures - Operating Paid from another Town Department budget or technology and custodial costs to the TAMI to level the playing field for all libraries.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow a reset of the MAR after 5 years of being granted waivers if the municipality can prove that the library has been proportionally increased.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take into account budget decreases due to staffing changes and adjust the MAR accordingly; Adjust the MAR to reflect staffing changes.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base the MAR on FTE staffing levels.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Statutory language:  M.G.L., 78, s.19A : “No city or town shall receive any money under this section in any year when the appropriation of said city or town for free public library services is below an amount equal to the average of its appropriation for free public library service for the three years immediately preceding, increased by two and one-half per cent of said average. Said board may, upon petition of a community, waive aforesaid requirement upon demonstration of fiscal hardship. Said waiver may only be granted by said board in a given fiscal year to not more than ten cities and towns in the commonwealth.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Equivalency</th>
<th>Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow libraries that have been granted a waiver (but not disproportionately cut) then have their budgets increased by the minimum percentage in subsequent years not to have to apply for a waiver in those years of increases</td>
<td>Municipalities must file for a waiver each year that the Library is not meeting the MAR.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow municipalities to use the TAMI or MAR (whichever is lower) to calculate the MAR if a waiver has been in effect the prior year.</td>
<td>Libraries must use whichever is the higher number, the TAMI or MAR.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit waivers to three years then have the municipality state they will restore the budget to the first year MAR level or lose certification.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (change); policy – (new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 5 years of waivers, a library can apply for full-certification (the new normal) if the library has seen increases of 2.5% per year after the initial cut year.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., 78, s.19A (new)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Statutory language:  M.G.L., 78, s.19A : “Said board [The Board of Library Commissioners] may, upon petition of a community, waive aforesaid requirement [Municipal Appropriation Requirement] upon demonstration of fiscal hardship. Said waiver may only be granted by said board in a given fiscal year to not more than ten cities and towns in the commonwealth.”

The number of waivers available for a given year is not determined until the budget language is final for that year. Budget language for FY 2015: “notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, the board of library commissioners may grant waivers in excess of the waiver limit set forth in the second paragraph of section 19A of chapter 78 of the General Laws in fiscal year 2015 for a period of not more than 1 year;”

Current Approved Policy:
The Municipal Appropriation Requirement (MAR) for each award year is computed using figures for the three prior fiscal years. For each of those three years that a municipality received a State Aid to Public Libraries award, the figure used will be either the MAR or Total Appropriated Municipal Income (TAMI), whichever is higher. If the municipality was not certified for State Aid to Public Libraries in any year, the actual TAMI for that year will be used. [http://mblc.state.ma.us/grants/state_aid/policies/sa_mar_cal_policy2017.php](http://mblc.state.ma.us/grants/state_aid/policies/sa_mar_cal_policy2017.php)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Expenditures (MX):</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MX should be determined by population groups with a set dollar amount rather than population group percentage of the TAMI.</td>
<td>The Materials Expenditure Requirement is defined in statute and regulation (MGL, c.78, s.19B; 605 CMR 4.01(5))</td>
<td>[MGL c. 78, s. 19B (5)] – (change) [605 CMR 4.01(5)] (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate population based requirement for MX and replace with the same percentage for all libraries.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>[605 CMR 4.01(5)] (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX should be based on only those budget items that most libraries have in common such as materials and personnel.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>[MGL c. 78, s. 19B (5)] – (change) [605 CMR 4.01(5)] (change) Policy (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use prior year TAMI to determine MX amount rather than population groups.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>[MGL c. 78, s. 19B (5)] – (change) [605 CMR 4.01(5)] (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Statutory language: M.G.L., 78, Section 19B. “The board of library commissioners, in setting up minimum standards of free public library service and in certifying such libraries for aid under section nineteen A shall require the filing of an annual report and shall require that such public libraries...(5) expend a reasonable portion of the library’s total budget on library materials.”

Current Regulatory language: 605 CMR 4.01(5) "Expend a reasonable portion of the library's total budget on library materials" means that the Board of Library Commissioners in determining "a reasonable portion" will be guided by the tabulation given below. Total budget is defined as the total municipal appropriation to the library for operations. All sources of income to the library's operating budget may be used to meet the materials expenditure requirement. Monies received as state or federal aid funds for the operation of a regional library system program must not be used to meet a local library's expenditure requirement for books and related materials.

Libraries which do not meet the minimum standards of expenditures for library materials upon the date of a first ever application for state aid will be granted a three-year period in which to meet these minimum standards.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries in communities with population</th>
<th>Minimum percentage of the municipal appropriation to the library for operations which must be spent on library materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Under 2,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 2,000 - 4,999</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) 15,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) 25,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) 50,000 and over</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Policy Language: The minimum materials expenditure standard is computed for all municipalities using the amount appropriated by the municipality to the library for operations and the percentage requirement as stated in regulation. (MGL, c.78, s.19B; 605 CMR 4.01(5)).

Operating expenditures include:

1. Personnel - Salaries only.
2. Library Materials - The cost of books, serials, audio materials, and other non-print materials that circulate to library patrons or are used by library patrons in the library. Included are CD-ROM and online costs, (including money paid to networks for electronic content), and museum passes. Supplies used to prepare library materials for circulation are not included (e.g. bar codes, book pockets, etc.) and the monetary value of donated books may not be included.
3. Other Operating Expenditures - The current and recurrent costs necessary to support the provision of library services. These include expenditures made by the library that are not capital, personnel, or for library materials. Other operating expenditures include building maintenance, energy and utilities, network membership, supplies, repair or replacement of existing furnishing and equipment, and other miscellaneous expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology:</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute (MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology (such as computers, wireless modems, and printers should be allowable as an MX.)</td>
<td>Current definition of library materials does not include technology.</td>
<td>[MGL c. 78, s. 19B (5)] - (change) [605 CMR 4.01(5)] (change) Policy – (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology for direct use by patrons would be allowable as an MX amortized over 5 years. Items that generate revenue such as copier and printers would be excluded.</td>
<td>Current definition of library materials does not include technology.</td>
<td>[MGL c. 78, s. 19B (5)] - (change) [605 CMR 4.01(5)] (change) Policy – (change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Statutory language: M.G.L., 78, Section 19B. “The board of library commissioners, in setting up minimum standards of free public library service and in certifying such libraries for aid under section nineteen A shall require the filing of an annual report and shall require that such public libraries...(5) expend a reasonable portion of the library’s total budget on library materials.”

Current Regulatory language: 605 CMR 4.01(5) "Expend a reasonable portion of the library's total budget on library materials" means that the Board of Library Commissioners in determining "a reasonable portion" will be guided by the tabulation given below. Total budget is defined as the total municipal appropriation to the library for operations. All sources of income to the library's operating budget may be used to meet the materials expenditure requirement. Monies received as state or federal aid funds for the operation of a regional library system program must not be used to meet a local library's expenditure requirement for books and related materials.

Current Policy Language: The minimum materials expenditure standard is computed for all municipalities using the amount appropriated by the municipality to the library for operations and the percentage requirement as stated in regulation. (MGL, c.78, s.19B; 605 CMR 4.01(5)). Materials expenditures include: “Library Materials - The cost of books, serials, audio materials, and other non-print materials that circulate to library patrons or are used by library patrons in the library. Included are CD-ROM and online costs, (including money paid to networks for electronic content), and museum passes. Supplies used to prepare library materials for circulation are not included (e.g. bar codes, book pockets, etc.) and the monetary value of donated books may not be included.”


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours:</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove the 'unique' hours requirement for systems with branches.</td>
<td>Minimum Hours Open-requirement.</td>
<td>[605 CMR 4.01 (3)] –( change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adjust the time period when hours open are assessed. | Compliance Period 605 CMR 4.01(3). | [605 CMR 4.01 (3)] –( change) Policy – |
Phase out the 'Compliance Period' and use an average of hours open over the entire year.

Weekly Minimum Hours Open (MGL, c. 78, s. 19B and 605 CMR 4.01(3)).

[605 CMR 4.01 (3)] – (change)
Compliance Period
605 CMR 4.01(3).
Policy – (change)

Counting of hours open should be measured for March to June. Not being open on Sunday in summer in an urban library reflects demand. A seasonal library open on Sundays in July is over-emphasized when it is merely meeting demand.

Current Statutory language: MGL c. 78, Section 19B. The board of library commissioners, in setting up minimum standards of free public library service and in certifying such libraries for aid under section nineteen A shall require the filing of an annual report and shall require that such public libraries Be kept open a minimum number of hours per week” means that library service should be available to the community a minimum number of hours per week. These hours of service should be planned in relation to local community needs, and the hours and days selected for service should reflect the maximum potential use. In communities which have more than one independent library unit supported in whole or in part by public funds and in communities which have branches or stations of a central library, the qualifying number of hours open will be considered as the total number of hours during which library service is available to the community or any of its parts without overlapping or duplication.

In order to be eligible to apply for State Aid to Public Libraries, a library must be open the minimum required hours, days, and evening hours for its population group between Labor Day and Memorial Day of each fiscal year. Summer hours are not used in measuring compliance, but the library must be open at least some hours each week, with posted weekly hours, during the summer period. The Minimum Hours Open requirement is defined in statute and regulation (MGL, c.78, s.19B and 605 CMR 4.01(3)).

Current Regulatory language: 605 CMR 4.01(3). “Be kept open a minimum number of hours per week” means that library service should be available to the community a minimum number of hours per week according to the tabulation below. These hours of service should be planned in relation to local community needs, and the hours and days selected for service should reflect the maximum potential use. In communities which have more than one independent library unit supported in whole or in part by public funds and in communities which have branches or stations of a central library, the qualifying number of hours open will be considered as the total number of hours during which library service is available to the community or any of its parts without overlapping or duplication.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries in communities with population</th>
<th>Recommended Minimum Hours Open Per Week (Summer Schedules Excluded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) under 2,000</td>
<td>10 including some evening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 2,000 - 4,999</td>
<td>15 including some evening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) 5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>25 including some evening hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) 10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>40 some part of five days, including some evening hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Libraries which do not meet the minimum standards of hours of service upon the date of first ever application for a state grant may establish eligibility for same provided a statement is filed indicating that the minimum standard will be reached within a three-year period from date of application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Plan:</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit a technology plan for 3-5 years duration that covers all aspects of effective and efficient utilization of current and future technologies.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., c.78, 19B)- (New) [605 CMR 4.01-(New)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing Education:</th>
<th>Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>Current Program Equivalency</th>
<th>Change Required Statute(MGL), Regulation (CMR) and/or policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of Continuing Education should be required based on population groups for Directors and for some staff and trustees.</td>
<td>No equivalent in current program.</td>
<td>M.G.L., c.78, 19B - (New) [605 CMR 4.01-(New)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>