

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium**

***WPLC Board Meeting Agenda***

**October 25, 2016, 3:00 p.m.**

In person: Potawatomi Hotel & Casino - Prosperity  
GoToMeeting (Connection information below)

**1. Call to order**

**2. Consent agenda**

- a. Review agenda
- b. Approval of minutes from August 24, 2016: <http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/2016-08-24%20WPLC%20Board%20Minutes.pdf>
- c. Updates from previous meeting: [http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/updates\\_0.pdf](http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/updates_0.pdf)
  - i. YTD budget
  - ii. LEAP & SimplyE update
  - iii. Steering Committee update
  - iv. Historical & Local Digital Collections Committee
  - v. Bylaws Workgroup Update
  - vi. Update on Periodicals Project

**3. Discussion/Action items**

**Discussion of OverDrive School and Public Library program**

*Background:* OverDrive is experimenting with a new program to integrate school and public libraries. A few school libraries that participate in School Download Library are working with their local public library consortium to allow access to students using their student IDs in addition to public library cards by adding authentication for the school library's authentication system to the public library consortium's OverDrive platform. In these cases, the school library appears on the list of libraries for a patron to select in addition to the public library. The perceived advantage of this setup is that students can have access without having to get a public library card and that the collection will potentially get more use by students and will increase the visibility of the public library and consortium brand with students. There are some disadvantages: increased length of the list of libraries patrons choose from, increased maintenance of authentication to these additional systems, and the possibility of diminishing the value of the public library card (as students would no longer need one to log into OverDrive), lack of clarity of who would be paying for the additional circulation, public confusion about who is funding the collection, potential complaints about content.

Currently, any public library system can choose to add barcodes from their local school ILS systems into the public library system's ILS to allow access using student barcodes, which may provide some of the advantages without adding the school libraries as separate entities.

*Additional documents:* None

*Questions for discussion:*

1. Are there additional advantages or disadvantages to this program?
2. Given the advantages and disadvantages, do we want to participate?

## Discussion of direction from the Formula Workgroup

*Background:* The Formula Workgroup met in September to discuss a potential change in the formula for funding the buying pool. The complete charge and membership for this workgroup can be found on the WPLC website: <http://www.wplc.info/formulaworkgroup>

The group discussed some concerns:

- The concern from some members of the workgroup, especially MCFLS, is that the \$150,000 is intended specifically to fulfill holds. MCFLS has been using Advantage funds to keep their holds ratio low, and are not comfortable with funding holds fulfillment with the same formula that is used for the \$1,000,000 buying pool.
- Systems are using Advantage differently, which creates some issues between the shared collection and Advantage collections:
  - Some systems are purchasing additional titles, while others are purchasing additional copies only.
  - There are different procedures in how people evaluate hold numbers and purchase with Advantage.
  - Some systems invest in Advantage but don't have time to do selecting.
  - Some systems are not using Advantage at all.

The group came up with the recommendation to allocate a percentage of the buying pool to Advantage accounts for each system. The formula for this percentage would not be based on circulation or population, but on the number of holds. If a system has higher holds, they would contribute more, but the funds would be placed into their Advantage account to help them deal with their own holds. Systems would be welcome to put additional funds into their Advantage accounts. There are a few things to consider with this model:

- We would need all systems to have Advantage accounts
- We would need accurate and consistent numbers from OverDrive about holds.
- We would need to determine the percentage that would go into the Advantage accounts.
- We would need procedures and standards for Advantage spending.

*Additional documents:* None

*Questions for discussion:*

1. What are your thoughts on the recommendation to allocate a percentage of the buying pool to Advantage accounts and to use a formula based on holds for that percentage of the buying pool?
2. What are other considerations or issues you foresee with this model?

## User & Non-User Survey Workgroup Recommendation

*Background:* The User & Non-User Survey is one of the projects that WPLC has undertaken every four years. As it was time to potentially repeat the survey, a workgroup was formed to discuss the desirability of repeating the survey and to investigate the costs of repeating the survey. They have completed their work, and have a report and recommendation for the Board to discuss and potentially take action on.

*Additional documents:*

1. User & Non-User Survey Workgroup Recommendation:  
<http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/User%20Non-User%20Survey%20Work%20Group%20Recommendation,%20Sept%202016.pdf>
2. Proposal from Morrill Solutions:  
[http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/Morrill%20Solutions\\_WI\\_alternate\(1\)\\_2016.pdf](http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/Morrill%20Solutions_WI_alternate(1)_2016.pdf)

*Questions for discussion:*

1. What input does the Board have to offer on this proposal and recommendation?
2. If the proposal is approved, are there Board members or other WPLC community members who wish to participate in the Workgroup going forward?
3. Are there ideas from the Board about potential funding partners that the Work Group should research or pursue?
4. If the proposal is approved, does the Board have input to provide on the direction of the process?

**Reconfiguration of Steering Committee seats**

*Background:* According to the WPLC bylaws, “the number of representatives {on the Steering Committee} from each Partner shall be determined by the aggregate annual investment in the Digital Library made by each Partner and its Members. Annually, the WPLC Board shall determine the amount, or portion thereof, invested in the Digital Library that shall entitle a Partner to have one representative on the Steering Committee.” While we should be considering this question, the project managers are recommending that we discuss some questions about apportionment of seats (because there are some concerns) to provide information to the Formula Workgroup, who is considering the formula for dividing costs and could also make a recommendation about apportionment of seats based on the new formula. The Bylaws Workgroup could recommend changes to the bylaws to reflect this recommendation from the Formula Workgroup or any other suggestions from the Board.

*Additional documents:* For optional additional reading on the original configuration of the Steering Committee seats, see the 2013 *Structure and Governance Report* -- <http://www.wplc.info/sites/wplc.info/files/WPLCGovComReport1-15-13.pdf>

*Questions for discussion:*

1. The project managers have concerns about reapportioning these seats on an annual basis, as it would mean annual change in the Steering Committee makeup. Could we discuss doing this less frequently, perhaps every three years or when there is a significant change in the overall amount contributed to the buying pool?
2. What is the optimal size for the Steering Committee? Should there be a cap on the number of members?
3. The 2013 Structure and Governance Report recommended a seat for “each \$60,000, or portion thereof, expended on the Digital Library collection. As we increase the amount of the buying pool, this configuration could mean additional seats on the Steering Committee, making a large committee every more unwieldy. Given the response to #2, could we consider a percentage contribution instead or some other method to ensure that the size of the committee does not surpass the ideal size or cap but still ensures representation?

**Califa Copyright Reform Statement**

*Background:* Califa has prepared a Copyright Reform Statement to help educate and bring about change to the largely nonnegotiable licensing terms set forth by publishers for e-content. They are asking for support by having consortia read and sign the statement. We would like to discuss this Copyright Reform Statement and what action the WPLC Board would like to take, if any.

*Additional documents:*

1. Email from Califa (includes more background):  
<https://share.illinoisheartland.org/sites/default/files/meetings/other/Copyright%20reform.pdf>
2. Executive summary of the Copyright Reform Statement: <http://www.wils.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Library-Copyright-Reform-Statement-from-Califa.docx>
3. The Copyright Reform Statement: [http://www.wils.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/library\\_copyright\\_reform\\_statement.pdf](http://www.wils.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/library_copyright_reform_statement.pdf)

*Questions for discussion:*

1. What are your thoughts about the Copyright Reform Statement?
2. Should WPLC sign onto this Copyright Reform Statement?

**2016 Board Chair & Liaison**

*Background:* The Nominations Committee (Steve Platteter, Mike Sheehan, Marty Van Pelt) are recommending Krista Ross continue as WPLC Board Chair and Maureen Welch continue as Steering Committee Liaison.

*Additional documents:* None

*Questions for discussion (after the vote):*

1. What are your expectations and desires for these two roles?

**4. Information Sharing From Partners**

- a. Question for discussion: The systems just submitted their system plans and LSTA grant applications. What new projects have you included in your grant applications or system plans that you'd like to share?
- b. Anything else to share?

**5. Meeting evaluation**

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

**6. Adjournment**

**GoToMeeting connection information:**

1. Please join my meeting, Tuesday, October 25, 2016 at 3:00 PM Central Daylight Time.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/431810157>

2. Use your microphone and speakers (VoIP) - a headset is recommended. Or, call in using your telephone.

Dial +1 (646) 749-3131

Access Code: 431-810-157

Audio PIN: Shown after joining the meeting