

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Board Meeting Notes
June, 4, 2019 at 10:00 am

Present: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Mark Arend (WLS), Chad Glamann, proxy for Evan Bend, (OWLS), Alison Hoffman, proxy for Jennifer Chamberlain (MLS), Anne Hamland (WVLS), David Kranz (SWLS), Anne-Marie Itzin (NWLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Rebecca Peterson (MCLS), Jennifer Schmidt (MCFLS), Martha Van Pelt (SCLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS)

Absent: Rob Nunez (KLS), Steve Ohs (LLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Tracy Vreeke (NFLS)

Project Managers: Melody Clark (WiLS), Stef Morrill (WiLS)

1. Call to order/Welcome & Introductions

Chair K. Anderson called the meeting to order at 10:01 am.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Review agenda
- b. Approval of minutes from [May 1, 2019](#)
- c. Acceptance of Steering Committee minutes from [May 23, 2019](#)
- d. Decisions made between May 1, 2019 and current meeting: None
- e. YTD budget

M. Van Pelt moved approval of the consent agenda; M. Welch seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Updates from Previous Meetings/Projects

The project managers suggested that this part of the agenda be replaced by the monthly updates. It was suggested to leave updates on the agenda with a link to the last monthly update to give time in the agenda to ask questions. Many like the monthly update format. It was asked if there were any suggestions or ideas for topics to be added to the monthly update. There were none at the time but all are encouraged to send suggestions to the project managers.

4. New Business

a. Discussion and action: 2020 Budget

The Budget Committee has recommended a budget for 2020 and the Steering Committee has recommended a buying pool amount that includes a 5% increase, divided between the base and holds reduction amount.

S. Morrill reviewed the operational budget. The bottom line of the budget remains the same. For transparency and ease of understanding, the way we're showing reserve and R&D has changed. There is \$24,000 in the income that will be taken from the R&D/Reserve carryover for BiblioBoard, if WPLC decides to continue with it after the review by the Collection Development Workgroup in Fall. As of 3/30 when this budget was made, WPLC had \$51,551.62 in reserves and R&D.

The operational expenses have remained the same. The R&D/Reserves are being showed as separate allocations rather than as part of the operating budget for clarity. There was an issue with the division of holds between Nicolet and OWLS on the budget the group was discussing. It has been corrected and a revised budget will be sent to all. It does not impact costs for any other system.

M. Welch explained that the Steering Committee approved the Collection Development Workgroup's 2019 recommendations with the exception of the buying pool amount for 2020. The Steering Committee voted unanimously at their last meeting to increase the buying pool amount by 5%, split between the buying pool and holds reduction amounts.

M. Welch moved approval of the 2020 Budget; A. Hamland seconded. Motion passed with 11 votes yea and 1 nay (NWLS).

b. Discussion and possible action: Collection Development Workgroup recommendations approved by the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee approved the 2019 recommendations from the Collection Development Workgroup with the exception to the 2020 buying pool. The Steering Committee unanimously recommended a 5% increase to the buying pool with the increase split between the base and holds reduction amounts. M. Welch, Steering Committee Liaison, briefly reviewed the approved recommendations:

- Undertaking a re-evaluation of the current policy to purchase pre-pubs only one month in advance, along with an investigation into the removal of some of the RTL options when searching in the WPLC Catalog.
- Utilizing an amount equal to the Simultaneous Use plan amounts to purchase Spanish language titles with CPC; developing a time line and publicity plan for the additions. The project managers will also do some small experiments with CPC as new scenarios are considered for this purchasing model.
- Using \$10,000 in 2019 to use a combination of purchasing options to fulfill holds on midlist titles with low copies and high holds. Doing this experiment in 2019 will provide information on how to allocate the budget and select for 2020.
- 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.
- Implementing 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 will be moved back into the consortium account.
- Holding a roundtable to give the Steering Committee and Board the opportunity to discuss national trends around e-content, the purpose of the WPLC collection, and advocacy for the collection, both within Wisconsin and nationally. This meeting would take place in the Fall, with some pre-education happening prior to the session.

The project managers prepared an outline and estimated budget for the roundtable for the group to review and possibly take action on. The group was asked if they would like additional attendees outside of Board and Steering members. The Selection Committee was suggested. There was concern about that as it is a very large group. It was suggested that the three

selectors that are on the Collection Development Workgroup be invited. The group agreed as well to having DPI representative.

There was a question about including mileage for participants in the budget. It was noted that considering one of the Board's goals is to encourage communication between Steering and Board that systems could pay for their members and encourage carpooling. The group decided not to add this to the budget.

There was a question about a virtual option for the roundtable. Project managers recommend not having a virtual option for the roundtable meeting as there will be better engagement if all are in person for this particular meeting.

D. Kranz moved to approve use of reserve funds from the budget to cover the cost for food for the roundtable meeting. J. Schmidt seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Discussion and possible action: Library Advantage Accounts

Some libraries are pursuing Advantage accounts specifically for their libraries. The Board discussed this trend to determine if action should be taken to prevent this within the WPLC OverDrive platform.

S. Morrill provided some history about library Advantage accounts. Back in 2011/12, the discussion around Advantage accounts started.

In May 2011, the Board discussed Advantage accounts. At the time, system Advantage accounts were not available, and some systems were encouraging individual libraries to purchase copies because it could not be done at the system level. The group discussed some of the issues around equity with Advantage accounts even then: "There was a lengthy discussion surrounding the belief that creating a statewide collection of e-books would ultimately be the ideal situation; not creating disparity according to library/system size."

By January 2012, Advantage accounts were available at the System level and same services had been clarified. At that month's board meeting, WiLS shared talking points about Advantage accounts that included the following:

Due to the same services provision of system membership in Wisconsin law (Section 43.15(4)(c)4, Wisconsin Statutes), no individual library can start a new Advantage account. Existing accounts will continue to exist, and content will remain available to the library's patrons only. No new content shall be added to these accounts.

In March 2016, the same services law changed when 2015 Act 306 was enacted. From Shannon Schultz: "This changed s. 43.15(4)(c)4, also known as the 'same services' provision, to allow libraries to give preference to local residents for remote access to online resources. We interpret this to mean that, yes, 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."

It was noted Verona is the only library that has pursued an individual Advantage account recently. Brown County is looking to create their own as they have a separate ILS.

M. Van Pelt stated Verona will only be purchasing additional copies. They will also continue to make contributions to the SCLS account and to the consortium. There was some discussion of Madison public using their old legacy Advantage account, but there was question about access to that. Project managers will ask OverDrive about system access to legacy individual library accounts to see if entire systems have access or if those were restricted to the individual libraries.

To prevent library Advantage accounts from being created. A conversation would need to take place with OverDrive about not pursuing or allowing individual library advantage accounts.

There was concern that individual Advantage accounts can weaken the consortium account. According to the results of the patron survey, patrons wanted more unique titles, so it would be beneficial to increase the consortium, and perhaps not allow individual Advantage accounts to buy copies only.

There was a suggestion to have WPLC make a philosophical statement about Advantage account rather than outright banning the accounts, at least at this time. The group agreed that they would like to start with a more generous approach, but did note that prolonging this issue may cause more issues in the future. The philosophical discussion could be part of the roundtable. Starting with the softer approach now and then furthering the discussion at the roundtable meeting would be a great start.

K. Anderson moved to do a soft approach by talking with OverDrive about requiring that systems request the creation of individual library Advantage accounts and asking OverDrive to cease the marketing of Advantage accounts to individual libraries as well as furthering this discussion at the roundtable this fall; M. Van Pelt seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

d. Discussion and possible action: Changes to the Collection Development Workgroup

The project managers proposed two changes to the Collection Development Workgroup:

- i. *Make the Collection Development Workgroup a permanent committee:* In the last few years, the workgroup has been active for more months than what was originally intended. Their input has been very helpful in guiding the collection and making the workgroup a full-time committee would allow them to provide feedback throughout the year as needed.
- ii. *Change the schedule for the regular work of the body:* It would be beneficial for the Steering Committee to review the draft recommendations from the workgroup at their February meeting. However, the workgroup does not start their work until January in the current timeline. The project managers proposed moving this timeline back so that work begins in the Fall.

There was a question about the reporting structure, term limits, and makeup of this body. The project managers will create a more detailed description of this body for future review.

M. Welch moved to approve making the Collection Development Workgroup a permanent Committee and changing the schedule for the body to be on a continuous basis. J. Schmidt seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

e. Public Library Email List

At the last SRLAAW meeting, a replacement for the public library Google Community was discussed. Google Communities are no longer being supported by Google and DPI does not have plans to replace the platform. This leaves a hole in communication for the public libraries. The wispublib list, which the Google Community replaces, was once a lively list with good discussion. It was suggested at the meeting that WPLC create and manage a replacement email list. S. Morrill reviewed a proposal for the list to become part of the work of WPLC. The proposal included management of the email list, batch loading and moderation of the list. It was asked how this money for this addition would be divided up. Project managers noted it would be added to the operational budget as project manager hours.

M. Van Pelt stated that SCLS would offer to run this email list for free.

M. Arend moved to further the proposed project. When asked if the group would consider SCLS doing the work, the motion was withdrawn. The group will wait to review proposals from both the project managers and SCLS at the next Board meeting in August.

f. Third Party Access Request

In April, Hedberg Public Library requested access to the Reports section of Marketplace for a third-party vendor to collect data about their Advantage account. The Reports section of Marketplace provides access to all of the reports available to consortium members, which would include circulation and other information for all members of the consortium, but no patron data. This information went out to the Board to ask if there were concerns and noting the Board will have a broader discussion about third party access including the possibility of developing a policy. There were no concerns but a suggestion if a policy is implemented that it includes specific access dates so that the third party isn't able to maintain access forever.

There were no additional concerns or comments at this time.

5. Information Sharing from Partners

M. Arend asked about the project manager time noting that he wants to be sure that the project managers are being paid for all their work as they typically do go over hours by the end of the year. S. Morrill mentioned that WILS has been over project hours and will likely be asking for an increase in hours for the 2021 budget.

M. Arend, who is retiring in a few months, announced that the posting for his position is now active on the Winnefox website. If anyone knows anyone who may be interested, direct them to the Winnefox website.

6. Meeting Evaluation

There were no comments on the meeting.

7. Adjourn

It was noted the next meeting will be on August 13, 2019 at 1:00 pm

M. Van Pelt moved to adjourn the meeting. M. Arend seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11: 32 am