NICE Team Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 17, 2023 | 9:00 am - 11:00 am

ATTENDEES: Tammie Blomberg (Rib Lake), Sue Heskin (Superior), Alexander Johnson (MCPL), Jackee Johnson (NWLS), Rachel Metzler (WVLS), Peggy O'Connell (Minocqua), Gina Rae (NWLS), Kelly Wiisanen (Superior), Katie Zimmermann (WVLS)

ABSENT: Sara Kelmann (Eagle River), Molly Lank-Jones (Hayward), Laurie Ollhoff (Merrill), Katelyn Sabelko (MCPL), Teresa Schmidt (Mercer)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Melody Clark (WiLS) Melissa McLimans (WiLS)

Meeting started at: 9:00am

1. **Communication Plan Update**
   The team reviewed the [communication plan](#) with the updated internal communication section. The group was reminded it was suggested at the last meeting to include internal team communication. It was noted that the communication plan with the internal communication would not be published on the NICE website, it will just be made available via the shared Drive.

2. **ILS Vendor Targeted Workgroup Update**
   The team heard an update on the ILS Vendor Targeted Workgroup. Project managers shared the workgroup met last week on the 12th. Each group member was asked to fill out a rubric for their top ILS choice in advance of the meeting. During the meeting, each team member shared their top choice and their pros and cons. The group also asked and discussed several other questions they had about the ILS vendors. From the prework, it was noted that none of the members selected the ILS product, CARL, as their top choice, so that was taken off the table as an option.

   The group then created rubrics together for the two remaining ILS options. At the end of the meeting, there was a slight lean towards Koha. There were some unanswered questions that the leadership team will work to provide for the next meeting, which will be held on the 30th. At that meeting, the group will review the information requested and determine if the new information changes the scores on the rubrics.

   It was noted that it was interesting that the group was looking at new elements that appeared when thinking about a joint effort rather than an individual ILS purchase.

3. **Appoint a Funding Formula and Budget Targeted Workgroup**
   Now that the ILS workgroup is underway, the NICE Team worked to appoint a Funding
   Formula and Budget workgroup. The group considered a charge, questions, and topics
   for the group to address and membership.

   a. **Workgroup Charge**
      The Leadership Team proposed the following workgroup charge: Determine the
      funding formula and how costs will be distributed among members for the shared
      ILS and related products and services.

      The Leadership Team noted that the workgroup was expanded to include the
      budget along with the funding formula. In order to talk about the full budget, the
      leadership team will need to come to the meetings with prepared numbers to
      make it possible to have discussions in the time frame laid out.

      The group asked for feedback on the charge. There was a question about timing
      with the ILS Selection Workgroup. Project managers clarified that the ILS
      workgroup may need a third meeting, but will try to schedule it before the Funding
      and Budget workgroup meets.

      There were no changes to the charge.

   b. **Questions/ and topics for the workgroup to address.**
      The group was reminded that the NICE Team had identified formula scenarios in
      the feasibility stage of this work, and the workgroup will review those, though they
      are not required only to consider those formula scenarios.

      The leadership team has identified the following for the group to review:
      ● What is included in the budget? Is it possible to provide a five-year
        projection?
        ○ Is this sustainable over time?
      ● What is the funding formula?
      ● How might the decision impact by-laws or agreements (participation,
        compliance, etc.)?
      ● What is the estimated annual cost for each library?
      The group added the additional questions:
      ● Will we have an idea of support staff costs at the system? Can this be
        considered as part of the funding formula?
        ○ It was clarified that system staff is partially part of the ILS budget

      The Leadership Team has a meeting set up with system staff and directors to suss
      out what costs the system will support and what will be set aside for members.

The team hopes to bring a proposed breakdown of what costs will be covered by the system and the amount libraries pay as part of the consortium, at least as a starting point, to this targeted workgroup.

    c. Workgroup membership

The Leadership Team proposed the following:
- Sherry Machones, NWLS
- Marla Sepnafski, WVLS
- Jackee Johnson, NWLS
- Katie Zimmermann, WVLS
- Sara Klemann, (Eagle River), NWLS
- Cherie Sanderson (Boulder Junction), NWLS
- Leah Giordano or Katelyn Sabelko (MCPL), WVLS
- Sue Heskin (SPL), NWLS
- Peggy O'Connell (MPL) WVLS
- Amber Brill (Greenwood) WVLS

This is a larger workgroup, but the Leadership Team wanted to make sure there was robust representation. There are 2-3 meetings expected of the workgroup. There were no additions or changes. It was noted that potential members have not been contacted yet, and the Leadership Team will reach out to the potential members and move forward after this meeting

4. **Standing Item: Communication**

Are there any communication needs or questions that have come up, and what is the status of the replies?

The Leadership Team noted that the questions from last month are still in process. There is a draft, and hopefully, by next month, there will be final answers for the website.

The meeting moved quickly today, and project managers shared that in the coming meetings, the pattern will likely be an update from one workgroup and a recommendation from another.

The meeting ended at 9:28 am