<div align="center">

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Annual Membership & Board Meeting Notes
May 2, 2018 2:00-5:00
Country Springs Hotel & Conference Center, Pewaukee, WI
And via GoToMeeting (Connection information below)

</div>

ATTENDEES: Emily Vieyra (Shorewood Public Library), Bruce Gay (Waukesha Public Library), Steve Heser (Milwaukee County Federated Library System), Anne Hamland (Wisconsin Valley Library Service), Tina Kakuske (Door County Public Library), Mellanie Mercier (Bridges Library System), Shawn Carlson (Bridges Library System), Alyssa Cleland (? – Northern Waters Library System), Laura Tomcik (Fall Creek Public Library), Martha Van Pelt (South Central Library System), Kristen Anderson (Winding Rivers Library System), Steve Ohs (Lakeshore Library System), Steve Platteter (Arrowhead Library System), Jean Anderson (South Central Library System), Maureen Welch (Indianhead Federated Library System), Mark Dakula (Rice Lake Public Library), Barb Brattin (Kenosha County Library System), Jamie Hein (Outagamie Waupaca Library System), John DeBacher (Dept. of Public Instruction), Michael DeVries (Beloit Public Library)

VIRTUAL ATTENDEES: Becky Petersen (Manitowoc Calumet Library System), Evan Bend (Outagamie Waupaca Library System), Darcy Mohr (Platteville Public Library), Lin Swartz-Truesdell (Kenosha County Library System), Noreen Fish (La Crosse Public Library), Kelly Rohde (Mead Public Library)

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   The group was welcomed to the WPLC Annual Membership meeting. Introductions of all attendees were made.

2. **Presentation of Information for Discussion**
   a. **Circulation and Collection Five-year comparison**
      A comparison of the digital libraries past five-year stats for collection, circulation, and user activity was shared. Statistics on 2017 circulation usage, collection, holds and patron visits were reviewed. In addition, a comparison of Wisconsin's physical collection and the Wisconsin's digital library were shared. The physical statistics shared are from 2016 DPI data.

   b. **Selector Guidelines**
      This has been an exciting process for 2017. The Collections Workgroup was recognized for all of their hard work. Guidelines have been created from the Collection Workgroup's recommendations from last year. They have been in place for a few months now. There has been a big effort to redefine roles for the selectors that align with the new selection area focuses. For the past few months, the selectors have had a chance to implement the guidelines and also offer some valuable feedback as well as identify areas that we need to work with OverDrive on regarding reporting and lists.

      There was a question about Recommend to Library and whether those recommendations go to the Advantage or consortium for purchase. Both types of accounts purchase recommendations but it's primarily at the consortium level. There was also a question about award winners, which could be purchased outside of the Recommendations process. Those also should place the user who recommended on hold for the title when it is purchased.

c. **Communication Best Practices**
In August of 2017 a survey of WPLC current Board and Digital Library Steering members was conducted on how they communicate WPLC related information with one another and within their systems. From the survey and conversations by both bodies, guidelines for communication were created.

The Best practices include suggestions for members before meetings like:
- Representatives should read through the prepared agendas and related documents before the meetings.
- Inform Board/Steering counterpart of any new business that may require feedback.

Things to do after meetings:
- Report out general information to the system members after meetings.
- Touch base with Board/Steering counterpart to inform them of any decisions, recommendations or suggestions that may be discussed at their next meeting.
- Gather feedback from counterpart or library system members as a whole, if necessary.
- Share any vendor updates.

Also, general information sharing and decision making and voting suggestions for best practices. Some of those include:
- Gathering feedback on decisions and voting.
- Consistency with dispersing information so that all member libraries know where to except to receive WPLC related information.

d. **Bylaws Completion Celebration**
The bylaws have been updated and were approved by the Board at their February meeting. This was a good process and the Bylaws Workgroup was thanked for their time and effort.

Some of the highlights of the changes are:
- To clarify the purpose: *To maintain a decision-making and fiscal model for public library cooperation that will allow libraries to explore and implement collaborative projects, sharing the costs as well as the knowledge and resource.* This statement was moved to the top of the purpose statement. The group felt it was important to clarify the purpose, that foundational element.
- Make the Steering Committee and Board language in the bylaws parallel to make the bodies function in a similar way
- Change the partner shares: *Each partner must pay an annual assessment of an equal Share of the general operating budget and an assessment toward the buying pool, as determined by a formula created by a joint committee of the Steering Committee and Board and recommended to the Board by the Steering Committee.*
- Keep voting as a simple majority: The change to equal partner shares allowed the Board to keep voting at a simple majority because each partner would now be contributing the same amount to the pool of funds the Board votes on.
- Change the voting to recognize the importance and work of the Steering Committee: Votes on recommendations from Steering may be approved by simple majority, rejected by a ⅔ majority of all Board members, or sent back to the Steering

Committee for further consideration.

e. **Biblioboard Process Update**
The WPLC is offering a new suite of new services and projects in conjunction with BiblioBoard. This two-year pilot project, the first year funded by LSTA, offers new services for Wisconsin readers and writers. The first project, the Wisconsin Author Project, is an author contest; submissions are accepted for adult and young adult fiction from WI residents and the first round of vetting is done by Library Journal. The final round of judging will be done by the WLA Reads committee and the winner will be announced this fall. One winner receives $1000, reviews in Library Journal, inclusion in a BiblioBoard collections for the state, and the chance to present at the WLA annual conference. One runner up gets a review in Library Journal and the chance to present at WLA as well. Submissions are being accepted through June 30th. Pressbooks is online software that allows folks to create ebooks and it ties into the Author Project nicely by giving a platform for creating book submissions. Pressbooks are also being used around the country to create open educational resources, like textbooks. SELF-e is a Library Journal program that writes can submit their books to in order to share them with other Wisconsin public library patrons, and for the chance to be selected by Library Journal for inclusion in one of their nationwide collections. All of these things are available to all WI residents. There is no cumbersome log in process, either, as the authentication is all done by geolocation.

Coming later this month, we'll be rolling out access to these BiblioBoard e-resource collections but we are giving you a sneak peek today. BiblioBoard Access contains international resources and rare materials from smaller organizations that openly share their digital artifacts around the world. BiblioBoard Core is a historical database covering a wide range of topics—including Literature, Philosophy, History, Geography and Science in subject anthologies and over 14,000 full-text eBooks and over 24,000 pieces of primary source content. Indie Wisconsin is a showcase of Wisconsin independent and small press fiction and non-fiction authors. The Library Journal Selects Collections aggregate top-notch selected submissions from SELF-e from around the country in five collections: General Fiction, Mystery/Thriller/Horror, Romance, Science Fiction/Fantasy, and Young Adult. Finally, Popup Picks is a collection of the best ebooks and other digital media from around the world including hand-curated, award-winning titles of all kinds from leading expert librarian curators. Every four months, there is a brand new collection of Popup Picks.

Finally, all of this plus the OverDrive collection will be aggregated for the public on a single website at https://widigitallibrary.org. This simple page with headings of Create, Share, and Discover will help patrons find and contextualize the resources. We hope for this page to be launched in the very near future!

It was shared that authors retain their copyright when titles are submitted to SELF-e or the Author Project and that titles can be withdrawn from either by request if they need to retain or transfer exclusive copyright.

[Update from after the meeting: BiblioBoard did not provide license terms specific to authors who wanted to participate in the contest but not in SELF-E. Those terms will be available in the next week. Here is a distillation of the terms for SELF-e:

Authors submitting to SELF-e give the SELF-e program a non-exclusive license to make their eBook(s) available to public library patrons via subscribing institutions in the public library market. Participation in SELF-e does not restrict authors and their other publishing service providers/future publishers in any manner from promoting and selling their ebooks to any market, including the public library market via other vendors. Authors also reserve all intellectual and propriety rights in the work— SELF-e does not infringe upon that.

Although the agreement states that authors must request removal of their work in writing and that it will take up to 180 days, in practice, authors can request to have their book removed from the program in print or email and it will be removed as soon as possible.

Overall, authors can continue selling/distributing their work through other channels, can have their title removed from the SELF-e program at any time, and still maintain total ownership of their work.]

f. **2019 Digital Buying Pool Recommendations**
The Collection Workgroup met in March and discussed a number of topics as they considered a buying pool and holds reduction amount. The 2017 recommendations of the workgroup, which were intended to reduce holds and increase patron satisfaction, have only been implemented recently. The impact of these recommendations cannot yet be measured, so it is difficult to recommend an increase or any recommendation for collection or selection change at this time. The individual recommendations were reviewed along with the Steering Committee's initial thoughts.

g. **Get a library Card/Instant Digital Card**
Get a library card was introduced last fall and was brought to the Steering Committee at their November meeting. They discussed it and had some follow up questions for OverDrive. Those questions were answered and they further discussed the program at their February meeting where they agreed that they would like to have this conversation at a larger level with the rest of the consortium at the annual membership meeting. Some of the main points of the program were reviewed as well as Steering's initial thoughts.

The attendees then broke out into groups to answer the following proposed questions:
- What are the advantages of this program?
  Marketing: reaching people that you otherwise may not get. Could potentially gain library supporters, especially if marketed as a library service. This could reach folks without a permanent addresses or others that might have a hard time getting a physical card. This could encourage folks to go to the actual library to renew or get full access. Low barrier to entry and increase overall patron base.

- What are the concerns?
  Cost – Is there a better use of the money that we might spend? There is no control on the amount spent. People who already have cards will sign up. Northern patrons are less likely to have mobile phones, which are required. Very active OverDrive users might use this as a way to get more checkouts and holds by getting duplicate cards. While libraries can block these cards, it is only done after the card is issued and the WPLC is charged. Not being able to gather actionable data (or not as much) is a problem; the data could be used in decision making. Understanding how to split the payment by usage is

impossible if patrons are not associated with a library or system. There was a concern that there are too many holes in this is currently being implemented at the consortium level and that patrons should see OverDrive as a service of their local library.

- How should payment be handled?
  Pilot for one year; WPLC would pay. Either divided 16 ways or gather statistics on those users, where they are coming from and what impact they are having on the collection and holds. State-funded. It was suggested that since patrons aren't associated with a local library or at least a system for a year, then the payment almost has to come out of the digital buying pool.

- Do you want the WPLC to pursue this program?
  Some groups said no as is. They felt it needed further development and the ability to have better aligned statistics. Some groups said it is worth continuing to look at.

The group identified additional questions for OverDrive: Does it have to be a year? Can the budget be capped? If users renew their card, are we billed another $0.90? How does Cognito verify residency? Capturing the IP address / geolocation would eliminate lots of work. Can these cards have their own checkout or hold caps? Can we re-negotiate the fee?

Next steps: Project managers will follow up with OverDrive to answer questions. Those answers in addition to the thoughts from the meeting today, will be taking to the Steering Committee for review and possible recommendation.

h. **New Lending Model discussion; Cost Per Circ**
This is a purchasing model that bills WPLC each time a title is checked out. The titles are not owned by WPLC.

Current cost per circulation in the WPLC collection: All time, all formats = $0.42; All time for audiobooks only = $0.41; All time for ebooks only = $0.43. More details about current cost-per-circ and purchasing scenarios can be found in the slides.

There was some concern that these titles won't be ingested into ILSs, but because they are selected title by title, they will be issued MARC records and available via API as other titles would be.

After the presentation of the current cost per circ of the collection and the new Cost per Circ (CPC) lending model, partners shared their experiences with this model with other vendors. Freegal at MCFLS, which uses a very similar model, is $10,000. It was noted that this is a great model of less popular things. The real question is how much value does instant access have? Kanopy and Hoopla, other products with similar models are being used at La Crosse. Hoopla at MCFLS turned into about $2.04 per circ. There also isn't a sense of fully loaded costs – staff training and time that might go into the titles. There is a paradigm shift because the content is not owned. La Crosse Public Library has both Kanopy and Hoopla. They spend, on average, $120 per month on Kanopy and, on average, $1487 per month on Hoopla. It was mentioned that the difference with these models is that there is no selection time and costs, with OverDrive CPC model that is a big consideration.

Project managers will confirm that the CPC model is available to Advantage even if the consortium doesn't use it.

The attendees then broke out into groups to answer the following proposed questions:

- Should patron satisfaction be considered as a factor as we think about CPC? Are you willing to pay for more copies at once? And if so, how much and for what titles?
  Many felt that yes, it should be a factor, but high-demand titles are not available so how much patron satisfaction will there be? Other products with this model do see lots of patron happiness. Capping by number of titles or cost would be ideal. This could be not just patron satisfaction but to library staff satisfaction as well.

- Where do you see items that you want in the collection that may not circulate well?
  This is a good idea for ILL, book club, or classroom use. Is there existing data that would help identify collections that would be good fits for CPC? This might be good for non-circulating material.

- If CPC does not scale well for the state, would it be beneficial for Advantage?
  This might not be the best fit for a smaller collection. This could be good for fulfilling series titles or annual titles like study guides or travel guides. This could contribute to the state collection. Advantage could be a test bed to understand the successes for collection development, commonalities could be implemented at the state level.

- Could the Digital Collection Workgroup use the CPC model as a way to audition new categories to see if there is any interest in adding the new category permanently to the collections?
  Yes! Leave it to the Collection Workgroup to provide examples and recommendations.

3. **Break and Membership Meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.**

4. **Board Meeting Welcome and Call to Order**
   Meeting called to order at 4:36 PM.

ATTENDEES: Kirsten Anderson (WRLS), Mark Arend (WLS), Amy Birtell (MLS), Alyssa Cleland (NWLS), Anne Hamland (WVLS), Steve Heser (MCFLS), David Krantz (SWLS), Rebecca Peterson (MCLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Lin Swartz-Truesdell (KLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS)

5. **Consent Agenda**
   a. Review Agenda – Any additions or questions? The agenda was accepted as is.
   b. Approval of minutes from February 19, 2018
   c. Acceptance of Steering Committee minutes from February 22, 2018
   d. YTD budget
   e. Decisions made in between February 2018 and current meeting: BiblioBoard two-year contract email vote.
   Motion to approve consent agenda made by A. Hamland, seconded by S. Platteter. Motion unanimously approved.

6. **Debrief and discussion from annual meeting topics**

a. **Communications Best Practices Document**
   S. Heser asked if systems are meeting with Board and Steering reps are meeting together. A. Birtell reports that MLS are meeting on a quarterly basis. M. Arend reported that their Steering rep reports to their Tech Advisory Group. Many systems involve selectors and Advantage selectors in the communication channels. Project managers will add suggestions for including other bodies (Advantage selectors, and other selectors.) It was also suggested to add the documents to the Google OverDrive Support community.

b. **2019 Digital Buying Pool Recommendations**
   There was a question about the formula for the buying pool. This was clarified that it is based on 75% usage and 25% budget. There were no concerns about the recommendations. There was clarification of the upcoming budget process. The Budget Committee is scheduled to meet on May 8, 2018.

c. **Any other topics for discussion**.
   None at this time.

7. **Survey to members about what they would like the consortium to do**
   The Board brainstormed some of possibilities as a starting point. What things does the Board see as possible activities for WPLC beyond Ideas?
   The group discussed the possibility of an online, immediate access/statewide registration product. There was a question about some of the past projects that WPLC has undertaken. WPLC has done an historical newspaper project, explored data analytics and has just begun the BiblioBoard project. The Board thought it would a good idea to preface the survey with examples of WPLC project history and a reminder that the WPLC is not just OverDrive. It was suggested that perhaps an email be sent out in advance of the survey asking people to think of projects that they would like the WPLC to do.

8. **Discounts on additional BiblioBoard products: should these be a WPLC project?**
   The group asked what the additional products would be and if we can include those BiblioBoard products in the survey to garner interest? And then from the results of that, the Board could evaluate interest and make a decision on whether or not the WPLC should pay for the management of those purchases.

Next meeting: Budget committee, May 8
Next Board Meeting: June 18th

Motion to adjourn made by A. Cleland and seconded by S. Heser. Approved unanimously.
Meeting adjourned at 5:18 PM.