

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium**  
**Annual Membership and Board Meeting Notes**  
**April 29, 2021 at 10:00 AM**  
**Online via Zoom**

- 1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. Annual Membership Meeting Presentation of Information**
  - a. 2020 Review
    - i. 2020 Statistics and Pandemic Data
    - ii. DPI/LSTA funding & Collection Update
    - iii. New Technology Committees
  - b. 2020 Recommendations Update
  - c. Current Collection Development Committee Recommendations
  - d. Q & A and general discussion time

[Slides](#) and [recording](#) from annual meeting can be found on the WPLC website.

**3. Break**

**4. Board Meeting Welcome and Call to Order**

Chair K. Anderson called the meeting to order at 11:00 am

**PRESENT:** Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (WLS), David Kranz (SWLS), Karol Kennedy - Proxy for Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Steve Heser (MCFLS), Rachel Metzler (WVLS), Steve Ohs (LLS), Rob Nunez (KLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Gina Rae (NWLS), Rebecca Schadrie (MCLS), Bradley Shipps (OWLS), Tracy Vreeke (NFLS), Martha Van Pelt (SWLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS)

**ABSENT:** Monarch Library System

**GUESTS:** David Dowling, Dominic Frandrup, Ben Miller, Patti Meyer, Vicki Teal Lovely

**PROJECT MANAGERS:** Jennifer Chamberlain (WiLS), Melody Clark (WiLS)

- 5. Consent Agenda**
  - a. Review agenda
  - b. Approval of minutes from [February 23, 2021](#)
  - c. Acceptance of Steering Committee minutes from [February 18, 2021](#) and [April 15, 2021](#)
  - d. [YTD Budget](#)

S. Ohs moved approval of the consent agenda, S. Platteter seconded. The consent agenda was approved by consensus.

**6. Discussion: Debrief from annual meeting topics.**

The group debriefed from the annual meeting presentation and discussion.

Project managers asked the group for feedback on this year's Collection Development Committee's recommendations. The Digital Library Steering Committee members were charged with sharing that

with their systems and getting feedback. The group was reminded that the recommendations will be approved at the Digital Library Steering Committee meeting in May. Project managers wanted to make sure there were no concerns from systems that haven't been communicated at the Steering Committee level.

J. Gilderson-Duwe noted that Winnefox directors haven't met to discuss them yet, but felt that the recommendations were the right ones and appropriate for this time and will support them with his directors. T. Vreeke shared that Nicolet also is in support of them. S. Platteter noted that Arrowhead supports them as well. S. Heser noted that MCFLS hasn't discussed them yet, but doesn't see any issues with them.

No additional thoughts or concerns on the recommendations were shared.

At the annual meeting the topic of the magazine renewal was brought up. Project managers wanted to get some feedback from the Board on this topic as well. It was noted that, as was shared in the annual meeting, the Digital Library Steering Committee was presented with a renewal option for the consortium to renew at \$100,000 for the next 2 or 3 years. The committee did an informal poll at their meeting to gauge interest and to assess how the committee members would potentially prefer to fund the cost. 83% of members present at the Steering Committee meeting were interested in renewing and over 55% would prefer to fund the renewal with additional fund outside of the current proposed buying pool.

M. Clark asked the Board members what their thoughts, questions, and concerns about this were.

It was noted that the DL Steering Committee was tasked with taking this topic back to their systems for further discussion. A breakdown of the circulation, by system, was also provided with the DL Steering Committee notes. The Board noted that would be really helpful in assessing use and the need for renewal.

S. Heser noted he supported M. Van Pelts suggestion during the annual meeting to keep the magazine formula separate from the buying pool and noted they support using additional funds outside of the buying pool. It was asked if this is something that all systems in the state would contribute, even those that did not initially purchase?

The group was reminded of the process for purchase of this collection. Recorded books/OverDrive offered renewal pricing for current subscribers for a total of over \$230,000. However, they offered the whole WPLC consortium the same magazines collection for \$75,000. Because of this, interested libraries and systems who were offered renewals did a cooperative purchase at the \$75,000 level, which extended magazines then to the whole consortium. It was clarified that we are moving forward as a whole consortium renewal. S. Heser also noted that he has received feedback from his board that they love the additional collection and love that the collection is available on the same platform as the other consortium's content. He would love to consider looking at this as a state-wide collection.

J. Gilderson-Duwe noted that S. Heser has identified the crux - statewide access only works if everyone pays in, and opt outs create problems with formulas.

T. Vreeke noted that she agreed with J. Gilderson-Duwe and S. Heser, loves the idea that this is a statewide offering on the same platform and noted that it is important to offer it in a similar way that we do other OverDrive content, where all the systems are a part of it. She noted she would prefer to see the funding based on population as well as circulation as doing it on circulation only is tricky as some systems have promoted these and others have not, and circulation of these materials can drastically change.

R. Metzler noted that WVLS prefers a separate budget for magazines as well and B. Shipps noted that InfoSoup is likely to participate in 2022.

M. Clark shared some preliminary circulation numbers, by system, that the DL Steering Committee requested. She noted that she ran those and sent them to the Steering Committee with the meeting notes. However, she will update those for through the end of April and send them out to both the Board and DL Steering Committee to help in their internal discussions. It was also noted that project managers will draft some potential budgets for the systems to review.

M. Welch noted that IFLS, and other libraries/systems, also have Flipster which carries Time Warner titles and People magazine is the number-one used title, thus it will be interesting to see if the system wants to keep that and/or how the usage from in an app that other are already using compares. T. Vreeke noted they are looking at this with Brown County as well as they too, have Flipster. M. Van Pelt noted that several libraries in SCLS have it as well.

Project managers also noted the DL Steering Committee discussed the fact that a part of the 2020 recommendations was to purchase as many simultaneous use packages as possible to help with patron satisfaction and the magazine collection falls under that.

K. Kennedy asked when a decision regarding this would be made as there are already questions/concerns regarding budgeting for next year. It was noted that the Budget committee has already met and has a draft budget. They are just waiting for the approval of the 2021 recommendations from the DL Steering Committee which include the buying pool numbers. Once that happens in May, the Budget Committee will finalize the budget and send to the Board. The Board will approve that budget for 2022 at their June meeting. If the magazine decision could be made before June, it could be added in, otherwise, we would have to do an addendum to the budget. The group agreed it would be best to try and come to a decision before the budget is finalized in June.

Project managers will draft magazine budget mockups and send to both the Board and DL Steering Committee to help in the conversations before the DL Steering Committee meets in May. The following will magazine budgets be drafted:

- Using the current buying pool formula (separate from the buying pool)
- Using the circulation of magazines instead of the full digital library usage, but still use the 25% population.

J. Gilderson-Duwe noted that he would like to see the comparison as outlined above because if the circulation data isn't mature for a while, and if the usage/cost is just a few percentages either way, that could help in determining the future formula, if needed.

M. Van Pelt noted that just to put the process in a nut shell, the group will vote on the 2022 budget at the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting and it would be best if the group could also then vote on the magazines as well as their members look at those as two costs that could be in conflict with each other.

It was asked if there were any additional comments or questions regarding the annual meeting.

J. Gilderson-Dewe commented that the pandemic use report was a great example of the kind of thing that WPLC should perhaps institutionalize and should take into consideration having a separate line item in the budget for data analysis and reporting. It was also noted that the group does have an R&D line item that could be used for this as well.

K. Anderson noted that she appreciated all of the different voices at the meeting today and all of the involvement.

M. Clark reiterated the importance of the collection comparison and how it shows the extensive work put into the digital library by the Collection Development, DL Steering and Selection committee is really paying off. Our consortium does a fantastic job at getting the best value out of the collection.

It was also noted that the data dashboards being created will be really helpful for not only selectors, but in advocacy as well. It was asked when the go live date for those would be. The dashboards will be previewed at the WAPL session next Friday, and will be shown to the Selection Committee in May for feedback. Project managers will take that feedback, apply it and hope to have the dashboards go live this summer.

S. Ohs noted that if anything in this wheelhouse emerges from ARPA, there may be need of continuity funding, and WPLC could be that option. J. Chamberlain noted that the pandemic report and data considerations raised by that process can certainly be used in context of ARPA priorities.

## **7. Information Sharing from Partners**

J. Gilderson-Dewe noted that project managers summary of the intentions behind the system technology collaboration project was a nice summary and excellent thumbnail of what we hope to be doing.

## **8. Adjourn**

Next meeting: June 10, 2021 at 10:00 am

S. Platteter motioned to adjourn and M. Van Pelt seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 11:38 am