

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium**  
**Digital Library Steering Committee Meeting Notes**  
May 24, 2018, 1:00 PM

ATTENDEES: Lori Belongia (Marshfield/SCLS), Dale V. Cropper (Brown County/NLS), Noreen Fish (La Crosse/WRLS), Nicole Hardina-Wilhelm (Neenah/WFLS), Tina Kakuske (Door County/NLS), Jennifer Loeffel (Franklin/MCFLS), Jessica MacPhail (Racine/LLS), Judy Pinger (Milwaukee/MCFLS), Melissa Prentice proxy for Kelly Rohde (Mead/MLS), Roxanne Staveness (Manitowoc/MCLS, Amy Stormberg (Amery/IFLS), Vanessa Taylir (Slinger/MLS), Lin Swartz-Truesdell (Kenosha/KCLS), Molly Warren (Madison/SCLS), Emily Vieyra (Shorewood/MCFLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS), Karina Zidon (Platteville/SWLS)

ABSENT: Shawn Carlson (Waukesha/BLS), Heidi Cox (Mcfarland/SCLS), Michael DeVries (Beloit/ALS), Dominic Frandrup (Antigo/WVLS), Jamie Hein (Clintonville/OWLS), Sue Heskin (Superior/NWLS), Jennie Stoltz (Pewaukee/BLS), Laura Tomcik (Fall Creek/IFLS)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Melody Clark (WiLS), Sara Gold (WiLS)

1. **Call to order** A. Stormberg called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM

2. **Review Agenda – changes or additions**

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

3. **Approval of minutes – April 19, 2018**

*Motion:* Approval of Minutes

*Moved to approve:* J. Pinger

*Second:* J. MacPhail

*Results:* Motion passed

*Discussion:* None

4. **Reports: Committees, Workgroups and Project Manager Updates**

a. **Decisions made in between 04/19/18 and 05/24/18 meetings.**

A. Stormberg reported there were no decisions made between meetings.

b. **WPLC Board Report**

M. Welch reported that the Board met after the Annual Membership meeting on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. The Board reviewed the digital buying pool recommendation, the communications plan, and the implementation of BiblioBoard. In addition, the Board began to discuss ideas for future projects that WPLC could possibly take on. Anyone with ideas are encouraged to pass them on to their Board representative. The next Board meeting is June 18<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM.

c. **Selection Committee**

S. Gold reported that members of the Selection Committee are working with herself and OverDrive to come up with a solution to the issue of poor reports and statistics available for patron recommendations. In addition, she is still working with Selection Committee members on getting them oriented to the new guidelines and selection process.

d. **Digital Collection Workgroup**

A. Stormberg reported that an update for this Workgroup would be provided as agenda item 6.a.

e. **Project Update**

M. Clark reference the Project Updates document. Both the OverDrive and BiblioBoard projects have been combined into one standing agenda item. It was reported that there were a few OverDrive updates. In the last Steering Committee meeting the group requested that project managers emphasize the importance for OverDrive to offer magazines to Advantage accounts. This is now an option. Pricing for Advantage is tiered based on the total annual circulation data for the library. Any interested Advantage account should contact the project managers to get pricing. It was noted that the updates for the IDC and CPC topics would be discussed later in the agenda. There was a question about the magazine pricing. It was asked if pricing is based on annual circulation data for Advantage libraries, the Consortium or both? And is it based on the physical circulation or the WPLC collection circulation. Project managers will take the questions to OverDrive for clarification.

OverDrive MARC record delivers in Marketplace began at the beginning of May. It was asked if there have been any issues or concerns with this? No concerns were reported

An update to the BiblioBoard rollout process was given. We have had over 39 author submissions so far. The contest is open until June 30<sup>th</sup> and the group was reminded that the submissions will be vetted first by Library Journal and typically only a portion of those make it to the local review committee, which for WPLC is a new WLA group.

Pressbooks and SELF-e webinars took place at the end of April and beginning of May. These were in a train the trainer format and were recorded. They are available for members to view on the WPLC website. It was asked if authors need to be 18 years old to submit? Project managers will verify with BiblioBoard.

**5. Ongoing Discussion Items**

a. **Digital Collection Workgroup Recommendation**

In the April meeting and at the Annual Membership meeting the Steering Committee and Board discussed the recommendations for the 2019 Buying Pool.

A. Stormberg asked if there were any additional questions or concerns regarding the buying pool recommendation.

*Motion:* Approve the Digital Collection Workgroup Recommendations for the 2019 Buying Pool.

*Moved to approve:* J. MacPhail

*Second:* L. Belongia

*Results:* Motion approved

*Discussion:* There were concerns from several members about the need for additional funding for the buying pool in the future. Also E. Vieyra mentioned the current formula to determine digital buying pool contributions based on a percent of physical collections budgets may not be the best formula going forward as libraries continue to review and assess their budgets for physical collections.

**b. Instant Digital Card**

In the April meeting the group recommended that this program be discussed at the Annual Membership Meeting. The Annual Membership Meeting notes on the IDC program and the Project Update were reviewed. It was noted that at the membership meeting there was a lot of great discussion including the identification of the advantages and concerns of the program. Those were reviewed and include:

*Advantages:* 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.

*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

There were several questions that were identified in the Annual meeting. Those were taken to OverDrive:

- Can the length of the digital card be modified? Currently the program states it is valid for one year.
  - Answer: Yes, this can be modified.
- Can the IDC budget be capped so once that amount has been reached no further cards may be issued?
  - Answer: Not at this time, but it can be turned off at any point in time.
- If patrons renew/get another IDC card, is the Consortium billed an additional \$0.90?
  - Answer: OverDrive project managers are investigating this.
- How does Cognito verify residency?
  - Answer: The company uses the billing address tied to the phone number.
- Is it possible to capture the geolocation of the patron to help in identifying the library system they would be associated with?
  - Answer: OverDrive project managers are investigating this.
- Can IDCs have their own checkout and hold caps.
  - Answer: No, not as of right now.

The group was then asked from the Annual meeting discussion and the answers from OverDrive, what are the deal breakers for implementing this program. It was explained that identifying these issues will enable project managers to take this information back to OverDrive to enhance the program as they develop it and get it to where WPLC can implement it. There were many questions and concerns about this program, mostly about card duplication, who would pay for cards, and who would oversee the program.

Identified questions and concerns include

- Who has the authority to decide who is a member in good standing and who should be blocked?
- Who is checking duplicates?
- If we do these (digital cards) how might it affect our hold ratios or usage?
- Can OverDrive indicate how much it could affect check outs?
- Would card costs eventually be returned to the patron's library?
- There was a concern that this is not an opt-in service and it would be consortium-wide.
- Could OverDrive ask an additional question to patrons about what county they are from (at the very least)?
- Do other consortia/libraries have the duplicate card issue? How do they handle that?

Some systems are investigating similar products available via ILS vendors. One member was concerned about the wild/unpredictable nature of the number of cards and the possible redundancy of cards issued to an individual patron.

Deal breakers were identified:

- Inability to associate IDC patrons with a library or library system. Because of this, follow up and payment is difficult.
- Duplicate cards.
- Cost

**c. CPC Lending Model Update**

OverDrive's new Cost Per Circ Lending model was discussed at the last Steering meeting as well as at the Annual Membership meeting. An update to the status of this has been added to the Project Update document. It was noted that project managers are still working with OverDrive to identify further information and data is still be collected. The feasibility of implementing and selecting for this type of lending model is being examined and discussed with OverDrive. Once additional information has been identified a recommendation can be made. There was a concern that Advantage titles are not taken into consideration when looking at the data for CPC.

**d. Default Checkout Periods**

The Steering Committee asked the Collection Workgroup to review the default checkout period for the digital library and make a recommendation regarding increasing the default checkout from seven to fourteen days. The Workgroup had recommended to not change the default period until the group received more information from OverDrive. The group was provided with default checkout information from comparable consortia. In addition, the recent change to the OverDrive app and website now offers patrons the option to easily change the lending period upon borrowing an item. The Workgroup reviewed, discussed and identified additional information to request from OverDrive:

- *How many patrons have changed the default or no longer have the default of 7 days?*
- *What percentage of materials are returned early and how early?*
- *With the identified comparable consortia, what are the holds and how much money are they spending on content?*
- *If the default lending period was changed, how will that change hold wait times?*

The following are comparable consortia and their default lending periods:

- Los Angeles Public Library: Default Checkouts—ebooks: 21 days audiobooks: 21 days
- Toronto Public Library: Default Checkouts—ebooks: 21 days audiobooks: 21 days
- Destination Download (Suburban Detroit Metro): Default Checkouts—ebooks: 21 days audiobooks: 14 days They set unique checkout periods for audio of 7 days and ebooks 14 days, for select titles on a monthly basis.

The additional information and new questions were reviewed. Project managers asked the Committee for guidance on this topic. It was asked if the group could also consider 21-day checkout periods for audiobooks. There was agreement that this may not be an issue with the new changes but increasing the checkout time for audiobooks was still a concern. The group would like to see more research on the subject and for the Collection Workgroup to identify some additional information during the six-month selection evaluation period.

Additional identified questions include:

- Could we find out if there is a higher return rate on audiobooks now that it is easier to return them?
- Could we get budget info, holds and wait times for the ebooks and audiobooks for the three consortia similar in size to the WPLC?

e. **Patron Focus Group**

This is an opportunity to discuss and identify questions for the WPLC Patron Focus Group.

A. Stormberg informed the group that this is an opportunity to discuss and identify questions for the WPLC Patron Focus Group.

**6. New Discussion Items**

a. **Selection Policy Update**

The Collection Development Workgroup has reviewed and updated the Collection Development Policy to align with the new selection focus and guidelines. The updates were reviewed. There were no additional questions.

*Motion:* Approve the Collection Policy Development Policy revisions.

*Moved to approve:* J. Pinger

*Second:* M. Warren

*Results:* Motion Passes

*Discussion:* None

b. **Potential Models for Buying Pool Increase**

The WPLC Collection Development Workgroup for 2018 recommended that the Steering Committee and Board consider developing a mechanism for a regular annual increase toward the buying pool (currently \$1,000,000) or the holds reduction amount (currently \$150,000).

The Workgroup proposed that the Steering Committee and Board discuss options for a regular annual increase and prepare a recommendation for the 2019 Collection Development Workgroup to consider as part of their work. Models were presented and discussed. It was asked if the group had any additional models they would like the Workgroup to consider.

There is concern from the group with a model that bases a percentage on libraries' physical collections. Libraries are seeing a decline in physical collections as the popularity of online collections increase, so a model based on a percentage of the physical collection budget would not be beneficial. It was asked if a model based on, or including, wait times could be considered. If wait times have decreased or increased over the years, we need to know why, i.e. more money towards high demand titles, usage falling off? The group also asked if a mock budget could be made for each of the models proposed. It was suggested that a combination of some of these models may be beneficial. It was also suggested to add more contextual information in the growth chart to help explain the changes in growth (i.e. increase in devices available, increase in the buying pool.)

**c. Committee information sharing and questions**

A. Stormberg asked if anyone had any information to share or any questions.

**7. Next Meeting Date**

It was noted that the next meeting will be held on September 20<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 via GoToMeeting.

**Adjournment Time:**

*Motion:* To Adjourn

*Moved to approve:* R. Staveness

*Second:* J. Pinger

*Results:* Motion Passed

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 PM