

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Joint Board/Steering/Annual Membership Meeting Notes
May 1, 2019**

PRESENT: Jean Anderson (SCLS), Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Mark Arend (WLS), Lori Belongia (Marshfield/SCLS), Evan Bend (OWLS), Angie Bodzislaw (Spooner/NWLS), Jennifer Chamberlain (MLS), John DeBacher (DPI), Michael Devries (Beloit/ALS), Dominic Frandrup (Antigo/WVLS), Bruce Gay (Waukesha/BLS), Jeff Gilderson-Duwe (Oshkosh PL/WLS), Anne Hamland (WVLS), Anne Marie Itzin (NWLS), Mark Jochem (SCLS), Tina Kakuske (Door County/NFLS), David Kranz (SWLS), Jessica MacPhail (Racine/LSLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Steve Ohs (LSLS), Lorelee Peterson Owen (WVLS), Rebecca Peterson (MCLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Jessica Schoonover (Trempealeau/WRLS), Martha Spanger (Altoona/IFLS), Amy Stormberg (Amery/IFLS), Trixine Tahtinen (Oostburg/MLS), Michelle Tryggstad (Bekum/WRLS), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), Tracy Vreeke (NFLS), Molly Warren (Madison/SCLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS), Karina Zidon (Platteville/SWLS)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Melody Clark (WiLS), Stef Morrill (WiLS)

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:02 PM

2. Welcome and Introductions

The group was welcomed, introductions were made and the agenda for the day was reviewed.

3. Presentation and discussion

a. Presentation of data reviewed with the Collection Development Workgroup

The Collection Development Workgroup reviewed various data this year including the 2018 recommendation evaluation, CPC scenarios, title lists for potential projects including Midlist / Low Copy / High Holds, models and budgets for potential buying pool increase, a comparison of physical and digital holds ratios by format and information collected from the annual patron and library surveys.

The patron survey received 8792 responses this year, which is almost double the number from the last full patron survey. Interested patrons are added to a virtual focus group. There are now 5046 in patrons in the focus group.

It was noted that 54% of respondents read or listen to books from Wisconsin's Digital Library on a tablet (Kindle Fire, iPad, etc.), 53% on a smartphone (Galaxy, iPhone, etc.), 25% on an e-reader (Kindle Paperwhite, Oasis, etc.), and 16% on desktop or laptop computers.

Both ebook and audiobook wait time satisfaction were reported. For all BiblioBoard products (Pressbooks, SELF-e, the Wisconsin Author Project, and BiblioBoard Library), between 2-5% of respondents were aware they existed and fewer than 1% have used any of the products.

In June 2018, BiblioBoard and OverDrive started a pilot where we could add 50 SELF-e Select simultaneous use titles from BiblioBoard into OverDrive. The 50 BiblioBoard titles in OverDrive have circulated over 21,000 times.

The WPLC Digital Collections Library Survey was open from March 25th through April 15th. There were 131 respondents, which is a typical response rate.

Respondents were asked about allocation of buying pool funds by format. They allocated an average of 56% to the \$1.15 million buying pool for ebooks and 44% to audiobooks.

Respondents were also asked to use a slider to indicate how they would like the WPLC to spend its budget on Wisconsin's Digital Library collection. One side of the slider represented spending all the money on copies of titles already in the collection to fill holds and reduce wait time while the other side represented spending all the money on new titles that are not yet in the collection to increase its scope. The middle of the slider represented spending equal amounts of money on both. The average response skewed very slightly toward spending more money on copies of titles already in the collection to fill holds and reduce wait time.

It was shared in the survey that statewide spending on OverDrive content is 3.8% of the total collection expenditure for all libraries, and Overdrive checkouts account for 6.9% of statewide circulation. Respondents were then asked how supportive they would be of allocating more of their collection budget to digital materials. 79% of respondents were supportive or very supportive while 21% were unsupportive or very unsupportive.

b. 2019 Digital Buying Pool Recommendations

i. Recommendations (Maureen Welch)

M. Welch, Collection Workgroup Development representative shared the following recommendations.

Selection Guideline Evaluations

RECOMMENDATION: The Workgroup is recommending a re-evaluation of the current policy to purchase pre-pubs only one month in advance. In addition, the Workgroup recommends investigation into the removal of some of the RTL options when searching in the WPLC Catalog.

Cost Per Circ (CPC) Next Steps

RECOMMENDATION: The Workgroup agrees that the Spanish language title scenario is a good use of CPC, but in addition, recommends that a timeframe and publicity plan be put in place. For a CPC Spanish title budget, the Workgroup recommends to start with matching the Simultaneous Use plan amounts. The Workgroup also recommends that the project managers be allowed to do some small experiments with CPC as new scenarios are considered for this purchasing model.

Models for Increase

RECOMMENDATION: The Workgroup recommends no increase for the 2020 buying pool and holds reduction amount, keeping the amount at \$1,150,000. The group recommends further, continued discussions about increases, the value of the collection as a core collection, the pricing of e-materials and the role of the consortium at a WPLC Roundtable in 2019.

Potential Projects

RECOMMENDATION: The Workgroup recommends that the Consortium pursue Potential Project option 3: Midlist Titles with Low Copies and High Holds, using a combination of purchasing options to fulfill holds. The Workgroup recommends implementing this project now, in 2019, to help give us information on how to allocate the budget and select for 2020. It was recommended that the \$10,000 donation WPLC received be used for this project.

BiblioBoard Review

RECOMMENDATION: The Workgroup recommends putting a placeholder for BiblioBoard in the 2020 budget, conducting an evaluation in the fall of 2019, and making a final recommendation to Steering in October of 2019.

Holds Reduction Policy

RECOMMENDATION: The Workgroup recommends a Holds Reduction policy where Advantage accounts are required to spend their Holds Reduction amount within the fiscal year it was received. If a system has not spent out their Holds reduction amount by 30 days after the end of the year (Jan 30), the remaining, unspent funds should be moved back into the consortium account.

ii. Steering Committee thoughts on recommendations

A. Stormberg, WPLC Digital Library Steering Committee Chair, presented the Steering Committee's thoughts on the 2019 Collection Development Workgroup's recommendations.

Selection Guideline Evaluation.

- There were some in favor of purchasing pre-order titles earlier than the one-month out date that is in place now.
- It was suggested that Advantage accounts and their procedures for pre-order purchase should be taken into consideration as a part of the evaluation.
- It was suggested that the project managers verify if Overdrive can restrict RTL on pre-pub items.

Cost Per Circ (CPC) Next Steps.

- The Committee was in agreement.
- They would like to see if we could create a Spanish-speaking focus group that can help with the questions/recommendation.
- It was noted that other small experiments would provide insight as we look at CPC for next budget year.

Models for Buying Pool Increase and the 2020 Buying Pool and Holds Reduction Amounts.

- There was general disappointment in no increase to the buying pool amount and many members felt waiting to discuss at a roundtable meeting that wouldn't affect the budget until 2021 seems too long.
- They suggested that Steering members talk to their systems and advocate for an increase.
- Some of the members stated that they have already decreased their print budgets in favor of increasing the WPLC buying pool and are willing to reallocate more.
- 14 out of the 21 Steering members present stated they would be in favor of an increase.
- Two of the 14 specified they would prefer the increase be through the Holds Reduction Amount.
- It was suggested that the amount of money being put into the collection above and beyond the buying pool would be good data to have at the roundtable meeting.
- The group agreed that they would like to see the topic of increase for the 2020 buying pool continue at the Annual in-person meeting.

Potential 2020 Projects.

- The Committee was in agreement with this recommendation.

BiblioBoard Review.

- There was initial concern over libraries needing to include this amount in their budgets for 2020, but the Steering Committee was comfortable with the recommendation if the money would come from reserve and R&D funds.
- The group feels this program will be difficult to evaluate.

Holds Reduction Amount Policy.

- The Committee has no concerns with this policy and the majority felt it was fair and good to have in place.

iii. Further discussion

1. Roundtable

Origins/goals of the roundtable

S. Morrill provided some background about the concept of the roundtable. In 2018, there were conversations at multiple meetings about a regular increase to the buying pool. From those conversations, it was clear that there was a division; some wanted an increase and felt it was needed while some did not.

As the Collection Development Workgroup started their work, S. Morrill met with K. Anderson as the Board chair to talk about the year and they both felt that there was not the will among the group to support an increase and that making that recommendation at this point in time would lead to division among the group. To try to move past this division, they thought it would be helpful to convene a gathering of the Board and Steering Committee to talk about the goals of the collection, the value of the collection, and how we talk about and support that value. At the same time, there have been some interesting developments in the national e-book landscape, including the introduction of the DPLA Exchange and further development of SimplyE that also warrants more conversation than we might get at a Board or Steering Committee meeting. This added to the value of having a roundtable conversation. That is where the concept of the roundtable came from and what was shared with the Collection Development workgroup.

It was shared that project managers are trying to meet with the #1 circulating OverDrive library, Toronto Public (WPLC is #2) and the rest of the top five to discuss advocating prices with publishers and OverDrive.

Potential schedule for Roundtable

If we move forward with this roundtable, the potential schedule would be:

Summer: WPLC Board and Steering Committee would receive background information, including statistics and information on national developments. These would probably take the form of webinars where people could attend and ask questions and recordings can be shared with everyone. With the hope that when the roundtable actually took place, everyone would have the same background.

September – October: Hold roundtable

Process review change (for 2020 and 2021)

One of the issues with the current schedule is that the work of the Collection Development Workgroup doesn't begin until January, and there is not a lot of time for the Board and Steering Committee to offer changes to those recommendations without impacting the budget timeline. For example, this year, if the Steering Committee wanted to ask the Collection Development Workgroup to revisit their recommendation, it would mean that a budget wouldn't be completed or approved until later in the year. Given that the systems and libraries have been asking for the budgets to be done earlier, this is problematic.

The project managers proposed moving the start date for the Collection Development Workgroup to Fall so that their recommendations could be ready by the February Steering Committee meeting and would give time to alter course before the budget work begins in April.

The project managers also suggested that the Collection Development workgroup become a committee. It's essentially acting as one now, and having it in place more permanently would

allow for more discussion over the year and more flexibility from year to year in their work as needs arise.

There were no questions about the process change. It was noted that the Board would need to formally approve any process change and to change the group from a Workgroup to a standing Committee.

It was asked where the roundtable notion came from and what the outcomes would be.

The following potential outcomes were identified:

- To get everyone on the same page regarding the WPLC
- To get direction for participation in national advocacy efforts
- To have a discussion about the value of the collection and work on creating internal advocacy for the collection.

It was noted that the WPLC monthly Board and Steering newsletter is helpful for internal advocacy. It was also suggested to create a quarterly newsletter to go out to the Announcements email list. Many librarians are unaware of the high cost of ebooks, and having internal messaging about this would be helpful.

2. 2020 buying pool amount recommendation: further discussion

The following comments and thoughts were shared:

- A Steering Committee member noted that they were one of the Committee members dissatisfied with the no increase recommendation. Their library has put more local funds into the buying pool via Advantage over the last couple of years because of the lack of consortium buying pool increase. They don't want to see the roundtable tied to the increase, but think the roundtable is a great idea.
- A system said that they are also buying from another source (Hoopla) to help deal with the need for content. Another system noted they also have Hoopla but it has not, and won't, decrease their support of the WPLC buying pool increase.
- Others noted they were in support of what had been stated about an increase in buying pool.
- It was suggested that the increase be to the holds reduction amount and noted it is a hard sell to their rural libraries to increase the buying pool when their system is voluntarily putting a lot into their Advantage and some systems are mostly relying on the buying pool.
- Two systems noted they had some pushback with small rural libraries when it comes to the buying pool and a potential increase. Their concern is with already small/decreasing local budgets.
- Another system stated that they also have a large number of smaller libraries. However, even the smallest, most rural (an Amish Community) library, is in support of an increase and adding to their System Advantage account.
- It was noted that Libby is making a really big difference because of the ease of use.
- A system noted they were in favor of an increase but it needs to be a predictable increase.
- The outcome for advocacy for the whole consortium is good, but local budgeting advocacy would be difficult to do at a roundtable.
- It was noted that a roundtable discussion on advocacy can still be really helpful to create talking points for libraries even if it is not specific to their local municipality.
- It was noted that Advantage account data would be really helpful in these discussions for the Roundtable and that there should be a shared vision among the Advantage selectors.

- A system stated they spend all of their Advantage money on fulfilling local holds. They have never seen an increase in their collection budget, but they look at what patrons are requesting and their patrons are asking for more e-materials, not physical materials.
- There was a question if libraries will ever be able to include the WPLC circulations in their own circulation for the state annual report. It was asked why this was important as including them in circs would decrease their cost per circ. It was noted that the value is that those circs need to be tied to a dollar amount in order for them to mean anything for county funding. The group discussed and felt that information about this issue could be one of the outcomes of the discussion at the Roundtable.
- It was asked what others are doing to encourage more funding from their counties. It was noted that having citizens go to County Board meetings to represent the libraries has been positive. It's more powerful than just having the librarians there.

NEXT STEPS: Project managers will put together a few more versions of the budget. A version with a 50% increase was also asked for. This will go out to the Budget Committee by the end of next week and then to the Steering Committee to review at their next meeting on May 23rd to make a recommendation to the Board before June. The roundtable would still take place to discuss advocacy and the future of the buying pool increase.

3. BiblioBoard evaluation

a. Preliminary budget review

S. Morrill reviewed the budget reviewed by the Budget Committee. The bottom line is that there are no increases this year in the proposed budget, though that may change with the earlier discussion. Some points mentioned were:

- A portion of R&D/Reserves carryover has been earmarked for the BiblioBoard project as discussed earlier.
- A total of \$15,000 would be put into R&D and Reserves: \$10,000 for R&D and \$5,000 for reserves because the R&D fund is smaller and more will be taken from it for BiblioBoard.
- If BiblioBoard is continued, we will need to convene a formula workgroup to discuss how the costs for that project would be divided in the future.

b. Other information

What are the other ways to evaluate these products? What is the right information needed in order to evaluate these products? J. Anderson worked with the review committee for the Author Project and suggested working with that group.

Some suggestions for evaluation included:

- A similar patron/library survey for users of pressbooks.
- A survey of authors who had their materials in the contest.
- Thinking about to evaluate the community engagement with writers' groups, etc.
- Understanding the consequences if we drop it: What about users who are currently using Pressbooks?
- Look at simultaneous use titles that are outside of BiblioBoard that we could purchase instead of BiblioBoard.

It was suggested that an increase of awareness is important, since the stats from the patron survey were so low.

c. Social Media Committee update – NOTE: the group did not have time to review this agenda topic so an update is provided below:

In early April, the newly-formed Social Media Committee met for the first time. The Committee, working with WPLC Project Manager Andi Coffin, consists five representatives from five different systems.

The Committee's initial focus will be on Facebook. They will create a private page for Wisconsin's Digital Library and eventually inviting individual libraries and library systems to join the group. This will allow the member community to contribute social media content for WDL and for the Committee to create different messages for its two different audiences - libraries and patrons. For now, the Committee is working to understand what the content might look like and will reconvene in early May to share mocked-up Facebook posts with one another.

The Committee is also considering promotional efforts beyond social media, including drawing on Committee members' expertise to create a marketing kit, available online, that would contain both print and digital assets for Wisconsin's Digital Library.

d. Review roles and responsibilities of WPLC bodies – NOTE: the group did not have time to review this agenda topic so an overview is provided below:

The Board had asked us to review the roles and responsibilities of the WPLC Governing bodies.

The Board's main roles and responsibilities include:

- Conduct all official business of the WPLC.
- May undertake other projects or entertain Partner or Member requests
- Makes decisions regarding the assessment of fees, expenditure of funds, and in determining eligibility for participation in Consortium projects and services.
- Board representatives are expected to attend and be prepared for board meetings.
- Board representatives will be responsible for reporting information to the libraries they represent and gathering feedback and input as needed.
- Board representatives have the authority to represent the system and to vote on budgetary and other issues brought to the WPLC board.

The Digital Library Steering Committee's main roles and responsibilities include:

- Oversee WPLC's Digital Library program.
- Makes policy and budget recommendations for the Digital Library Buying Pool and the Digital Library to the WPLC Board for formal approval.
- Makes all decisions relating to the day-to-day operation of the Digital Library.
- Establishes and oversees Selection Committee
- Steering Committee members will act as representation of their system.
- Committee representatives will be expected to attend and be prepared for committee meetings. If unable to attend, committee representatives will provide a proxy and notify the steering chair and project manager. Committee meets approximately six times per year.
- Steering Committee representatives will be responsible for reporting information to the libraries they represent in their system and gathering feedback and input as needed.
- Committee representatives should have experience with and working knowledge of the current OverDrive Digital Library platform.
- Representatives will follow up with WPLC Board member representative to discuss issues when necessary.

The Collection Development workgroup's main roles and responsibilities include:

- Evaluate the composition of the collection purchased by the digital buying pool with particular attention on known concerns and potential additions to the collection.

- Solicit feedback from the community regarding collection areas.
- Create recommendation of allocation of the buying pool to go to the Steering Committee.
- Develop an updated selection policy.
- Document process for consideration of new collection areas/formats and creation of a recommendation for buying pool allocation.

The Selection Committee's main roles and responsibilities include:

- Members will act as representation of their system.
- Members will adhere to the WPLC Collection Development Policy when purchasing materials for Wisconsin's Digital Library.
- Selectors will strive to build collections that are responsive to the community's informational and recreational reading needs, while still meeting the mission and goals of both the WPLC and Wisconsin public libraries.
- Each selector is assigned an area or genre to focus on and selects titles in both e-book and audio formats for purchase on a monthly basis unless otherwise noted.
- Selections must adhere to the monthly budget amount.
- Attendance at selectors meeting is also required.

e. Potential Creator pilot

In March, the BiblioLabs team provided a demonstration of the Creator platform to the WPLC Historical and Local Digital Collections Committee. Creator is a multimedia authoring tool that can be used to organize and display digitized primary source materials or other digital content and to collect content (music, photos, etc.) submitted by community members.

The committee was interested enough in the product as a potential way to increase visibility of digital collections that they were interested in some potential pilots. Based on this conversation, the project managers came up with the idea for four small-scale pilot projects to demonstrate a range of potential use cases for Creator. Projects created as part of the pilot would be made available through Wisconsin's Digital Library BiblioBoard interface and, optionally, on the open web.

1) Regional content curation

A public library system already supporting local history digitization projects for member libraries would use Creator to curate Anthologies (BiblioBoard's term for groups or sets of resources). These Anthologies would bring together content from member libraries around specific historical topics or events significant to the region (such as logging, Civilian Conservation Corps, World War II manufacturing, etc.). Content might already be available online through the library system, could be loaded directly to the BiblioBoard platform, and/or could be pulled from BiblioBoard's existing content integrations (i.e. public domain content from Internet Archive).

2) Statewide content curation

The WPLC Historical and Local Committee would partner with the Recollection Wisconsin Steering Committee to identify historical topics of statewide interest to educators. Recollection Wisconsin would use Creator to create Anthologies around these topics, drawing content from collections available through Recollection Wisconsin. Contextual information and classroom guides would be added, modeled on the Digital Public Library of America's Primary Source Sets for K-12 educators.

3) Local-level content submission (two projects)

Two public libraries, ideally in different parts of the state and serving different population sizes, would use Creator's Custom Submission Pages for community-generated content collection projects, such as building a collection of local music recordings, hosting a digital photography contest, gathering family recipes from

patrons, or collecting photos and memories of a significant community event, such as the flooding that impacted many Wisconsin communities last summer.

SCLS noted they have been talking about this without knowing that this Creator tool existed. This would be filling a need for them.

D. Kranz, who is the Board rep on the Committee, said the Committee noted that there are libraries of varying sizes that have these digital collections but no place to put or curate and Creator can fill that need.

There was enough interest in this for the group to move forward in their exploratory process.

f. Lucky Day

It was noted that there is not much of an update for the Lucky Day project as OverDrive has pushed the timeline back. OverDrive did note that they would do patron testing before going live with it. As of today, there is no go-live date scheduled.

g. Individual library Advantage accounts

There have been many questions recently regarding individual library Advantage accounts and their ability to obtain them. Some of the questions include the following:

- How many individual library accounts are currently actively purchasing? Answer: 0
- How much did they spend in 2018? Answer: 0
- So far in 2019? Answer: 0
- What percentage of Advantage spending is this? Answer: 0
- What about the Wisconsin "Same Service" provision? Answer: DPI states that individual libraries may have an Advantage account with OverDrive. They must, however, be able to allow nonresidents to access those materials in house if they show up at the library.

The group was asked if there were any questions or concerns about allowing libraries to have individual Advantage accounts.

Some systems do discourage libraries from having individual library accounts and encourages them to contribute to their system account.

It was stated that individual library Advantage Accounts weakens the collective collection.

The group felt this should be further discussed at a Board meeting.

4. Adjournment

The meeting ended at 3:01

R. Peterson made the motion for adjournment. M. Welch seconded.