

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium

Board Meeting Notes

June 10, 2024, at 2:00 pm

by zoom

{Alternate in-person location: 707 Quay St, Manitowoc, WI 54220}

PRESENT: Mellanie Mercier (Bridges), Katelyn Noack (IFLS), Rob Nunez (Kenosha), Rebecca Scherer (MCLS), Steve Hesel (MCFLS), Riti Grover (Monarch), Tracy Vreeke (Nicolet), Gina Rae (NWLS), Bradley Shipps (OWLS), Steven Platteter (PLLS), Jean Anderson (SCLS), Angela Noel (SWLS), Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Clairellyn Sommersmith (Winnefox), Rachel Metzler (WVLS)

GUESTS: Ben Miller (DPI), Shannon Schultz (SCLS)

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

1. Call to order

R. Scherer called the meeting to order at: 2:00pm

2. Welcome, Proxy Announcements, and Roll Call

R. Scherer welcomed the group, asked for proxy announcements, and did a roll call.

3. Consent Agenda

- a. Review agenda
- b. Approval of minutes from [May 1, 2024](#)
- c. Acceptance of Technology Steering Committee minutes from [May 14, 2024](#)
- d. [YTD Budget](#)

K. Noack moved approval of the consent agenda. R. Grover seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Updates from Previous Meetings/Projects

a. Strategic Planning Update

R. Scherer shared that over the summer they will be scheduling three 1-hour focus groups: two groups will consist of Board and Steering Committee members, and partners of the WPLC, such as DPI and Recollection Wisconsin; the third focus group will be with the Project Managers. Each focus group will consist of no more than 10 individuals. Anyone who wants to participate but is unable to can request a questionnaire in order to provide feedback. Once the focus group meetings have been completed, development of a Stakeholder Survey will begin, which will have about 12 questions intended for library staff. Towards the end of summer, information that has been gathered from additional sources, such as the SOAR exercise and the Visioning Session meeting from Fall 2023, will be reviewed in tandem with the results of the visioning sessions and surveys.

5. New Business

a. Discussion and action: 2025 Budget

At the last meeting of the Board, the group reviewed the draft 2025 budget. The group asked to see two variations of the budget, one with the addition of the Digital Library Marketing line with a reduction from the R&D line and one with the addition of the Digital Library Marketing line with no change to the R&D line, an overall increase of \$3k.

The Board was asked if there were any questions about the budgets and if the systems that had concerns about the 3K increase wanted to share their thoughts.

The group was reminded that there aren't any expected expenses for the R&D line, and at the last meeting the Board felt that this line is well-funded for the time being. There were a couple of systems that initially had concerns about adding the \$3k instead of taking that cost out of R&D, but after sharing both draft budgets to the System Director, the System Director felt comfortable with both budgets. R. Scherer reminded the group of the Statewide Delivery costs that will be discussed later in this meeting. It was asked if the R&D line has ever been completely spent; M. Clark confirmed that at least in the last 10 years since WiLS has been the Project Manager, no. S. Hesper shared that moving \$3,000 from R&D affects each system equally, and supports this option for the 2025 budget. R. Grover shared that she thinks it's fair to have a lesser amount of funds in the R&D line, as the line has enough surplus that has not been used; however with the likelihood of incoming expenses due to Statewide Delivery costs, the Board should be mindful of the amount and agrees that \$3,000 is acceptable.

K. Anderson moved to take \$3,000 out of R&D for 2025. S. Platteter seconded. Motion passed.

Documents: [WPLC 2025 Budget Draft Reduced R&D](#) and [2025 Budget No R&D Change](#)

b. Discussion and possible action: R&D and Reserves

At the last meeting, the group began discussing caps for the R&D and Reserve line items in the budget, as well as the definitions and purposes of both line items.

There was agreement from the group that it makes sense to put a cap on these budgets and to allow excess to rollover into digital content. T. Vreeke made the point that before assigning a cap to each account, the Board needs to assess any upcoming expenses that would be paid from either account, and to make sure everyone is in agreement to what kinds of expenses each of these lines would be used for. S. Hesper suggested that the R&D line can be used, for example, if updating to a new platform: R&D can cover the one-time platform fee, implementation fees, etc. T. Vreeke suggested that these line items be revisited on an annual basis to keep the budget flexible for known/new

upcoming expenses, like new projects. C. Sommersmith added that these funds should not shrink, as it's harder to build a budget back up. R. Scherer asked what expenses have come from the R&D line recently? M. Clark confirmed that the marketing group has used funds from the Reserves line for some of their activities, and the funds were also used to purchase food for the in-person WPLC Board meeting held last fall. M. Clark also added that definitions of these two lines could be included within the budget themselves, in case in the future the definitions feel too restrictive; they can serve more as guidelines than strict definitions.

T. Vreeke moved to cap the Reserves line at \$50,000 and to cap the R&D line at \$80,000; to allow rollover between both R&D and Reserves, and once both are fully funded, to allow additional excess funds to be used for digital collection purchasing; and to keep both line items in the budget to be revisited on an annual basis. K. Anderson seconded.

R. Metzler asked if the R&D line and the Reserves line are part of the partner shares? M. Clark confirmed yes, what makes up the costs of partner shares is essentially everything except content. J. Chamberlain asked if the rollover would be automatic, or would it need a Board vote and discussion during a meeting? M. Clark asked what timing would rollover happen: immediately or end of the year? T. Vreeke suggested that rollover would be automatic immediately. There was no disagreement.

The motion passed unanimously.

The Budget Committee will revisit applying definitions and the purpose of the R&D and Reserves lines when they begin discussing the 2026-27 budget. M. Clark will also look at other consortia to see their definitions of similar lines, and will draft something for the budget committee.

c. **Discussion: Buying Pool Amount for 2026 & 2027**

In 2019, the Board agreed to an annual 5% increase to the buying pool for the next five years. This increase ended with the 2025 budget. It was noted that the Collection Development Committee will reform this fall and they will be charged with recommendations for Wisconsin's Digital Library which includes a recommendation for the digital library budget. The purpose of the discussion today is to start the conversation and understand the will of the board around the digital library buying pool so that the Collection Development Committee can keep that in mind as they draft recommendations for FY 2026 and 2027.

R. Metzler pointed out that when discussing buying pool amounts, the group needs to be mindful that library budgets are not increasing. C. Sommersmith posed the question if Advantage purchasing does the state a disservice? Ideally there would be less discrepancy across the state. The group suggested that the group could approach this topic within the Strategic Planning discussions, and asked how other systems have

currently been funding their Advantage budgets? R. Scherer suggested that a survey be sent out; M. Clark has the amounts that systems have been putting in year-over-year, but not *how* each system has been able to fund. M. Clark will send out a quick form or email to get that information from each system, then will compile the responses and send those out to the group. The group also feels like this discussion will tie in well with the Strategic Planning process. R. Scherer asked when the 2026 budgeting work is expected to take place. M. Clark noted that the budget committee, which convenes every two years, will meet next March and the 2026 budget will be approved in June 2025.

R. Scherer summarized the conversation that the group will look to the strategic planning process to help the budget committee with their work in early 2025.

d. **Discussion and Potential Action: Delivery Workgroup Update**

The Delivery Workgroup met for the first time on June 7th. S. Schultz from SCLS joined the meeting and provided some background information, noting that due to the elimination of the LSTA Grant “Statewide Delivery Service System Cost Support,” the South Central Library System must increase delivery fees to public library systems to offset the \$75,000 budget deficit. SCLS covered this deficit for 2023-24, but cannot sustain this moving forward. The formulas used to calculate each amount is only for systems, not other contracted services for delivery. Costs are calculated by taking into account volume at each location and the amount of state aid the system receives. SCLS always assumes the highest volume, but since there isn’t a way to track it, they match the system that reports the highest volume.

The group asked if the base fee has changed in the past, and is it expected to change again in the future, especially considering ALS and LLS combining into PLLS? S. Schultz shared that the base fee hasn’t changed since 2017, and it is not expected to change. Right now, PLLS still has two drop-points, and PLLS will be assessing this and likely going to a single drop-point when they discuss their 2026 budget; but this will not affect the delivery base fee. T. Vreeke asked to confirm that this budget is necessary to make the statewide delivery service sustainable? S. Schultz confirmed yes. A. Noel noted that SRLAAW has recommended that an increase in delivery be put into the 2025-27 state budget, and asked the group that if that were to come through, costs could potentially decrease here? T. Vreeke clarified that SRLAAW is looking at asking for a categorical request for delivery services, but nothing is finalized yet.

T. Vreeke moved to approve the budget as presented. C. Sommersmith seconded. As the SCLS representative, J. Anderson abstained from voting. The motion passed unanimously.

The group also noted that not everyone on the WPLC Board attends meetings of other groups, for example Systems Directors meetings, so not everyone is privy to all

conversations. B. Miller noted that the System Directors group is intended to be for discussion only, there aren't decisions being made for the WPLC in these meetings. M. Clark also noted that the WPLC Delivery Workgroup just organized in the last few weeks, and going forward they have chosen to meet monthly, so will be able to provide regular updates.

As a reminder, if anyone has questions, comments, or concerns about agenda items, everyone is welcome to reach out to the Project Managers and/or Board Chair in advance of the meetings.

e. **Discussion and Action: Collection Development Committee Member Appointment**

Since the Board approved a restructuring of the [Collection Development Committee](#) from an annual to a biennial process, the committee and recommendation process will begin again this fall. It was noted that this group typically meets, at most, three times in the fall/winter. Typically, October and December and if necessary February/March. The Collection Development Committee typically comprises three Board members, three Digital Library Steering Committee members and three Selection Committee members. It was asked if there were any volunteers to represent the Board on the Committee.

Volunteers: Rachel Metzler, Rebecca Scherer, and Jean Anderson

6. **Information Sharing from Partners**

Questions to consider:

- What are potential opportunities for collaboration?
- What's new happening at your system?
- What issues are you facing?

7. **Adjourn**

Next meeting: Board Meeting on August 5, 2024 at 2:00 pm

The meeting ended at: 3:24pm