

Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
WPLC Board Meeting Minutes
August 24, 2016
GoToMeeting

ATTENDEES: Mark Arend (WLS), Evan Bend (OWLS), Amy Birtell (ESLS), Steve Hesper (MCFLS), Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Steve Platteter (ALS), Krista Ross (SWLS), Michael Sheehan (NWLS), Lin Swartz-Truesdell (KCLS), Marty Van Pelt (SCLS), Maureen Welch (IFLS)

ABSENT: Kristen Anderson (WRLS), Mike Gelhausen (MWLS), Mellanie Mercier (BLS), Mark Merrifield (NLS), Steve Ohs (LLS), Becky Petersen (MCFSS)

PROJECT MANAGERS PRESENT: Andi Coffin (WiLS), Stef Morrill (WiLS)

Summary of actions:

- *Nomination Committee was formed. M. Van Pelt, S. Platteter, and M. Sheehan volunteered to be on the committee.*
- *2017 WiLS project manager contract was approved.*

1. Call to order

K. Ross called the meeting to order at 10:05. In order to make sure the meeting is productive and pleasant, the group was reminded that their attention during the meeting is important and that long pauses in virtual meetings are normal and expected. It was noted that the WPLC board meetings are typically not recorded but could be if needed or wanted by the board.

2. Consent agenda

- a. Review agenda
- b. Approval of minutes from June 9, 2016:
<http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/2016-06-09%20WPLC%20Board%20Notes.pdf>
- c. Updates from previous meeting: <http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/updates.pdf>
 - i. YTD budget
 - ii. LEAP & SimplyE update
 - iii. Steering Committee update (including update on domain name)
 - iv. Historical & Local Digital Collections Committee
 - v. Bylaws Workgroup Update
 - vi. Formula Workgroup Update
 - vii. User & Non-User Survey Workgroup Update

Motion: S. Platteter moved to approve the consent agenda; M. Sheehan seconded. There was no discussion, and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Discussion/Action items

Form Board Nominations Committee

Background: It's time for us to form the Nominations Committee that will solicit candidates to be the Board Chair and Liaison to the Steering Committee. The positions will serve the 2017 calendar year. During the meeting we will be asking for volunteers for the Nominations Committee.

Additional documents: None

Questions for discussion:

1. Would you like to serve on the Nominations Committee?

Last year, we had three members for this committee. M. Van Pelt, S. Platteter, and M. Sheehan volunteered to be on the 2016 Nominations Committee.

M. Van Pelt moved to approve the nominations committee; M. Arend seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of 2017 Meeting Calendar

Background: Based on our current calendar of activities, WiLS has prepared a potential board meeting calendar for 2017. We will review and discuss the calendar, with final approval of the calendar occurring by email between this meeting and our October meeting so everyone can get the dates on their calendars as soon as possible!

Additional documents:

<http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/WPLC%202017%20Board%20and%20Steering%20Meeting%20Calendar%20-DRAFT.pdf>

Questions for discussion:

1. Do you have any conflicts or concerns with the proposed dates?

It was noted that WAPL 2017 may conflict, but the dates for that conference are not yet published. S. Morrill said she would ask about WAPL 2017 dates and share with the Board. Otherwise, the Board expressed no concern about these dates.

2. Do you have any questions about activities that will occur at each meeting? Is there anything you feel is missing or not happening at the appropriate time?

The Board shared that they felt this is a fairly complete picture of the responsibilities for the coming year, and there was no further discussion. The final dates will be sent by project managers to the group.

Discussion of what constitutes a WPLC project

Background: At the Annual Meeting, there was some discussion of the purpose of WPLC and what projects WPLC should undertake. One of the gray areas for WPLC are projects that may be for a subset of libraries/systems or may start with a set of libraries/systems with the potential to expand beyond the initial group. If we want to continue to grow and change as a consortium, starting projects for subsets of libraries/systems may be a way to do that, though not every project may benefit every system/library immediately. Are there benefits for us to have groups of libraries work together even if a totality of

WPLC may not participate? This line of thinking culminates in the question, "What constitutes a WPLC project?"

There is a current concrete example to consider: While OverDrive Periodicals was not included in the 2017 buying pool, WiLS was working with a subset of systems to create a shared collection through OverDrive that would be available to only those systems and paid for by the systems. With OverDrive Periodicals being off the market for the foreseeable future, the subset of systems are now interested in pursuing a group purchase of another periodicals product. WiLS is working with the subset of systems, but would like to clarify if this work should still be considered WPLC work. Because this particular project is for a subset of libraries, should it not be considered a WPLC project? Or are there other reasons why this particular project would not be considered a WPLC project?

Questions for discussion:

1. Is there a desire for WPLC to undertake projects that may start with a subset of systems?

Some members of the board felt that it was a good idea for the WPLC to undertake projects that start with a subset of membership because that is typically how pilot projects begin, which is a positive thing. It was noted that it could get complex when the discussion is about how these projects would be funded – by the WPLC or by the subset. It was proposed that the Board make the decision to fund projects on a project-by-project basis and it was noted that this may have an impact on the Bylaws Committee current work. These projects could be viewed as partnerships with WPLC so the WPLC gets the experience, and perhaps the WPLC could fund the percentage of the project that is the percentage of participating systems. The board noted the WPLC should continue to participate in these collaborative projects because that's the point of the WPLC. Funding and WPLC participation should be decided on a project-by-project basis.

2. Is there a desire for WPLC to undertake projects that may always be a subset of systems?

It was suggested that you may not know when a project begins that it will always be a subset, and it was noted that even OverDrive began as a project of a subset of the WPLC. Some members of the board felt that the WPLC should encourage full participation whenever possible and that the point of the WPLC is to encourage experiments; when a project moves beyond experimentation, then the WPLC becomes involved in sustaining projects or progressing projects and these questions should be answered then. The Board was unwilling to make a rule about this, but felt that the WPLC has an important role in experimenting with new services and that participation by the whole should be encouraged whenever possible; WPLC ownership of projects should be decided on a case-by-case basis.

3. How should we proceed with the periodicals project?

It is proposed that this remains a WPLC project because of the work already done, the knowledge already gained by the collective, and that others may want to join at a future date. Project manager time should be considered by the Board at a later date. The WPLC might be the place where, when everyone can't participate in one platform, multiple platforms are offered to get to the needs of every system. Also, while in most cases, a consortial purchase is typically less expensive, sometimes it's not (as in the case of Flipster) and it makes no business sense to work as a consortium. Zinio is interested in offering a discounted price for the consortium. OverDrive is out of this space right now, but they anticipate they will be coming back with their own product in the next year. The marketplace for products like these is

not settled, so perhaps the WPLC could offer as many as possible. An important component of WPLC is research; each system doesn't need to do the research individually and the WPLC can continue to collect data on purchases and experiences outside the consortium. If a project's utility diminishes, the WPLC can revisit its participation at that point. The board noted that if many projects become collaborations outside of WPLC or are not collaborations at all, it reduces the effectiveness of the WPLC. If members are not willing to participate they can still benefit from the research and processes developed by the WPLC and project management to support it. It shouldn't be ignored that the WPLC, as a larger group, has more influence over vendors – in product development and pricing – than individual members. The board provided consensus that the periodical project should continue as a WPLC project.

Discussion of Potential 2017 R&D Projects

Background: As of the end of July, WPLC has \$5,000 for R&D and \$11,947.17 in Reserves. At this meeting, we will discuss potential 2017 R&D projects. After this meeting, WiLS will do any research necessary related to the potential projects and bring back more complete information for decisions at the October meeting.

Additional documents: None

Questions for discussion:

1. Do you have any ideas for potential R&D projects? Keep in mind that potential R&D projects do not have to be focused only on digital collections, but could be anything that we might want to undertake either as a whole group or as a subset of the group (if it is a pilot that could benefit the whole group).

It is suggested that the User/Non-User Survey Workgroup could use this money. Another member suggested that the new LSTA grants for people counters / statistics could fund many or even all systems. If this could be a coordinated, state-wide effort it would increase efficacy, decrease duplicative work, and facilitate information sharing. More ideas suggested were: coordinated mobile hotspots, digitization and preservation for existing and new digital collections. The board was encouraged to share any ideas following the meeting with the Chair or project managers.

Discussion of Project Manager Evaluation Survey

Background: Since our last meeting, WiLS asked each Board member to complete a survey regarding their performance. The results are included in this packet. The Board Chair will share thoughts about the results and any proposed changes that WiLS might make to improve services.

Additional documents: Survey results, sent to the Board in the agenda email.

Questions for discussion:

1. Do you have any suggestions how WiLS could improve their services to WPLC?

WiLS was encouraged to present the pros and cons for proposed projects, and share buying pool budget information earlier. The systems are under constraints to provide budgets to libraries. WiLS can provide budget numbers assuming no changes earlier than currently, but systems are expected to know those budget numbers could change. Some members felt that the budget numbers were provided this year at an appropriate time.

Discussion & Approval of 2017 Project Manager Contract

Background: It is time for the annual renewal of the contract. Most of the changes in the contract are done for clarification. There were two appendices in the 2016 contract that have been removed and replaced with language indicating that the schedules will be set in conjunction with the Board and Steering Committee before the end of the calendar year.

Additional documents: <http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/2017%20WPLC%20Contract.docx>

Questions for discussion:

1. Do you have any questions or concerns about the contract?

It was suggested that there should be some flexibility to allow WILS to manage projects that are subsets of the WPLC membership.

M. Arend moved to approve the contract; and M. Sheehan seconded.

S. Platteter expressed concern that since M. Arend and himself are WILS board members, is there conflict of interest. M. Arend withdraws his motion and both WILS board members abstain from voting.

J. Klingbeil moved to approve the contract; and M. Sheehan seconded. There were no objections or discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Information Sharing From Partners.

At our last meeting, we discussed trying to expand our information sharing to include more than just WPLC-related activities in hopes of both learning more from each other and also spurring new ideas for collaboration. When we send each call for agenda, we will also ask for a question for the meeting. If we receive no suggestions, the Board Chair and WILS will create a question for discussion and include the question in this agenda.

- a. Question for discussion: TBD, sent prior to the meeting.
- b. Anything else to share?

The board shared stories about their favorite things they did this summer. IFLS and WVLS have signed a collaborative agreement. Tech Soup is offering a webinar in early September that would be great for WPLC members to attend. Digital Historical Newspapers went live this week, and the committee working on this project has already begun work on a new batch of newspapers; the Board will be kept updated on progress.

5. Meeting evaluation

How did the meeting go? Was everyone participating? How might we improve for our next meeting?

The board felt the questions for discussion with agenda items were helpful and helped spark discussion and focus the conversation. It allowed participants to think about topics before the meeting. The format helped to draw all participants into discussions. Door prizes were considered.

6. Adjournment

By consensus, the board moved to adjourn at 11:15.