

# NICE Team Meeting Notes

Tuesday, June 18, 2024 | 9:00 am - 11:00 am

ATTENDEES: Sue Heskin (Superior), Alexander Johnson (MCPL), Jackee Johnson (NWLS), Sara Kelmann (Eagle River), Molly Lank-Jones (Hayward), 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: Tammie Blomberg (Rib Lake)

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

Meeting started at: 9:03 am

## Pre-Meeting Work

- Review the [NICE Final Report](#) and [One-pager](#)

## Meeting Agenda

### 1. Final Report

The group reviewed and discussed the NICE Final Report. It was noted that the additional appendix with the budget will be added.

Project managers noted that most of the document had been shared in pieces with the team throughout the process, starting with the first workgroup recommendation and ending with last month's meeting, at which the group reviewed the overarching recommendations. Some small changes were made since then, clarifying some points, editing language, etc.

One of the changes was that a section was added to each of the workgroup recommendations that describes the decision-making process. This was done for a couple of reasons. First, it was to be transparent and open about how decisions were arrived at, even when it was hard. Second, it was to show how the process of making a decision was often organic, flexible, and responsive.

The one-pager attempts to distill the most important information for those who may not want or need to read a 40-page report.

The group was asked several big-picture questions.

- Overall, is this an accurate representation of the process?

- M. Lank-Jones shared she felt the report is an excellent and well done report on the process.
  - G. Rae appreciated that nothing was glossed over, and it was transparent.
  - L. Ollhoff appreciated the process overview as she feels that many people may not understand how long this process has taken.
  - A. Johnson noted that having all of the recommendations in there is good because it shows that the bulk of the work was the recommendation.
- Does this report communicate the most important pieces of information and tell a coherent story?
    - P. O'Connell shared that the report stressed that it is meant to be an overview and not hit on every scenario. However, it does emphasize the process, and believes in the endeavor, and doesn't feel anything was left out.
- Is the report missing something? Was there anything you expected to see that wasn't included?
    - K. Sabelko asked if the leadership team could be highlighted in the report.
      - It was noted that the leadership team will be added to the report.
- Are there any places you found confusing that could be clarified?
    - J. Johnson noted that a library director shared the holds recommendation with staff, and they didn't understand it. It was asked if there was any way to make that recommendation clearer about what the libraries can expect.
      - S. Klemann noted to make it more clear, it could be added, "NWLS currently does this, and WVLS currently does this.."
    - A. Johnson shared that compromise would be a better term than consensus and suggested "Consensus and Compromise" instead of "High level of consensus."
      - It was noted that the majority of the workgroup reached consensus, thus using the phrase "high level of consensus"
      - S. Klemann agreed with this.
      - K. Zimmerman noted that to reach consensus sometimes compromises were made.
    - In the Regular Assessment section on page 7, it was asked if it could be added that if something comes up before one year, it would be addressed then. There may be language in the Holds or Delivery recommendation that can be used to add to this section.
    - The Collaborative Decision-Making Workgroup highlight in the one-pager was slightly confusing; it may need to be reworded for clarity.

- In the one-pager, add a “new shared instance” of Sierra for the ILS Vendor Selection Workgroup section.
- It was suggested to link to the first phase one-pager in the one-pager.
- The “Why” of the project may need to be added to the one-pager or as a separate document.
- M. Lank-Jones shared that the last bullet under Merger at a Glance seems like a synopsis of the previous bullets. Should it be in paragraph form instead?
- In the timeline, modify the consortia votes to reflect early fall/by September 2024.
- K. Zimmermann wants to review the comparison appendix for clarity and ensure that they are unique titles within the time frame.
- P. O’Connell asked if it would be beneficial to add more information on ILS combining trends within public libraries or the PLSR work that was done.
  - It was suggested that this could be a link back to the feasibility study.
  - There may be language already written about other system mergers to be added to the report.
- It was asked if Appendix D will show individual library costs. It was noted that it will contain the shared costs amount without the individual library amounts within the report. However, individual library costs will be shared with the libraries directly.
- It was asked if the implementation timeline should be moved to the project timeline section.
  - It was shared that the implementation timeline is very vague and unknown. It should be kept separate. There could be a reference to it or a link to the appendix.

Project managers noted that this report is the culmination of the amazing work the NICE Team has done this past year. The group was asked how they think they can help make sure that folks at their libraries, in their ILS consortia, or in their systems are aware of the report and informed of what will be voted on.

- L. Ollhoff will share with her board, highlight each of the recommendations, and point to the full recommendations for more information.
- S. Heskin noted she will do the same with her board, focusing on the one-pager but also sharing the full document.

## **2. Standing Item: Communication**

- June Town Hall meeting update
  - [Notes from the meeting](#) were shared with the group. There were 40 attendees!

- K. Sabelko shared that many of her staff are very stressed about this project and this could be due to MCPL undergoing a lot of change in the last few years.
- There was a question about including WISCAT data in the report, but knowing that the data is not an accurate representation, there is a concern.
  - It was noted that those numbers may be coming in low as there are many barriers to utilizing WISCAT.
  - It was suggested to share the WISCAT information in the FAQs.
  - The WISCAT numbers are similar to the cataloging comparisons so it could be added as an appendix as well.
- R. Metzler did a Delivery Time test and [shared the results](#).
  - It was suggested that this may be helpful to include in the report since delivery times have been a particular concern. A brief appendix referred to from the delivery recommendation section might be a good place to start.
  - It was noted that this is information that was not examined by the workgroup, so it may not be relevant to include.
  - It was agreed that it should be in the FAQs and not in the report.
- Any communication needs or questions that have come up, and what is the status of the replies?
  - WVLS has sent out Q&As to each library.

### **3. Recap of Important Decisions or Discussions**

- Suggested updates will be made to the documents and sent out to the team for review.
- NICE Team members were thanked for their service to the process.