

ILS Merger Exploration Committee/Samarbeid
Wednesday, March 21, 2018, 10AM-2PM
Appleton Public Library

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Desiree Bongers, Joan Denis, Kristie Hauer, Ann Hunt, Kristin Laufenberg, Gretchen Raab, Aaron Raschke, Holly Selwitschka, Steve Thiry, Sandy Zuehlke.

EXCUSED: Peg Burington, Lucy Hazlewood

OTHERS PRESENT: Pete Gilbert, OWLS Board; Amanda Lee, OWLS; Jerry Letcher, Winnefox Board; Bradley Shippo, OWLS; Karla Smith, Winnefox; Tracy Vreeke, NFLS.

Welcome and introductions

Co-chair Steve Thiry called the meeting to order, welcomed everyone and asked them to introduce themselves.

Review of process to date

Bradley gave a brief summary of events leading up to this meeting. At WLA in October, staff from OWLS and Winnefox discussed whether a regional ILS is worth exploring. OWLS and Winnefox met in early December 2017 and began work on a memo to OWLSnet and WALs member libraries, which was sent on January 5th and is available on the Samarbeid site. The memo launched a series of discussions with WALs and OWLSnet member libraries at various consortium meetings, and having received a mostly favorable response from members, both system boards passed a resolution supporting the exploration. System staff met again on February 2, 2018 to discuss committee structure and scope. Committee members were selected, this meeting scheduled, and now system staff is stepping back to let libraries lead the exploration. At this stage, we think it's best to focus big picture/values rather than diving into technical details. Bradley asked if there were any questions about the process to date.

Ann said she had received some feedback about the timeline being quick and asked about library input. Bradley said the content of the scope document is up for discussion, and the committee can adjust the timeline if they feel it's necessary. Karla explained that the timeline is in part driven by the end of Winnefox's ILS contract and the need to replace OWLS's database server, and we expect that work will be conducted between meetings to keep the process moving. The timeline needs to be process driven, but there is some urgency.

Steve mentioned that we are treating these as open meetings. Bradley said the goal is to keep the process transparent, and make sure all WALs and OWLSnet libraries are informed. Bradley explained that OWLSnet committee members have partnered with directors at our smallest libraries to keep in constant contact throughout the process.

System staff are not voting committee members, but will support the work of the committee, conducting research, handling meeting logistics, etc. Mark has contacted other library systems who have merged. Karla explained that system staff are trying to be proactive and anticipate questions.

Steve wants systems to get background information about what is possible and getting costs. Steve wants to get a framework to take back to libraries to get things moving.

Discussion and adoption of Committee Scope

Bradley pointed out that the draft scope makes sense from a system staff perspective, but systems often look at things through a different lens than libraries, and asked if the process makes sense to committee members. General agreement that it does.

How will communication with libraries work? WALs meets on 5th Tuesday, 3-4 times a year. OWLSnet meets bimonthly, next meeting in May. Winnefox directors have monthly or quarterly county meetings. Both OWLS and NFLS have directors meetings. We may also need to do communication outside of meetings or call special meetings. Member library staff and others may send comments or questions to the whole committee using ils-merger@winnefox.org email address or through a form on the web site. System staff have compiled a list of meetings which will be shared with the committee.

The timeline was again raised as a concern. Steve noted that phase 1 and phase 2 might intertwine a lot. There was general agreement that the committee is comfortable with the timeline as long as it's not set in stone.

Ann moved to adopt the committee scope. Gretchen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of guiding principles and values

In reading background info, Steve noticed differences between OWLSnet and WALs, but didn't think they were insurmountable.

Ann said customer service should be the number one guiding principle.

Joan raised the value of representation, each library has a vote. Various voting models could be considered: consensus, weighted voting, equal voting. Also, what kinds of things do we vote on?

OWLSnet uses weighted voting. Most issues are decided by consensus, but when a vote is required, AAC Bylaws state that a decision requires 2/3 member libraries and 2/3 fee shares. Both thresholds must be reached. Policy recommendations from AAC have to be adopted by the OWLS Board.

WALS uses equal voting. WALs does not have a written policy about voting; they just listen. Advisory committee makes recommendations to Mark and Jeff. If All WALs cannot reach consensus on something, Karla sends surveys and makes decisions based on that.

Joan thinks we need to nail things down because it's important that everyone has a say.

Gretchen asked if we can keep doing things the way we do, running two parallel governance systems.

Bradley wondered how that would work for decisions that affect all libraries on the ILS.

Steve would like to ask member libraries about how they feel about voting.

Karla shared that in her research, she has found that a lot of consortia do one library one vote. Within SRLAAW, there is variety, but also a majority doing one library one vote.

We will need to strike a balance between promoting resource sharing/equity and maintaining local control.

An example is how to handle local holds. And here we need to define our terms because we discovered that WALs and OWLSnet define that differently.

OWLSnet does not give preference to local patrons in filling holds. The first person in the holds queue gets the first item that is checked in regardless of the patron's home agency or the item's owning agency. So, when OWLSnet members say "local holds," they are generally talking about the idea of changing the hold fulfillment process to prioritize local patrons. OWLSnet has historically decided not to do this and the received wisdom is that it was thought to improve customer service and be more efficient for delivery and the speed of holds queues. OWLSnet also do not allow the use of "local holds only." Certain items can be set to "local use only" if they match the Resource Sharing List of Exceptions, which is voted on by AAC.

OWLSnet's definition of local holds – a library's items go to holds placed by their patrons first – is the default hold fulfillment process in WALs, so WALs doesn't have specific name for that. When WALs libraries speak of local holds, they are referring to temporarily giving an item a "local holds only" item type, so that only local patrons may place holds on that item. OWLSnet committee members thought of that as "moratorium."

Lucky Day is another way of prioritizing local patrons which WALs currently allows and OWLSnet does not. Gretchen indicated that the Lucky Day collection is very important to Neenah.

We will need to come up with a common language to discuss these topics clearly because there are likely sticking points here. The underlying principle of all of them is about how resource sharing works. System staff will work on definitions (see suggestion at the end of this document).

Aaron asked if we could get statistics on the wait time for the different holds filling processes.

Ann said she might be willing to consider prioritizing local holds in the holds queue (WALs default), but not the local holds/moratorium model, and Lucky day is a separate issue.

Sandy said she would consider not having local holds (referring to the moratorium version), but says she has a lot of browsing customers so it might affect customer service.

Holly said that each library has unique items, that it might want to keep local. However, as long as everyone shares it will work out with less issues. If some libraries do and some don't, then it will be messy.

Ann mentioned getting items from Winnefox, and Joan asked if OWLS has other areas of collaboration with Winnefox that do not include NFLS, like delivery. Ann clarified she was talking about ILS items through Wiscat. Bradley explained that OWLS has collaborated with Winnefox on CE and Trustee Tale. OWLS and Winnefox libraries share a lot of patrons who live near the system border and have two library cards. But, when a Neenah patron requests an Appleton item, delivery goes from APL to Madison to Neenah, which is inefficient. Ann noted that sometimes Winnefox patrons will return items at her library, and she can't check it in, so they accumulate fines while it goes through statewide delivery.

It was pointed out that delivery schedules may be a sticking point. All OWLS libraries have 5-day a week delivery, but many Winnefox and NFLS libraries do not. Differences will affect resource sharing. Bradley mentioned that the PLSR process may inform how delivery will be handled. Peg Burington, who serves on this committee but is currently at PLA, is on the delivery workgroup. The most recent model has moved the boundaries of the proposed delivery regions.

Communication will be difficult with this many libraries. Ann suggested forming committees. How does governance work?

Ann asked what others are looking for from this process. Aaron said money is a huge concern. If library costs are going to increase, he will probably not vote for it even with better customer service. If he can buy less with access to a bigger collection that is a consideration.

Steve asked if we need a collection standard or recommendation to member libraries that exceeds the state requirement. Would such a standard prevent library boards from cutting collection spending? WALs recommends that 10% of total expenditures goes to materials. In 2009, collection spending in WALs libraries ranged from 9% to 28%. What encourages libraries to contribute to the shared collection vs what is the benefit of consortium membership? Kristin said standards would be a sticking point for her because her board would not respond well to the consortium telling them how to spend local funds. Kristin's building is a major expense. Steve's building expenses aren't in his budget (because they share buildings with the villages). Bradley pointed out some libraries budgets look very different so standardizing these things and determining value would take work. Karla mentioned this might not have anything to do with the ILS, but Steve said the collection is intertwined with the ILS. Tracy mentioned disciplinary action could be recommended for libraries that take advantage of resource sharing.

Ann asked if we should make financial consideration a value in terms of merging and costs. Can libraries afford it? Bradley said there may be a big upfront cost, but our hope is that it would be more efficient over time. Each system will likely determine their own fees, so we want to be fair about distributing upfront costs. It's too soon to know what it will cost. We have compared current costs, but ILL pricing structure has changed, so we can't just extrapolate.

Sandy asked if it will cost counties above and beyond to merge. Steve asked if efficiency/cost savings is a goal or objective. Kristie pointed out that until we have real numbers it is impossible to know, and it's too soon to get those. Ann asked if this was going to be a shared cost or if only one system migrates, does that system absorb all the cost? Bradley and Karla stated that each system has some funds to do this. Bradley mentioned that the systems can propose a funding structure to the committee when it gets to that point, but it is premature

Joan suggested comparing databases to save costs and deduping services. Bradley said that reference databases are not specifically in scope but third-party services that interact with the ILS or OPAC may need to be discussed. Ann asked if the discovery layer is included? General agreement that discovery layer should be included in this discussion. Bradley thinks the online databases/enhanced content is a question for after we decide to move forward.

ILS third party data like Hoopla—what is allowed in a shared catalog if not everyone has access? WALs does not allow Hoopla records in the catalog. OWLSnet does allow Hoopla records in the catalog though only four libraries subscribe.

Aaron is going to take the list of principles/values back to his county and ask which of these is more important than others and rank them. We also may be missing something from the principles/values list. We can also ask libraries about what sticking points they anticipate.

Karla suggests that questions and answers about how we do things and how our different ILSes are set up might uncover more fundamental differences or areas like local holds where we aren't speaking the same language.

Steve wants to direct people to the discussion email.

Desiree asked committee members to think about governance for next meeting. She doesn't think OWLSnet's weighted voting based on fees would work because our WALs and OWLSnet fee structures are different. Bradley mentioned that if the committee wanted to explore weighted voting, they might look at the variables used to calculate fees in both systems (population, circulation, etc.) and consider those for weighting factors.

Bradley explained that system staff have set up a Google Drive folder for working documents and asked people to give us the email address they want to use to access those documents.

During this discussion, Tracy took notes on a flip chart as follows:

- Philosophies:
 - Customer service #1
 - ILS Representation/Hoopla etc.
 - Vote/Voice/1 vote per library
 - Consensus/weighted voting
 - Keep local control/sharing balance
 - Local holds/equity of access
 - Moratorium/lucky day
- Delivery
- Communication between member libraries
- Governance
- Financial responsibilities/efficiencies
- Collection standards

Schedule April meeting

Wednesdays seem to work. Next meeting: April 18th, 10:00am in Ripon.

Meeting adjourned

Suggested terms for the purpose of future discussions, drafted by system staff after the meeting:

Location Agnostic Holds = The first patron in line gets the first available item. OWLSnet default.

Local Priority Holds = My patron gets my stuff first, and then stuff automatically goes to fill all other holds. WALs default.

Local Item Holds = Only local patrons can place a hold on an item; temporary status. WALs "local holds." Not permitted in OWLSnet.

**ILS Merger Exploration Committee
Minutes**

Wednesday, April 18, 2018

Location: Ripon Public Library, Silver Creek Room

Committee members present: Desiree Bongers, Peg Burington, Linda DeNell, Joan Denis, Kristie Hauer, Ann Hunt, Kristin Laufenberg, Gretchen Raab, Aaron Raschke, Holly Selwitschka, Steve Thiry, Sandy Zuehlke

Support Staff present: Mark Arend, Amanda Lee, Bradley Shipps, Tracy Vreeke, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe

Others present: Jerry Letcher,

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Desiree Bongers at 10:03. Introductions went around the table. Gretchen moved and Joan seconded approval of the March minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda item: Determine use of Google folder vs website

Bradley & Mark clarified their understanding of the Google folders and Samarbeid website.

- The website is for meeting documents, background papers, and committee approved “official documents”. This is a public website and directors, staff, and trustees are encouraged to follow the committee’s work here.
- The Google folder is for documents “Not ready for Prime Time”: a place for committee members to cooperatively work on documents and to post preliminary documents and research. It is available to committee members and staff.
- There is a second Google folder available to system staff to prepare reports and other documents for committee review.

It was noted that documents should state who prepared them.

Agenda item: Review and feedback from other libraries of what was accomplished at last meeting

Ann: resource sharing secondary to customer service. Some WALs practices are concerning because of a seeming unwillingness to share everything. Kristin: similar concerns. Smaller libraries in OWLS know they have an equal chance of getting everything because we share.
Ann: Not sharing everything a step backwards.

Bradley: Eva @ Black Creek came from Lakeshores and prefers the way OWLSnet does it. Directors of small libraries like it. Ann: Manawa reports new book shelf mostly full and lots on holds pickup shelf.

Peg: can we do a study? Steve: data regarding lucky day inconclusive. Infosoup did a study some years back. Holly: different perceptions; we are all professionals and all share. Libraries have to be responsible for buying for their own users. Is there agreement that it’s OK to make some items non-holdable or holdable for pickup only at the owning library? These would be rare or valuable items (local history, etc.) and stuff that is fragile, unusual, or many pieces that would not travel well on the van.

Joan & Ann: Questions about lucky day. Gretchen: these are purchases over and above regular circulating, holdable copies.

Joan: one director said holds get filled faster without lucky day. Steve: can we put together document explaining this stuff? Wants to see standards for lucky day and local holds to see if in agreement, the only issue may only be holds prioritization. Likes that OWLSnet users can see where they are on holds list.

Sandy: local holds not that important for Waushara Co. directors. Joan: directors didn't see this as major sticking points. Bradley: holds list prioritization probably not deal breaker. Local holds probably would be.

Ann: what are Winnefox sticking points? Gretchen: lucky day. Aaron: local holds. Kristin: director had questions about cost. Bradley: each system can set costs for member libraries.

Agenda item: Discuss cost models for a) migration and b) ongoing maintenance

Agreement between Winnefox & OWLS directors that migration costs will be split 50/50. Both systems have reserve funds for this.

Kristie H: might be state or LSTA money available? Mark: John DeBacher had informally said that, depending on availability of funds, Division would be open to considering this.

Sandy: anyone else doing this? Jeff: Lakeshores SHARE added Kenosha a couple years ago and the Arrowhead libraries earlier this year. Bradley: seems to be more openness for ILS mergers.

Ann: if Winnefox libraries want acquisitions who pays for it? Mark: Winnefox. Jeff: Good chance that total ongoing costs will be less than both paying now. Mark: informal price from SirsiDynix was that they would charge a merged system about 1-1/2% of what Winnefox pays now. Very informal estimate, as final price depends on what modules are chosen.

Two cost-sharing issues for annual maintenance costs:

- How costs are split between the systems
- How each system divides up costs for member libraries.

Do all libraries, in all 3 systems, have to pay on the same basis or can consortium divide up cost between Winnefox and OWLS/Nicolet and systems decide how to divide costs between system & libraries?

Bradley: reminded the group that fees came up because it is basis of OWLSnet voting. Suggested last time to look at the factors that go into the fees. Doesn't necessarily have to be used to determine voting, but that's why it came up in the last meeting.

Agenda item: Discuss governance models

Ann: doesn't see OWLSnet voting as a block. More likely divide up on big v. small. Linda: discussion because we're all small—needs to be one library one vote. Aaron: less concern in Marquette Co. because small libraries will stick together. Tracy: don't see voting lining up OWLS/Nicolet.

Bradley: what do we vote on? When does something reach the level of voting? Consortium with 58 libraries probably can't continue discussion/consensus model. Ann: sees need for some sort of exec committee to make decisions. Can't use one library/one vote. Bradley: what is that committee's charge?

Bradley: policies & procedures on OWLS page.
<https://owlsnet.org/owlsnet/policies/circulation-policies-and-procedures> and
<https://owlsnet.org/owlsnet/aac>

Desiree: hard to tell in advance what issues will go to governance body, what may come up.
Bradley: we need a procedure for bringing issues to the group.

Jeff: Need mechanism to ensure every library has voice.

Aaron: What does SCLS do? Ann: service committees & exec committee. Bradley: what committees do we need? Policy currently goes to OWLS board. Procedure set at library committee level. What will we do—go to all 3 system boards? Ann: exec committee should have power to set policy—take it out of system board hands. Final policy should be in library hands. Mark: decisions have to be fair and everyone has to agree they are fair, that decision was made fairly.

Agenda item: Discuss the Philosophies-Values-Sticking Points

Desiree: Any other real issues besides local holds? Steve: it's really resource sharing. Ann: it's customer service.

Aaron: delivery. Libraries might be more inclined to agree if everyone has 5-day delivery.
Peg: PLSR proposal is 5-day for everyone. Bradley: long-term depends on system funding.
Jeff: a combined ILS would put us in a good position to pilot some regional hubs and delivery models.

Delivery out of scope of this committee but it is linked and there are some efficiencies we can do better. OWLS & Nicolet both use Waltco. Winnefox has own vans and drivers.

Kristin L: concern that small libraries might lose out if delivery reduced.
Joan: did we decide that collection standards are outside of this group? Winnefox has recommendation of 10% of budget. Ann: some consortia have holds ratio policy.

Agenda item: Schedule May meeting

Neenah Public Library, Shattuck Room, Wednesday, May 16, 10:30 – 1:00 (Please note time change).

Action items for the next meeting:

Winnefox staff:

- Report on how Lucky Day (no holds allowed) and Local Hold (only a library's cardholders can place a hold) are used in Winnefox

OWLS staff:

- Ask Innovative for billing criteria

System staff:

- Research governance models in use at other large systems/consortia
- Draft a basic resource sharing policy
- Draft a committee-based governance model
- Draft a system-level cost sharing plan for start-up/migration costs and ongoing maintenance costs based on how SirsiDynix would charge us. Will do same for III if that information comes available.

Respectfully submitted, Mark Arend, (notes by Mark Arend, Amanda Lee, Bradley Shipps)

DRAFT

Meeting of ILS Merger Exploration Committee

Wednesday, May 16, 2018

10:30 am - 12:30 pm

Location: Neenah Public Library, 240 E Wisconsin Ave, Neenah, WI 54956
Shattuck Meeting Room
[Directions](#)

Parking is available in the Library lot. If the lot is full, there is 3 hour on-street parking available in front of the Library on Wisconsin Ave. Additional parking is available on Wisconsin Ave east of Oak Street.

Preparation

Prior to the meeting, please visit the committee website at <https://sites.google.com/view/samarbeid/home> and review these items:

- Draft minutes of the April 18 meeting
- Draft resource sharing policy
- Draft governance models
- Draft cost sharing model

Agenda

- 1) Welcome and introductions
- 2) Approve April 18, 2018 minutes
- 3) Review of last meeting and feedback from libraries
- 4) Discussion of draft resource sharing policy
- 5) Discussion of draft governance models
- 6) Discussion of draft cost sharing model
- 7) Determination of next steps
 - Database maintenance/cataloging discussion in June
- 8) Schedule June meeting