

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium

Board Meeting Notes

August 5, 2024 at 2:00 pm

by zoom

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

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

ABSENT: Rob Nunez (Kenosha), Angela Noel (SWLS)

GUESTS: David Dowling (PLLS), Ben Miller (DPI), Jim Novy (PLLS)

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

1. Call to order

R. Scherer called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm

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 [June 10, 2024](#)
- c. [YTD Budget](#)

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

4. Committee and Project Updates

a. OverDrive Advocacy

i. Advantage account Options with OverDrive

PLLS has been working with OverDrive to advocate for 'tiered advantage' accounts setup, where libraries could have sub-advantage accounts to the system's advantage account and have their purchases prioritized for their own patrons and then for their systems before going out to the entire consortium. This idea and request to OverDrive has come from research and work that PLLS has done around advantage purchasing.

A little background was given. The WPLC is seeing a great demand for e-resources but is having difficulty meeting the demand. PLLS believes the

source of this problem is two-fold, one being the disparity between priorities and amounts dedicated to electronic resources of each system within Wisconsin, and two, some of it is the disparity of priorities between libraries within the same system. PLLS has shared that they have libraries who have digital circulation making up less than 5% of their circulation and those who have it making up close to 25% of their circulation. All of this information was shared with OverDrive.

Because the WPLC makes up the entire state, which is fairly unique for OverDrive's customer base, this issue and need for tiered advantage accounts is not a need that OverDrive sees from most of their members, therefore they will not put time and effort into developing it. Their suggested option is for the WPLC to implement their Reciprocal Lending Agreement, or RLA. This essentially means that any system that would want to could have their own OverDrive platform and then their libraries could have advantage accounts. Once that was established then they could share their materials with other systems and/or the WPLC collection as a whole via RLA. This set up is not ideal and could be very complicated. Another option, and one that PLLS identified, is utilizing and optimizing selection tools. This is something that they are already working on and this topic may be something that we could investigate more and incorporate into the upcoming year's Digital Library recommendations that the Collection Development Workgroup will be developing later this year.

J. Novy, IT Director at PLLS joined the meeting to share additional details about this issue and their advocacy efforts with OverDrive. In addition to what M. Clark summarized, PLLS is also looking at different tools that could be put into place to give the libraries lists of titles that are on hold and their prices, and could calculate out the cost and number of copies needed to improve hold wait times for their patrons- giving agency to libraries to be able to meet the demands of their communities. One of the end-goals of this is to develop a way to determine X-amount of funding will yield Y-amount of improvement to holds-wait-times. When asked what reports PLLS is running, J. Novy shared that they are trying to merge reports of physical circulations with digital circulations in order to see circulations by format (ie physical audiobooks, OverDrive audiobooks, and Hoopla audiobooks) side-by-side.

J. Anderson shared that SCLS currently has some libraries in the system that have individual Advantage accounts, though she believes that this practice is largely discouraged at the statewide level, and has noticed that titles purchased by these libraries would become Advantage Plus titles. M. Clark confirmed that all Advantage libraries are a part of Advantage Plus, and titles roll up to the consortium account, not the System's Advantage account first.

K. Anderson shared that WRLS has found it helpful to educate their libraries and directors about OverDrive and Libby- new directors aren't always aware of how titles are purchased, the costs involved, etc; providing some context to new directors and library staff, and sending final-quarter reminders that excess funds can be used for digital collection development, has helped encourage their libraries to contribute to the digital library.

M. Mercier shared that Bridges has it setup so that libraries have Advantage Marketplace logins for Bridges' system Advantage account, but billing is for the individual libraries- this allows their libraries to do their own selecting and purchasing, but it's for the system account and they are able to be billed for it.

C. Sommersmith asked if there is a spreadsheet or data that can be shared ahead of statewide billing discussions that shows how much is being contributed to advantage? M. Clark shared that she will have that information and will share it once the Advantage Purchasing Survey closes. There are still a few systems that haven't responded to that survey, and M. Clark will send out reminders after the meeting.

Project Managers will continue to work with PLLS to see how they're going to move forward; there may be some outcomes that can be included in the Collection Development recommendations for the next couple of years that may help reduce the holds/spending issue.

ii. **Better MARC records**

It was shared that MCFLS and Milwaukee Public have been working together with project managers to advocate for better MARC records. MCFLS is moving to a new discovery layer, managed by Bywater. Bywater developers meet regularly with OverDrive to work towards solutions for interpreting and cleaning up the metadata coming via OverDrive API. OverDrive does fix things if and when issues are brought to their attention. Bywater suggested that they may try to get a larger group meeting together with someone(s) from OverDrive and libraries who use Aspen, their discovery layer, to discuss the types of metadata quality issues we see and our goals for long-term solutions rather than simply addressing single records as they appear. Emily Vierya at Milwaukee Public Library has been instrumental in communicating with OverDrive and Bywater and has compiled a list of long term solutions that need to happen:

- Standardizing title entry, particularly for series. We see series entries used as titles, subtitles, with the word volume or book, with numerals and written out numbers. For patron discovery via any platform other than Libby, things become tricky.

- Standardizing author entry, using authorized names particularly to reflect cultural preferences. Authority records already exist, and again for patron discovery in any platform other than Libby, author names not matching causes confusion.

The project managers are bringing this issue to the next OverDrive Partners Advisory group meeting in late fall to bring awareness of it with other large OverDrive clients.

B. Miller shared that a Bibliographic Standards Committee has recently developed out of PLSR that is interested in doing this work, too, looking at it from an ILS lens. Both groups are in the beginning stages of this work.

b. Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee Update

- i. [Creation of Historical and Local Digitization Community of Practice](#)

It was shared that this is just informational and that the Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee is hoping to start this in September with invitations to system staff that support member libraries that are working on digitization projects.

c. Digital Library Marketing Committee Update

- i. [Highlight from Facebook](#)

It was asked if there were any questions about this update from the Marketing Committee. R. Scherer shared her support for this update. There were no questions or further discussion.

5. Discussion and Action Items

a. Discussion and Potential Action: Strategic Planning and the WPLC Mission and Vision statements

The Strategic Planning workgroup has drafted a [mission and vision statement](#) for the WPLC.

The Board reviewed and discussed the draft statements. WVLS felt that the Vision Statement was vague, and also noted that the Mission Statement focused well on the Wisconsin Digital Library but was unsure how other services, such as Statewide Delivery, fit into the mission. C. Sommersmith agreed that there are services that have been added to the WPLC that have expanded what this group does, and thinks that services like Delivery are represented under *affordability and equity*- for example Statewide Delivery under WPLC makes the service affordable and more equitable. T. Vreeke added that she feels like the Mission Statement is broad enough that it does allow for the additional services and projects that the WPLC works on to fit; the Vision Statement is too vague and not very inspiring. G. Rae noted that WPLC should be expanded at the top of the document to be Wisconsin Public Library Consortium, and try to stay away from library jargon. S. Hesel shared that he thinks that a vision statement should express a

future view of the WPLC and what it is expected to be. C. Sommersmith asked if library *systems* should be reflected in the Mission Statement? R. Scherer agreed that it might be good to update language to include “libraries and library systems”- when asking for funding from legislature, this could help push that this is something being done for patrons statewide. S. Hesper added that he sees WPLC’s focus more on service the libraries; that systems are the vehicle and ultimately the WPLC Board members are representing their member libraries. J. Anderson also shared the definitions of Systems, Members and Affiliate Organizations as laid out in the Bylaws; from this the group agreed that systems and members are covered by the term “libraries”, and no changes are needed to this language.

M. Clark shared a note from the consultants that the team discussed that the Vision Statement felt a bit more like a tagline, and that S. Hesper had shared an alternative idea: “Creating a collaborative environment of innovation and equity for all Wisconsin libraries.”

The group decided that they are happy with the Mission Statement, with the edit of spelling out WPLC. The Vision Statement is too vague and not as inspiring as the group would like to see, and requests that the consultants help recreate this.

b. Discussion and Action: Form Board Nominations Committee

The group was asked to form the Nominations Committee that will solicit candidates for Board Chair, Vice-Chair, and liaisons to all Steering Committees. The positions will serve the 2025 calendar year.

It was noted that this year there are liaisons to both of the backup committees. However, these committees, the Technology Backup and Digital Archives backup are no longer formal steering committees and are now workgroups. It was asked if the Board still wants to have liaisons assigned to these bodies. The group decided not to have liaisons assigned to these two workgroups. M. Clark and WPLC Project Managers will make sure that members of the Technology Steering Committee are also a part of these workgroups to help make sure information is continuing to be shared between the two bodies.

Volunteers for the committee: G. Rae, R. Metzler, M. Mercier

c. Discussion: Digital Library Buying Pool

The Collection Development Committee will be convening this fall to prepare recommendations for Wisconsin’s Digital Library for the next two years (2026 & 2027). The buying pools current increase recommendation for ~5% for five years will end with the 2025 budget.

It was noted that although this topic was discussed at the last meeting and the thought was that this topic would be a part of the strategic planning process, that process most likely will not include concrete budget suggestions, so it is important for the Board to discuss the buying pool for 2026 & 2027 and any possible recommendations that the group has for the Collection Development Committee.

Multiple Board members noted that they don't think their libraries would be able to support higher than a 5% increase; that the capacity to increase isn't there yet, but 5% would be acceptable. M. Clark asked the group if there are any concerns about having a flat buying pool; the group agreed that they do not want a flat buying pool. There was unanimous support for a 5% increase.

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?

M. Clark reminded the group that if they haven't already completed the [Advantage Funding Survey](#), please do so. Those who haven't responded yet will receive an email reminder as well.

7. **Adjourn**

Next meeting: Board Meeting on October 21, 2024, at 2:00 pm

Motion to adjourn made by S. Hesper. Seconded by R. Grover.

Meeting ended at: 3:07 pm