NICE Team Meeting Notes

Tuesday, March 19, 2024 | 9:00 am - 11:00 am

ATTENDEES: Sue Heskin (Superior), Alexander Johnson (MCPL), Jackee Johnson (NWLS),   Sara Kelmann (Eagle River), Laurie Ollhoff (Merrill), Molly Lank-Jones (Hayward), Rachel Metzler (WVLS), Peggy O'Connell (Minocqua), Gina Rae (NWLS), Katelyn Sabelko (MCPL), Teresa Schmidt (Mercer), Katie Zimmermann (WVLS)

ABSENT: Tammie Blomberg (Rib Lake), Kelly Wiisanen (Superior)

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

Meeting started at: 9:00 am

Meeting Agenda

1. **Formula and Budget Workgroup Update**
   The team reviewed the formula and budget workgroup recommendation. Project managers reminded the team that the workgroup met three times and a subgroup of system staff also met in order to get to this recommendation.

   The group, through these meetings, simplified the shared budget, so it reflects only ILS items that must be shared (i.e., there can only be a single invoice). The approach allows each system to maintain the local practices that its libraries are familiar with.

   The group has recommended a funding approach calculated on the percentage of the total shared cost based on the previous three-year average of collection size and circulation, with a per-site base cost of 1% of the total budget. This is essentially the formula that NWLS currently uses.

   Further, the workgroup felt that the application of a unified base fee for shared cost is a way to ensure a shared sense of buy-in and ownership of the ILS. This funding approach allows every library an equitable investment or financial commitment. This approach also acknowledges that certain data points (circulation and collection size) may change from year to year in an effort to build agility and sustainability.

   The team was asked if they had any questions or if they needed any other information from the workgroup.

   S. Klemann noted she was on the workgroup and was very happy with the recommendation.

K. Sabelko shared that it is equitable and agreed with the workgroup's recommendations. S. Heskin also shared that she was on that workgroup and agreed that it makes a lot of sense specifically regarding equity.

There was consensus and general acceptance of the recommendation. The next step is to share the recommendation with the membership.

The workgroup was thanked for their hard work in getting to this recommendation.

2. **Holds Fulfillment Workgroup Update**
The Holds Fulfillment Workgroup met yesterday. They reviewed the previous workgroups' recommendations and the current holds process in both systems and discussed priority on local holds, paging priority, and standardization of transit slips. The group has a meeting poll out to schedule their next meeting in April.

The recommendation likely won't be ready for the April meeting, but the team will be updated as soon as there is more information.

The topic is very detailed, and the group will need a couple of meetings to reach a recommendation. P. O'Connell shared differences between how holds are taken care of with her staff and they were supportive of any recommendations. They saw the benefits of both approaches.

3. **Appoint Targeted Workgroups**
The NICE team refined the charge and anticipated work for the Records Standards Workgroup.

The workgroup document had not been well-fleshed out, so a good amount of thoughts and work had been done in the comments and suggestions. The workgroup used the comments to structure the discussion.

R. Metzler noted she took the approach of what work should be done and whom but expressed an openness to a different approach.

J. Johnson shared that NWLS went in a different direction because they have a centralized cataloging process that is unlikely to change, so having the workgroup determine who does what work wouldn't be the best approach. She had put in an alternate charge in the document focused on determining standards.

Team members shared that they were concerned there would not be enough time for the workgroup to reach a recommendation on a record standard.

The project managers asked, If workflows can't change, what should this workgroup focus on?

There is a worry that the standards won't match, but it was shared that those standards are likely closer than not. Some team members shared that they felt parts of this discussion were not suitable outside of system directors. There may need to be a different set of workgroup members, especially if the topic is focused on workflow changes and financial impacts.

S. Klemann offered that this group compares the standards and sees how far apart the standards actually are and decides pathways for future decision-making. There was a good amount of agreement on this by member library representatives.

It was suggested that the workgroup will need to focus on the things that have to be determined right away, and the group discussed removing "minimum" from the charge and rather, focusing on the development of a standard.

Non-system staff members were asked what they felt would be the most valuable output of this workgroup.

A. Johnson noted that having standards is what is most important. If workflow changes occur, that would be the next step. L. Ohloff agreed. S. Heskin also agreed that a shared standard was the primary need, and records should make sense and not need to be changed/corrected later. There was further agreement in the chat.

K. Zimmermann noted that standards are different between the two systems and would like to be careful not to start with language that refers to compromising or lower standard records.

More discussion about the charge ensued, with the group agreeing to edit it to "Determine what constitutes a completed record in a shared ILS with the goal of enhancing the patron experience while considering future processes."

There was consensus that the workgroup would focus on new records and not revising past records in a shared ILS.

There was robust discussion about whether the workgroup could accomplish its charge; while some members had concerns, most agreed that the workgroup should meet and begin the work. The project managers noted that they will try to help the workgroup think about things in different phases (Pre-merger, Implementation, Day One, In the future, etc.)

The group discussed and updated the questions and topics for the workgroup to consider.

S. Klemann asked if the cataloging group at the state level had anything that could be helpful. That group is offering basic cataloging suggestions and is not yet positioned to help this process.

The group refined workgroup membership. MCPL recommended Chris Luebbe would be the proper representative and WVLS would like to add a director who does cataloging to the committee.

4. **Standing Item: Communication**
   The Town Hall meeting has been scheduled. NICE team members have reached out to directors to encourage participation. Two team members indicated willingness to present. NWLS has a meeting on Thursday and will share it with the system. A. Johnson and K. Sabelko are both willing to help present as well.

   L. Ohlofff noted that she has had staff members submit questions via the web form, but they have not received a response. It has been over a month. The leadership team has received the questions and they discuss and decide what to add to the FAQ. The team will reach out to the staff members.

   Three team members noted that the ILS recommendation is getting more attention. This can be added to the April agenda for the NICE team to consider/reconsider if it is something that is identified at the Town Hall meeting.

   The next meeting is on April 16.

   Meeting ended at 10:38 AM.