NICE Team Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 21, 2023 | 9:00 am - 11:00 am

ATTENDEES: Tammie Blomberg (Rib Lake), Sue Heskin (Superior), Alexander Johnson (MCPL), Sara Kelmann (Eagle River), Jackee Johnson (NWLS), Rachel Metzler (WVLS), Peggy O'Connell (Minocqua), Laurie Ollhoff (Merrill), Gina Rae (NWLS), Katelyn Sabelko (MCPL), Teresa Schmidt (Mercer), Kelly Wiisanen (Superior), Katie Zimmermann (WVLS)

ABSENT: Molly Lank-Jones (Hayward)

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

Meeting started at: 9:00am

Meeting Agenda

1. **ILS Vendor Targeted Workgroup Recommendation**
   The team reviewed the ILS Vendor Targeted Workgroup Recommendation. The ILS Workgroup recommends Koha from the vendor Bywater with a caveat that the acquisitions module needs to be fully functional for consortia by the time NWLS and WVLS migrate. The workgroup reached a majority on this recommendation after utilizing the decision-making matrix individually and as a group. It was noted that MCPL is not currently able to support the change due to staff and operational stability concerns.

   The group discussed how they wanted to move forward with this recommendation.

   It was noted that there is a difficult task in front of the group and though consensus was not achieved in the workgroup, it was important to make a decision to help move things forward.

   It was indicated by one member that they are reluctant to move forward with the recommendation due to unfamiliarity with the recommended ILS. Project managers shared that there are notes and rubrics available from the workgroup that show why the group arrived at its decision.

   Two members of the workgroup reported they did not receive the agenda that contained links to the workgroup recommendation.

   The recommendation pathway was clarified. The workgroups make a recommendation that the NICE team reviews and a report will be completed to be shared with ILS consortia

members and system boards for vote. Other workgroups use the other recommendations to form their own decisions as well.

It was asked if there are policy related recommendations that are ILS dependent. The Funding Formula workgroup has begun and it needs actual numbers. They are currently working with estimates, but actuals are desired. Records standards, cataloging, and other workgroup recommendations may hinge on which ILS is picked as well. It would be duplicative work to consider things for both ILS products.

The group was asked if there are questions for the ILS workgroup that would require another meeting. There was some confusion that the WVLS group, by a slight margin, had decided to recommend keeping Sierra and how the two recommendations would be unified or clearly communicated. It was shared that there was more information received about Koha through the process that made the decision more comfortable for members from WVLS. The rubrics were also used to show the work and how the Koha decision might be more suitable for the NICE project and differ from the system recommendation. The group discussed how it can communicate well about the differences to alleviate some of the confusion.

Project managers communicated that the ILS recommendation can also be shared with membership along with a simple survey that asks if libraries/members can support the recommendation. This would be a way for this group to feel comfortable with the recommendation and adding it to the final report. Some NICE team members indicated that it may not make sense to get feedback at this point as it could cause confusion and that it may make more sense to trust the process. It was noted that stakeholders are all at different levels of engagement with the process, so it might be useful to make sure all stakeholders have as much information as possible and have opportunities to weigh in. The desire is to avoid confusion or dissent late in the process.

As part of this discussion, the current state of Koha's acquisitions module was clarified.

Because the group felt that surveying the membership may not provide helpful results, based on past experience, it discussed options beyond a survey. It was suggested that the systems share the recommendation to members, ask for feedback, through email and as an agenda item at upcoming consortia meetings.

The group indicated that it is comfortable with moving forward with the workgroup recommendation and there is no need to ask further questions of the workgroup at this point. The group agreed that a one pager or video could be sent out to make people aware of the recommendation and it can be an agenda item for future system meetings.

The group was asked if workgroups are the right approach for this process and if there is anything additional that could be supplied. It was noted that moving towards more specifics in workgroups is a good sign. Others noted that the workgroup process is still a good one. There is a fear that some groups have more complicated questions in front of them.

2. **Formula and Budget Workgroup Update**
   The team heard an update on the Formula and Budget Workgroup.
   The workgroup met last week and reviewed the funding formulas outlined in the NICE Project Feasibility Report. In addition, they reviewed and discussed funding formula scenario spreadsheets that the NICE Leadership Team put together using a $500,000 budget for each scenario.

   The group agreed to remove two scenarios from consideration; the scenario using a percentage of the total cost of 25% based on extended service population and 75% based on the previous three-year average of collection circulation, and the scenario that is a percentage of the total cost based on the previous three-years average circulation.

   In addition, the group added two scenarios to review, which are minor modifications of existing scenarios. The first is applying a .5% base cost to the existing scenario of the total cost based on the previous three-year average of collection size and circulation. And the second is adding a three-year average circulation to the existing scenario of a simple average of each member's portion of their annual circulation and total holdings.

   New budgets will be prepared using the additional scenarios for the group to review before their next meeting.

   K. Zimmerman asked if this group would like to get the targeted workgroup emails as well. The group agreed that at this time it would not be helpful. All targeted workgroup documentation is available in the shared Google Drive folder.

3. **Expectations and Roles for Workgroup Members**
   The team reviewed a [draft of workgroup roles and expectations](#).
   It was shared that this information was drafted to help in explaining and clarifying workgroup expectations when recruiting workgroup members. The group was asked feedback and if there were any suggested changes.

   It was suggested to add a link to the rubric in the document.

4. **Appoint Targeted Workgroups**
   The group developed and appointed members to the [Delivery](#) and [Governance](#) Targeted Workgroups

Delivery Workgroup

The Leadership Team proposed the following workgroup charge: Determine the structure of delivery for a shared ILS including vendor expectations, sorting methods, and any necessary route / stop changes or additions.

The group asked for feedback on the charge. It was asked if this group is talking about the idea of sharing materials and how it would work. This group is not expected to handle holds fulfillment or how materials are shared. The group should assume some amount of materials will be shared between the consortia.

The group was comfortable with the charge with the addition of noting the expectation that materials will be shared. After discussion, the charge was updated to, "Determine the structure of delivery for a shared ILS platform and collections including vendor expectations, sorting methods, and any necessary route / stop changes or additions."

Delivery Workgroup Work and Issues to Address

The Leadership Team has identified the following for the group to review:
- If possible, estimate increased need for delivery.
- Review any available statistics on how many WISCAT loans occur per year between NWLS and WVLS
- What, if any, increase in time dealing with delivery for individual libraries and system staff is anticipated?
- Is additional space needed at libraries or at system offices or vendor sort to deal with delivery?
- How would sorting between systems happen? Would NWLN libraries have a WVLS bin and vice versa?
- Does the transportation of items continue to go through statewide delivery? Would an increase be problematic for the vendor?
- How will delivery cost increases be handled, if there are any?
- Study current delivery routes and delivery times between NWLS and WVLS libraries.

The group was asked if they had any changes or additions. There was a question related to precision of numbers and if this workgroup will result in a route plan and time estimates. It is not clear how detailed the outcomes will be. It may start broader as what has to change and what has to be planned for. There will be as many specifics as possible.

It was asked how can a determination be made on space needs at libraries. This was on the list because it was a concern during Project WIN. If libraries are doing sorting or vendors can help answer the question, but the group may not be able to get to a precise

answer of square footage or space changes. Additional space at libraries could be handled very broadly. There is a fear of getting too into the weeds and better to keep in mind rather than calculate space and cost needs. The group discussed shifting the existing question to avoid confusion. The question is ok but the group will need to be steered out of the weeds. Project managers will be clear that we are looking for more general terms and don't need absolutes.

Suggested change is, what are facility needs for system and member libraries to successfully handle delivery and sorting.

Delivery Workgroup Membership
The leadership proposed the following:
- Jackee Johnson, NWLS ILS Administrator
- Sherry Machones, NWLS System Director
- Jamie Matczak, WVLS Courier Contact
- Sarah May, NWLS Resource Sharing Coordinator
- Rachel Metzler, WVLS ILL Coordinator
- Marla Sepnafski, WVLS System Director
- Katie Zimmermann, WVLS ILS Administrator

The systems shared that they wanted to include system directors because delivery costs are mostly covered by the systems and the contracts with vendors are with systems. Delivery coordinators were seen as necessary as well as ILL coordinators. The membership of the workgroup is balanced by role and not number of staff.

Governance Workgroup Charge
The Leadership Team proposed the following workgroup charge: Determine a structure for joint decision making for shared aspects of the ILS.

The group asked for feedback on the charge. It was noted that the charge should reflect any other broader applications (ie collection sharing, etc.).

There was a suggested change to "Determine a structure for joint decision making in this shared partnership." The feasibility report uses the language of the joint ILS. Another suggestion was made of "Determine a structure for decision making for a joint ILS and resource sharing as we work towards the potential of shared practices and policies." The group was comfortable with that change.

Governance Workgroup Work and Issues to Address
The Leadership Team has identified the following for the group to review:

- The group will review the current structures of both systems using the scenario where both NWLN and V-Cat Consortium stay intact as governing bodies and discuss the following:
  - Representation - one representative per library or elected representatives for a larger group
  - Voting - weighted, one vote per institution/representative
  - Will the structure include decision making or recommending to other bodies for decision making

The group was asked if they had any changes or additions. It was asked if the workgroup will discuss how groups will come together to vote and discuss topics. The bullet points were clarified. The recommendation from the feasibility phase was that the group would move forward with a shared ILS but separate consortia. This workgroup would be determining the shared decisions.

It was suggested that the group consider a one consortium model but members felt that would be too large of a charge. There were suggestions to change the name of the work group to Collaborative Decision Making Workgroup. The group agreed to this change.

Governance Workgroup Membership
The leadership proposed the following:
- Tammie Blomberg, Director Rib Lake, or Kay Heiting, Director Granton
- Leah Giordano, Katelyn Sabelko or Alexander Johnson, MCPL
- Sue Heskin, Director Superior Public Library
- Jackee Johnson, NWLS ILS Administrator
- Cherie Sanderson, Director Boulder Junction Library
- Teresa Schmidt, Director, Mercer Public Library
- Janay Ziebell, V-Cat Chair
- Katie Zimmermann, WVLS ILS Administrator

The systems both wanted leadership from their consortium and steering committees with a balance for library sizes. From MCPL, it is best to have Leah G. on the workgroup.

5. **Standing Item: Communication**
   Leadership is continuing to update the FAQs on the project website. The team was encouraged to share questions and encourage dialogue. No questions were reported from workgroup members.

   The meeting at ended at 11:02 am