

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Board Meeting Notes
February 23, 2021 at 1:00 PM

PRESENT: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), Anne Hamland (WVLS), Steve Hesper (MCFLS), David Kranz (SWLS), Sherry Machones (NWLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Rob Nunez (KLS), Steve Ohs (LLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Rebecca Schadrie (MCLS), Bradley Shipp (OWLS), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS), Kimberly Young (MLS)

ABSENT: Tracy Vreeke (NFLS)

GUEST: Kim Kiesewetter (WiLS), Joshua Klingbeil (WLVS), Ben Miller (DPI), Rachel Metzler (WVLS), Jen Schmidt (MCFLS)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Jennifer Chamberlain (WiLS), Melody Clark (WiLS), Rebecca Rosenstiel (WiLS)

1. Call to order/Welcome & Introductions

Chair K. Anderson called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Review agenda
- b. Approval of minutes from [October 23, 2020](#)
- c. Acceptance of Digital Library Steering Committee minutes from [November 12, 2020](#)
- d. Decisions made between October 23, 2020 and current meeting: None
- e. [YTD Budget](#)

It was noted the Year To Date Budget does not have the carry over from 2020 incorporated yet as it is to be discussed and approved in agenda item 4.a.

It was pointed out that the YTD Budget document has two instances of incorrect dates: The print view of the document still references 2018, and the 2021 Budget sheet's header reads 2020.

J. Gilderson-Duwe moved to approve the Consent Agenda with changes to the YTD Budget, M. Welch seconded. The consent agenda was approved by consensus.

3. Updates from Previous Meetings/Projects

- a. **Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee Update** – The Board was reminded that the Committee received funds from LSTA to support processing and metadata creation for existing newspaper scans by a third-party vendor. That work is moving along well but slowly (approx. 25,000 pages out of 600,000 have now been processed). However, they are running into an issue with the quality control/review step after the vendor's work is completed. They were expecting to use a free quality analysis tool from the Library of Congress to validate the output files, but it turns out they can't use that tool. Another option would be that the vendor can load the content to a test instance of the access platform (Veridian) they intend to use eventually. They could potentially review content in that test instance and then it could be migrated to the

final production instance if/when they are actually ready to implement the platform. This quality analysis option would be a fee of \$1,000 to set up + \$165/month for as long as they need it, which they are estimating could be about \$3,000-\$4,000 in total cost. The alternative to that route would be some kind of manual review process where someone spot-checked a percentage of the files randomly. That would be free but time consuming and not particularly reliable. Being able to use the intended access platform would also give them the opportunity to demo the access site. The committee will be reviewing these options and could be requesting the Board use R&D or Reserve funds for this. They were unable to convene before this meeting and most likely will need to invest these funds before the next meeting of the Board so this request may come to the Board in between meetings.

J. Gilderson-Duwe asked what kind of work the third-party vendor is proposing. M. Clark isn't sure, as an official request hasn't been received from the group yet. When the request does come, project managers will ask for details on the work.

- b. DPI and WPLC Pandemic Use Report Update** – The report has been completed and DPI will disseminate when they are ready. Ben Miller from DPI gave an overview and Kim Kiesewetter, WILS' data analyst, reviewed the report. The group was asked if they had any questions.

K. Anderson asked if there were any planned discussions regarding this report. B. Miller said that there aren't at this time, but that is a great idea and they will talk about moving forward with planning potential discussions.

M. Welch asked if there is a way to calculate the cost per circulation- many libraries in the system would like to be able to explain these costs to their boards. It was noted that because of the difference between digital and physical collections, a comparison between the two in regards to cost per circulation isn't direct. OverDrive also does not have a cost per circulation report, but project managers can talk with OverDrive to see if they can help get some numbers.

M. Welch asked if there are any plans for this study to become an ongoing project. K. Anderson agreed that it would be beneficial to continue this study. K. Kiesewetter said that this is a preliminary report with no plan for it to be ongoing at this same level, and also pointed out that the data in the report is available through the Insights tab in OverDrive Marketplace.

J. Gilderson-Duwe asked if there is an official roll-out date for this report. B. Miller said that there is not an official date, however board members can share the report with their libraries or at the regional-level when they receive it. M. Clark will be forwarding the report to the board after the meeting.

The group was asked that in order to do more data work and prepare potential Wisconsin's Digital Library advocacy information, would the systems be willing to provide circulation data on physical items for the past two years broken out monthly by print and audio. Project managers will send out an email after the meeting requesting the information.

J. Gilderson-Duwe asked if the 2-year physical circulation statistics should be at the library- or system-level. K. Kiesewetter clarified that for this project, either is fine.

Many board members shared their gratitude for this project- Thank you Ben and Kim!

- c. **Technical Committees Update – notes from [November](#) and [January](#) meetings** – The group was reminded that the Tech Operations Committee has met twice and the Tech Steering Committee will meet for the first time on March 9th. The focus of the Operations committee has primarily been process. They have put together a proposal discussion and submission process as well as discussed some potential project topics but need guidance from the Technology Steering Committee.
- d. **Advocacy Workgroup Update** – The Advocacy workgroup which was created from the 2020 Collection Development Committee Recommendations has met twice. S. Hesel from the workgroup was asked to give an update.

This group was formed in 2019, and are exploring partnerships that can maximize collection sharing. The group has identified COLAND and LD&L to begin talks with. The group met with COLAND last week, with a follow-up meeting scheduled in May. The group will be meeting with LD&L in July. They have put together a one-page advocacy sheet to help in their discussion with these various bodies.

4. New Business

a. Discussion and action: Apportionment of the 2020 Budget Carryover and Unbudgeted Expenses

Each year, the Board takes the funds not spent by the Consortium in the previous year and allocates them to the appropriate budget for the current year. This year, we have the following funds to allocate:

- \$2.00 Buying Pool {recommendation: carry over to digital content}
- \$7,685.76 Historical Newspaper Uploads {recommendation: carry over to same line}
- \$111,000.00 LSTA Historical Newspaper Project {recommendation: carry over to same line}
- \$1.00 Recorded Books {recommendation: carry over to same line}
- \$7,200 Donations {recommendation: move to Historical Newspaper Uploads} \$7,200 from donations carryover needs to go to Historical Newspaper Uploads from mis-allocated Ann Tice/Stock Donations on 11/30/2018 and 1/8/2019
- \$8,800.00 Donations {recommendation: move to digital content}
- \$1,970.10 Website {recommendation: carry over to same line}
- \$958.40 OverDrive Content {recommendation: carry over to same line}
- \$6,815.33 Historical Newspaper Hosting {recommendation: carry over to same line}
- \$39,000.00 R&D {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
- \$32,373.73 Reserve {recommendation: carry over to the same line}
- \$(39.75) Other Expenses {recommendation: remove from reserve}

The group was asked if there are there any questions or concerns about the proposed allocation and changes.

M. Welch asked for clarification on the Historical Newspaper Uploads total. J. Chamberlain clarified that the recommended carryover amount is the difference between the 2021 income and expenses for the Historical Newspaper Uploads.

S. Platteter motioned to approve apportionment of the 2020 budget carryover as recommended and M. Welch seconded. Motion carried.

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 Digital Library Steering Committee
- A representative from any Board Subcommittee (currently the Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee)
- A volunteer from the Board

The group was asked if they wish to keep the makeup of the Budget Committee the same as last year, to which the group agreed. When asked if the Technology Collaboration Steering Liaison be added as well, J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested that it isn't necessary at this point.

S. Ohs volunteered to serve on the Committee as the Board volunteer. D. Kranz will be asked to serve as the representative from the Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee.

c. Discussion and Action: Bylaws Review

According to the WPLC Bylaws, they are reviewed and updated every four years. The last update was done approved in 2018. We are due to approve any revisions in 2022, so if the group feels revisions are needed, a committee should be formed to work on them this year in order to approve them next year at this time.

Project managers have reviewed and made suggestions for updating the bylaws. The Consortium has seen some considerable changes in the past few years and project managers are recommending a committee be formed and the bylaws be updated to reflect those and potential future changes.

The group was asked if they think the changes are considerable to require a bylaws workgroup for this year? J. Gilderson-Duwe motioned to approve a bylaws workgroup, and M. Welch seconded.

J. Gilderson-Duwe, S. Heser, and B. Shipps volunteered to serve on the workgroup.

d. Discussion: Printing services for Social Media Committee work

At the last meeting, the Board approved the Social Media Committee's proposal for marketing and advocacy of Wisconsin's Digital Library. In order for the group to proceed, they would like to identify a partner for printing to better understand the potential limitations of printing before they proceed further. What the Social Media committee wants to know is what a system might charge for printing and shipping a couple different assets (a single page full color flyer, a business card, a bookmark, for instance) and if the system would have to cap the service somehow (so, factoring in their own capacity needs) and what would that be?

The group was asked if there are any interested and available systems to provide printing services?

A. Hamland asked if there is a specific project that is being worked on that would need the printing services, instead of using promotional materials from OverDrive. It was noted that they are planning to do all Wisconsin Digital Library branding. M. Welch proposed creating templates for libraries and/or systems to be able to add local branding and print on their own as well. B. Shipps said that OWLS has printing services. M. Clark thanked B. Shipps and will report back to the Social Media Committee.

e. Discussion: Planning for the 2020 Annual Meeting

The next meeting will be the WPLC Annual Meeting. The annual meeting is typically held at WAPL, however WAPL will be held virtually, May 4 - 7, 2021.

M. Clark will be sending out a poll to the group with date and time options for the annual meeting.

At the last meeting the following topics were identified for the annual meeting.

- New Technology Committees update
- 2020 recommendations update
- Overview of the 2021 recommendations
- 2020 and pandemic data review

It was asked if there are additional specific topics to address at the meeting? J. Gilderson-Duwe suggested the DPI and WPLC Pandemic Use Report, however this report is already being submitted as a proposal to be presented at WAPL.

In the past the Board has requested a session during WAPL on various WPLC topics. The group was asked if there any interest this year and if so, what topics?

M. Welch suggested an update on the changes that have happened with WPLC, and K. Anderson agreed. It was suggested to do a WPLC overview session at WAPL. M. Clark will submit a proposal for a WPLC overview session.

It was also suggested that the WPLC Brochure be updated. Project managers will work on that with a goal to have it updated by the Annual Membership meeting.

f. Discussion: Annual Review of Consortium Documents

As this is the first meeting of the year, the group reviewed the Board orientation packet.

M. Welsh asked if the breakdown of the buying pool and the holds reduction amount was included in these documents. M. Clark pointed the group to the Buying Pool Summary sheet of the WPLC 2021 Budget file. A description of the breakdown is also included in the budget explanation document within the orientation packet.

5. Information Sharing from Partners

6. Adjourn

Next meeting: Annual Membership Meeting and Board Meeting TBD

M. Van Pelt motioned to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 2:26 pm.