**Minutes:**

1. **Call to order and Establishment of Quorum**: 9:15 am

Present: Karla Smith, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Aaron Raschke, Clairellyn Sommersmith, Gretchen Raab, Cindy Wallace, Lori Burgess, Julie Stobbe, Vicki Lenz. Holly Selwitschka also attended.

Absent: Desiree Bongers, Chris Kalupa, Mark Arend.

2. **Approval of the Minutes of March 8:** Aaron R moved to approve Minutes from March meeting; Clairellyn S seconded. Approved.

3. **OWLSnet Talks:**

**Jeff gave introductory comments about his view of resource sharing.** Jeff expressed concern about how some people are clinging to minutia. Sharing needs to be looked at from 30,000 ft, not just the number of holds on specific titles or types of items. Rather look at the Netborrower/Netlender numbers over time.

Jeff also expressed concern about the level of acrimony he heard (and heard about) at the last ALL-WALS meeting. He is concerned that we are drifting towards a rationale of compelling each other to do things, instead of trusting the judgment of each library’s director. For example: Coloma’s decision not to buy M. Obama’s Becoming. While, he personally believes he would have made a different decision in Sandy’s place, he defends Sandy’s right to make that decision for her own library.

In summary: Be a good sharer—give and get in equal proportions, not necessarily exact same materials. The main thrust is to abide by the principles and recommendations in place. Work out differences between individual libraries and use peer pressure as needed. Ex: after Desiree’s comments about OPL not buying Blu-Ray, Jeff directed the selector at OPL to be sure to buy a combo pack (if there is one) of any/all hot titles she orders. Placed a special $3,000 order to increase combo-pack collection.

**Comments from Samarbeid Meeting:**

Jeff: It boils down to “Can we work with these people?”

Holly S is concerned that we don’t have the same philosophies and that we might lose our individual identities. Not sure if all OWLSnet libraries are being represented by the people on the Samarbeid committee. Also, since Samarbeid committee is dominated by OWLSnet loud voices, she wonders if AAC policies are also determined by loudest voices. She has never left a Samarbeid meeting feeling positive. However, she also has never left feeling it was time to quit.

Aaron R reasoned that, since OWLSnet members of Samarbeid are people who volunteered, it is likely that they are the people who have the strongest convictions. He assumes they have the same end goals as we do. They probably aren’t *trying* to bulldoze us. But it is true that it is hard to get a word in edgewise.

Gretchen R also agrees that there is a danger of losing our independence. She was grateful that the facilitator intervened several times to allow people to finish their thoughts.

Gretchen is also concerned about loss of nimbleness. She cited Lucky Day as an example. Lucky Day has been a long established practice. We didn’t go through any boards to get started. APL has been trying for years to get LD, but it had to go through AAC and OWLSnet Board, then procedures also have to be developed and determined.

Gretchen doesn’t sense the same level of trust in OWLSnet that we have in WALS. “We have something really good here, I would hate to lose that.” Also a sense that OWLSnet is a standing as a block—not the 40-30-30 of each system, but 40-60.

Cindy W relayed Chris Kalupa’s comments: Chris also commented that without the facilitator one or two people would have completely dominated the conversation. Chris brought up that she felt WALS made a good faith effort in giving up LH, and she didn’t see that willingness to give from the OWLSnet people.

There was consensus that the Small Library Summit had a different tenor than the Samarbeid meetings. Perhaps the issue is with the individuals on the Samarbeid committee and they don’t speak for all of OWLSnet.

Jeff summarized by saying that he still believes that there would be significant benefit from a bigger catalog, and doesn’t want to shut down discussions yet. However, he feels the need to express the concerns that he is hearing. Two things that encapsulate his concerns: 1) The push for NOW policies to be based on OWLSnet model; and 2) how is Directors’ Council not AAC?

Jeff also assured WTEC that

* He will carefully read by-laws, and that we need to talk them through with all our libraries. He doesn’t consider them a “done deal.”
* He will come up with some “what if” scenarios to test the governance structure.
* He is also concerned with issues of innovation and legislating libraries, and will ask how do we preserve “nimbility” or quickly implement a new thing.
* Until we’ve found a governance structure under which we feel that we can “live and thrive”, he won’t bring the matter to the board.

Lori B added an outside perspective: It is difficult to stop doing something (ex of closing 10-yr old job center services). Even if merger doesn’t happen, it hasn’t been a waste of time. There are also different approaches to take to achieve similar goals—like a Discovery layer bridging systems. Also, both systems have reached this point from completely different backgrounds. WALS and OWLS libraries were added as natural growth of system—they joined willingly. Nicolet was in a difficult position and didn’t have much choice. OWLSnet doesn’t know any other way than what they’ve been doing, and we don’t know any other way than what we’ve been doing.

4. **Purchasing thresholds for items with holds**:

Consensus is that there is no need to add numbers into the Principles of Participation, or set a firm threshold. There were concerns that not all library directors are aware of the guidelines as they exist or aware of the existing tools to help meet those guidelines.

There was also consensus that:

1. WALS should provide more training on what is expected from new directors
2. WALS should provide more reports to point out or highlight titles with lots of holds
   1. Specifically, that WALS should provide a new report that lists titles with holds which haven’t been filled within 3 months.
3. WALS should provide more training on what to do with the various reports we are running for libraries.

5. **Using Every Checkout as a factor when calculating WALS fees.**

Consensus is that there is no reason to change the factors in calculating the WALS fees. The handout shows there isn’t much difference (at least this year) between the library percentages when calculated using DPI numbers and when calculated using system-run numbers. System-run numbers are more current and as such are more accurate proxy for system usage. Also, system-run numbers pick up the blips (like Princeton’s checking out everything to Storage) which correlate directly to system load and staff time.

6. **Overdrive/WPLC Update**

Collection Development Workgroup recommended we wait another year to increase the budget. Steering committee disagrees and advocates for increase. The report at WAPL shows that Winnefox still has the healthiest advantage accounts.

There are still the same concerns as always: Some libraries say they can’t afford to increase amount spent. Others (including us) are concerned that we will strangle the project by lack of funding. Yes, Wisconsin has the lowest spend per user and spend per checkout of peer rate, but this is at the cost of very long hold lines. Not necessarily a good thing. Hold times are way more than 3 months.

7. **General Technology update and discussion of projects.**

Dell buying group is going forward. The long term goal is for all library systems in state to get same level of IT funding. The short term goal is to setup statewide Dell purchasing at same shared discount.

Shared server backup/digitization projects is to setup an off-site backup facility for all systems across the state to have a safe backup mechanism. Spearheaded by WVLS and SCLS, this is a more expensive project. They are looking for LSTA funds. We have already committed $27,000 of our allocated 2018 LSTA grant to this project. Not sure about 2019 LSTA money yet. Goal is to build a shared infrastructure across the state so that there could be backup of support. Also want to create standards for purchasing and support.

For management of either/both these projects, there is talk of setting up an steering committee. Jeff recommends using WPLC. That’s exactly what it was designed for.

KnowB4 Training: Is some email security training that we are exploring in collaboration with a couple other systems.

8. **Future Agenda Items**

* Purchasing thresholds revisited when Desiree can be there—specifically in regards to Blu-Ray.
* More OWLSnet

No current conflicts with July 12th as next meeting date. Meeting adjourned at: ?? 11-ish?