Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Board Meeting Notes
February 21, 2020 at 1:30 PM
Online via Zoom
{Alternate in-person location: 980 WI-16, West Salem, WI 54669}

Present: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Evan Bend (OWLS), Jennifer Chamberlain (MLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Anne Hamland (WVLS), Steve Heser (MCFLS), Anne-Marie Itzin (NWLS), David Kranz (SWLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Rebecca Schadrie (MCLS), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), Tracy Vreeke (NFLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS)

Absent: Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Rob Nunez (KLS), Steve Ohs (LLS)

Project Managers: Sarah Birkholz (WiLS), Melody Clark (WiLS)

1. **Call to order/Welcome & Introductions**
   Chair K. Anderson called the meeting to order at 1:31 pm

2. **Consent Agenda**
   a. Review agenda
      i. Moving item 4c to after 4e
   b. Approval of minutes from October 22, 2019
   c. Acceptance of Steering Committee minutes from November 14, 2019
   d. Decisions made between October 22, 2019 and current meeting: None

   There were no changes and the consent agenda were approved by consensus.

3. **Updates from Previous Meetings/Projects**
   a. **Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee**
   E. Pfotenhauer reported in 2015, WPLC initiated a partnership with the Wisconsin Newspaper Association and the Wisconsin Historical Society to add digitized historical newspapers to the existing Archive of Wisconsin Newspapers database available through BadgerLink. A pilot project, supported by an LSTA grant, was completed in 2016. Since then, WPLC project managers have worked with 23 individual libraries to coordinate the digitization of more than 600,000 pages of historical newspapers on master microfilm negatives held by WHS and ingestion of content into the Archive by WNA's access platform vendor, Tecnavia. Digitization and uploading costs are contributed by individual libraries; DPI has subsidized a portion of the upload costs through LSTA funds.

   Libraries and their patrons have appreciated the increased access to high-demand content that the Archive provides, but have also reported that the interface is slow to load and difficult to navigate. Other concerns include lack of availability outside of the state (demand from genealogists), unpredictable turnaround times for processing uploads, and inconsistent support from Tecnavia via WNA. In late 2018, the WPLC Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee began to investigate alternative platforms for providing improved centralized access to digitized historical newspapers.

E. Pfotenhauer also provided an update to the Committee's progress to date and a proposed timeline:

Nov. - Dec. 2018: Conducted usability testing of Archive of WI Newspapers/Tecnavia platform with librarians who have content in the collection, an information professional with no previous exposure to the collection, and expert genealogists who use the collection.

Jan. - March 2019: Developed list of evaluation criteria – preferred features and functions of access platform.

April - May 2019: Evaluated current platform and three alternatives: Veridian, ChronAm, and ProSeek.

June 2019: Identified Veridian as preferred platform due to ease of use, most modern/visually appealing interface, works well on mobile devices, supports METS/ALTO (core metadata standard for digital newspapers), and adoption by numerous statewide digital newspaper initiatives including California, Colorado, Illinois, and Michigan.

July - November 2019: Information gathering and development of proposed plan for adoption of Veridian. Conversations with Wisconsin Historical Society Library-Archives regarding partnership. WHS has more than 500,000 digitized newspaper pages to contribute to a centralized access platform (digitized as part of the National Digital Newspaper Program with NEH and LoC).

December 2019: WPLC Historical and Local Collections Committee endorses draft plan, pending potential commitments from WHS.

Jan. - Feb. 2020: Continued discussions with WHS regarding partnership and roles.

Proposed timeline
- 2020: Planning year
  - Create service model
  - Investigate funding sources
  - Negotiate and sign contract with platform
  - Determine and test migration process
- 2021: Migration year
  - Establish platform
  - Move public library materials currently in Tecnavia into the new platform
  - Move Chronicling America (NDNP) materials into the new platform
- 2022: New content
  - Begin loading new materials into the new platform

b. **Collection Development Committee**
The group was reminded that in 2019 the Collection Development Workgroup became a standing committee of the Steering Committee. This provides the opportunity to move the group's timeline up and have a first draft of the recommendations available to the Steering Committee at their February meeting, which was yesterday. The Steering Committee reviewed the draft and offered feedback to the Committee. Steering will have an additional opportunity

to review the draft at their April meeting. The recommendations will be discussed at the annual meeting and Steering will vote on the recommendations at the end of May.

c. **YTD Budget**
A Year to Date Budget has been included. No changes to the budget have been made. It was noted that the Holds Reduction Amounts have been dispersed to the System advantage accounts as content credit since the Board last met.

It was asked for a walkthrough of the budget spreadsheet and all of its tabs. The group reviewed the tabs and it was explained that the consortium is now purchasing content credit in advance for consortium purchases for the digital library as the invoices of that is less problematic and time consuming to process.

4. **New Business**
   a. **Apportionment of the 2019 Budget Carryover and Unbudgeted Expenses**
   It was explained that each year, we take the funds not spent by the Consortium in the previous year and allocate them to the appropriate budget for the current year.   This year, we have the following funds to allocate:

   $5.00 for Member shares {recommendation: carry over to reserve}
   $11,150.00 for Donations {recommendation: move to digital content}
   $37,452.00 for Digital Newspaper uploads {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   $12,000.00 for LSTA funding {recommendation: move to R&D}
   $1.00 for Recorded books {recommendation: carry over to reserve}
   $985.05 for Website {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   $1,497.81 for Digital content {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   $4,925.00 for Digital newspaper hosting {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   $642.28 for Newspaper upload {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   $17,000 for R&D {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   $34,551.23 for Reserve {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
   -$9.00 from Buying pool {recommendation: remove from digital content}
   -$438.50 in Other income (Roundtable expense) [remove from reserve}

   It was noted that this year we had a few unbudgeted expenses, -$9 less than expected from the buying pool amount and then then $438.50 in other income which was the roundtable expense the Board approved last year. It was asked if there were any questions or concerns about the proposed allocation and changes? There were no concerns.

   J. Guilderson-Duwe moved approval of 2019 Budget Carryover and changes; T. Vreeke seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

   b. **Formation of Budget Committee**
   The Board needs to form the annual Budget Committee. Last year, the Budget Committee consisted of:
   - The Board Chair
   - The Board Liaison to the Steering Committee
   - A representative from any Board Subcommittee (currently the Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee)

- A volunteer from the Board
  - T. Vreeke volunteered

The group was asked to confirm the members and ask for volunteers from the Board. D. Kranz is currently serving on the Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee and was asked to serve on the Budget Committee as a representative from a Board subcommittee. He agreed.

M. Van Pelt moved approval of the formation of the Budget Committee; S. Heser seconded. Motion passed.

c. **Planning for the 2020 Annual Meeting** (Moved to discussion after 4.e)
Our next meeting will be the WPLC Annual Meeting, held in conjunction with the Steering Committee at WAPL. WAPL will be held April 29-May 1, 2020 at Best Western Premier Waterfront Hotel & Conference Center in Oshkosh. The group agreed at the last meeting the meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 29th and discussed having a WPLC informational session during WAPL, similar to the format of 2019.

Suggested topic ideas for the meeting:
- Brief stats review
- CDC recommendation and Steering thoughts on recommendations
- Sustainable funding and the CDC recommendation
- Advocacy/Marketing Efforts
  - CDC recommendation of advocacy with funding bodies and partnerships
  - Social Media Committee potential focus on public and libraries

d. **Potential R&D projects**
At the last meeting of the Board, partners shared some potential R&D project ideas for 2020. There was a lot of interest in both the augmented reality historical society project and advocacy efforts. As a next step, project managers were tasked with gathering further information around these topics. The group was asked if there is any interest in pursuing either of these projects? In addition, what are other potential outcomes and what would they like the next steps to be?

There was interest in the marketing and advocacy from the roundtable as well as the proposed R&D projects. It was noted that as a part of the CDC recommendations that they were recommending a group do some marketing/advocating around additional funding sources and building partnerships.

It was asked if is reasonable or feasible to consider just one of the R&D options, or both? It was clarified that it depends on scope of the project and that there certainly are funds in R&D to explore both, but it really depends on what the desired outcome is.

There were many concerns surrounding WPLC trying to do more with Advocacy. It was agreed that this is a broad topic as it could be advocacy for the digital library, for funding, for libraries, for patrons, etc. It was also noted that many different groups, associations and bodies within the state have tried, some moderately successful and some failed, to do state-wide advocacy. It was also pointed out that often the best results lie with local, relatable stories and sometimes state-wide stories/advocacy doesn't reach home for all. It was agreed that it is hard to translate

local stories to different/larger stages and noted that we haven't found the right angle for this yet.

It was noted that the WPLC Social Media Committee is fairly new but perhaps we should give them the opportunity to propose a project of their own in regards to advocacy. There was agreement in getting feedback from the Social Media Committee. It was noted that stories are so important and perhaps a partnership with LDNL would be beneficial.

It was suggested that potentially the Social Media Committee could figure out a way to create a simple tool for libraries themselves to gather their own stories, without a whole lot of work?

It was asked if there was any interest in the AR/VR project? There wasn't any interested in pursuing this project. It was noted, however that the group appreciated this research and would like to see it posted to the WPLC website for future reference.

Next steps for this are to gather feedback from the Social Media Committee on their thoughts around advocacy and marketing of the digital library and library community in general. It was noted that since the Social Media Committee is volunteer basis from the community and not appointed, we may want to approach them with some delicacy, and be sure not to overwhelm them with a lot of new asks.

e. **Discussion: Round Table Survey Results**
The Board was thanked for participating in the roundtable, reviewing the reports and providing feedback via the survey. The intent of the survey was to gauge the support of the various statements created by the groups. Each section or report had recommendations or suggestions on activities the WPLC should do. For each section we included the survey results as well as the individual comments. As a reminder the different topics were, Advantage, Collections, in-state advocacy, National Role/Publishers, and Sustainable increases. It should be noted that many of these topics and suggestions are included in the Collection Development Committee's recommendations for this year. There are recommendations for sustainable increases, publisher/national role and advantage.

It was noted that overall there was a high percentage of agreement for most of the topics and where there wasn't, many of the responses were unsure.

The group reviewed the document and were asked of the identified issues, focusing on the topics with the most agreement, which topics should the WPLC focus on for this upcoming year? This feedback will help guide the recommendations for this year in addition, we can use the topics the board is interested in and further explore or discuss at the annual meeting.
The group had additional questions and thoughts regarding marketing and advocacy. It was noted that advocacy can be a very broad topic. The statement from the Roundtable included three very different topics: marketing campaigns targeting libraries, library funding bodies and the public, both patrons and non-users. It was stated that we should decide and focus on what the group would like to achieve.

It was noted that the recommendation from the CDC to create a subcommittee was to explore funding partnerships, though that is a type of advocacy as well, and that recommendation

could be expanded to include more thoughts and discussion on large scale, state-wide, advocacy. From the previous discussion on R&D projects, the WPLC can have a separate focus regarding advocacy with the Social Media Committee looking into more patron focused/story gathering advocacy targeting both the public and libraries.

f. **Discussion: SRLAAW recommendation related to technology projects governance**
    J. Guilderson-Duwe provided some background and explained that SRLAAW made a recommendation to WPLC related to technology projects governance. Back in August of 2019, SRLAAW appointed a committee to look at several questions regarding system technology collaborative efforts. This has grown out of the annual tech-a-talka workgroup meetings and the PLSR process motivated by the recommendation PLSR IT workgroup, which were to steer technology on a state-wide basis/effort to address equity issues and service and support to local public libraries that is somewhat uneven across the state. In the wake of the IT workgroup report there were several systems that felt they were already in a position and had capability to take on some of these issues without having to create new structures or hierarchy. That morphed in the direction of having technology folks from a number of different systems, especially South Central and Wisconsin Valley, talk about some low-hanging fruit and some other bigger opportunities for technology collaboration among the systems. A first win was establishing a state-wide purchasing account with Dell, which has resulted in better unit pricing for all, and then the backup server and digitalization storage project as well as the partnership with Northern Waters, IFLS and Wisconsin Valley established, LEAN Wisconsin.

    There have been talks from 2018 into 2019 asking did these collaborative efforts need a governance structure for decision making. The technology folks disavowed budget responsibilities. So, last summer SRLAAW appointed a committee to start looking at those issues. The appointed committee met at WLA of last year. The group consisted of J. Guilderson-Duwe of Winnefox, J. Thompson of IFLS, B. Brattin of Kenosha, B. Shipps of OWLS, and V. Teal-Lovely of SCLS. They put forward the proposal that an entity already existed with the purpose of facilitating and supporting collaborative projects among Wisconsin's Library Systems, that is WPLC. The proposal is that WPLC take on a new project and alter its structure to create two committees, one would be a technology operations committee and then a technology collaboration steering committee. This would be a body that had more administration level expertise that would discuss agreements, budgets, obtain legal advice, if necessary, etc. The Board would still have the final say on creation of any new technology projects that came up from the technology steering committee.

    This proposal out of SRLAAW has structural and budgetary implications that need to be discussed. J. Guilderson-Duwe proposed that the WPLC Board create a subcommittee to evaluate this proposal.

    There was a question if there was any thought of tapping into the working group of tech folks, Tech-a-talka. It was noted that the assumption was that, that group would morph into the tech operations committee, thinking it would be the same group of usual suspects, morphing from a loose association to an official committee.

    A clarifying question about what the motion from SRLAAW was and it was asked if SRLAAW sent the first two points of the proposal recommendation to WPLC, not the whole structure.

It was clarified the motion from SRLAAW was to accept the executive summary of the proposal.

It was agreed to create a subcommittee to explore this proposal and make a recommendation to the Board.

Volunteers for committee:
- J. Guilderson-Duwe
- S. Heser
- M. Van Pelt
- K. Anderson
- J. Chamberlain
- M. Welch as alternate if needed

J. Guilderson-Duwe moved approval of the formation of the subcommittee; M. Welch seconded. Motion passed.

g. **Discussion: Support Course**
The WPLC provides and updates support course documentation. However, WiLS provides the course twice a year for $45 per person. WiLS will no longer be providing this service, but as project managers will be updating the support course documentation as needed.

It was clarified that the support course will not be offered by wills but the documentation will be maintained and up-to-date so systems can run the course for their libraries if you so choose.

h. **Annual Review of Consortium Documents**
The orientation packet is updated at the beginning of every year to include updated information for the Board. The group reviewed the packet. There was emphasis on the communications best practices document. The group was reminded and encouraged to share information and decision with the community they represent and also get feedback when needed and make connections with their Steering representative as well.

5. **Information Sharing from Partners**
There was no information sharing / skipped due to time concerns.

6. **Meeting Evaluation**
There were no comments / skipped due to time concerns.

7. **Adjourn**
Next meeting: Annual Meeting and Board Meeting on April 29, 2020.

Meeting adjourned at 3:01 pm