

MONARCH LIBRARY SYSTEM ILS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Plymouth Public Library

March 7, 2017

Called to Order: 10:01 AM

Adjourned: 12:21 PM

PRESENT: Martha Rosche (Plymouth), Betty McCartney (Elkhart Lake), Alison Hoffman (Monarch), Tom Carson (Port Washington), Ann Penke (Lakeland University), Robert Nitsch (Monarch), Amy Birtell (Monarch), David Nimmer (Cedarburg), Garrett Erickson (Mead), Alex Harvancik (Horicon), Candy Graulich (Hustisford)

REMOTELY: Mary Alice Bodden (Theresa), Sue Kinyon (Brownsville)

ABSENT: Mark Rosmarynowski (Sheboygan Falls)

1. Call the meeting to order—Compliance with Open Meeting Law requirements

Betty McCartney called the meeting to order at Plymouth Library at 10:01 AM.

2. Approval of Agenda

Martha made the motion to approve the agenda, Ann Penke seconded. Motion carried.

3. Public Comment and Correspondence

Alex Harvancik gave an official statement from Horicon Public Library to the ILS Committee. She also provided the ILS Committee with a handout with photographs of feature film displays at Horizon Library in February and March to show how many new DVDs are on the shelf. It is attached.

Candy Graulich from Hustisford passed out the “Holds alert report by branch 2/14/17” for items with three or more holds for Monarch Libraries, and things that were released on 2/14 or earlier, and without on-order records. She explained how we are all getting to know each other in the new system, and how they almost always had local holds first, but there was always a problem with lending. There were times when they lent over 400 times more than they received.

Garrett Erickson from Mead spoke about large libraries and about how their budgets are frozen. He explained that Mead is asking less for what they asked for budget-wise than in 1996. He explains that it seems moratorium is the easiest way to keep the collections in-house and they would be in favor of either a moratorium or another method. He does not think penalties would be easy, but Mead would be in favor of looking at a moratorium. The Mead Library Board is not seeing a huge benefit of being in the consortium, but he believes the moratorium for a period of time, shorter than 180 days, may help.

Candy explained that the way that no moratorium was in place was why Beaver Dam did not join the system.

4. Disposition of Minutes of the Previous Regular Meeting

Betty made the motion to approve the 2/1/17 minutes, Ann seconded. Motion carried.

5. ILS Standards

a. *Collection Management (ratios, restrictions to circulation, browse collections, in-demand collection)*

David clarified that even if you have 9 holds, you are still adhering to the 5:1 ratio and you do not need to purchase another copy until you reach 10, and the same goes for the 10:1 for audiovisual.

b. *Circulation of Materials (loan periods, renewals, patron records, filling holds, fines and lost materials)*

Materials not included in regular circulation need to be identified so they are not included on the ratio report. Tom asked what the arguments about moratoriums are. Ann brought up that at Lakeland, they don't have a browsing collection so her patrons would never get any popular items until much later.

David explained that if someone wants something that is just sitting on another library's shelf, it is unreasonable to have a moratorium. Tom brought up that most of the holds are for DVDs, and wondered if we could focus specifically on that.

Mary Alice explained that she is not against moratoriums, and she explained that her patrons do not put many holds on things and that they prefer to see it in the library. She believes we need to look at new DVDs with a moratorium. Ann said that because she does not buy the popular things, she tries to look at the nonfiction book collections and tries to add to that portion of the system collection.

Alex brought up that patrons are waiting a long time to get DVDs. David explained he thinks that boards are more likely to think that they would rather wait longer for DVDs than buy many extra copies.

Martha said that delivery is taking longer and that's adding to the problem. Tom said that we need to encourage our patrons to place holds on things. David brought up the future and regional library systems and what that is going to look like.

Martha asked how many libraries in MWFLS had a moratorium, and Alex said the majority did. Alex said that a survey did last year said the libraries had positive things to say. David said that any decisions will be made at a director-wide level and that there is not much more for us to discuss. Betty explained that we have only been a system for 2.5 months and there have been a lot of changes made, including the hold routing system. Betty would like to see us all working from the same page for a while, and agrees that this is something that will have to come down to a vote. David encourages the directors to talk about it at the next upcoming all-directors meeting and think about: would the moratorium be for everybody? Just for net lenders?

Tom asked about how moratorium for item-type specific things work, and Alison explained that there is a preferred lender list that can be edited for the items.

The circulation subcommittee thought that \$50 versus \$100 for a maximum fine is reasonable and the change should be made. They also would like the patron to be "restricted" until the fines are cleared.

David asked about waiving fines for another library if they will be collecting the fines at that library. For instance, somebody comes to Cedarburg and has \$3.00 in overdue from Neiderkorn, can Cedarburg waive? The language is changed in D)IV) to “have accrued.”

David made a motion to approve the document with the changes, and to go back to the directors for more discussion on the moratorium. Martha seconded. Motion carried.

c. *Bibliographic Database (cataloging, authority control, brief entries)*

On hold.

d. *Non-compliance with standards*

Betty has been getting a lot of emails about libraries not in compliance with standards, such as libraries renewing new materials up to six times even though there are holds on them. Betty said she does not want us to become a police organization but she does want to talk about our options. Mark sent Betty an email with some thoughts about libraries staying in compliance: positive—those in compliance will be rewarded by system (t-shirts, etc.), neutral—those not in compliance need to provide reasoning as to why they will not be in compliance (Kohler Library is also a school, for example), negative—the library may be asked to chip in more for system services or shared materials, reduction of support/services, reduced resource sharing, financial penalty, expulsion from the system.

Martha would like to leave this as a discussion item because we need approved standards first.

e. *Issuing library cards from other municipality*

It came up that some libraries were not issuing library cards from other municipalities, but we should be issuing library cards to anybody in our system. David said in the past, we would exchange cards and the library would issue a home card to that person. The home library should be the library in the municipality that they are from, not necessarily the library that they use.

Discussion ensued regarding library cards, and having a general Monarch-wide card. The issue is prefixes on card numbers and their numbers not working for databases with certain libraries. Betty recommends that everyone needs to issue cards to people within the system as long as patrons are giving them correct information. Patrons can choose to get that library's card or a generic system-wide card and make sure you code them correctly. Ann made a motion to accept the circulation subcommittee recommendations regarding cards, Tom seconded. Motion carried.

f. *SRLAAW Draft of Best Practices for libraries that bill for cross-county use*

David said one of the best practices is that there is an 18 month address check on cards to ensure it is correct. Within Polaris, there is address check and expired patron. David said one option is cards never expire but the address check is done every 18 months, and another option is that Polaris would automatically pull out cards that the last activity date is over a defined period of time (18 months, 3 years) and it could be automatically deleted or put into a record check to be reviewed. It can be set to your standards (for instance, those with fines are not deleted). The other option is the cards expire every 12-18 months but it never prompts for an address check. Mead does this currently. Some libraries only go by the

expired option. There is no functionality for Polaris to pull based on expiration date, only activity date. The circulation committee's recommendation is that cards never expire but address checks are done at least every 18 months. Betty brought up seasonal patrons and Ann brought up her special methods. Alison said its a library-by-library decision. Currently, patrons are blocked from Overdrive with "address check required" on Polaris, along with patron expired block. Amy said that Lakeshores uses a product from the U.S. Census Bureau to check addresses, and he is looking into other products that we can use.

We will wait until the Draft of Best Practices is approved to make any decisions, but would like to make all directors aware of this.

6. Circulation Subcommittee Report—David Nimmer

David said they are recommending that every library director or circulation person be put on the listserv for circulation updates. They will be working on going over the rules for registering patrons, especially the "home library" versus "registered library" issue. Additionally, they talked about the process for collecting money for lost items. With the Request Time to Fill Custom Report, David said that if the hold was placed before the first item was actually entered, the report would look at the first available date as the day the first item is added. It currently looks at the date the hold is placed, so it is added on 3 to 6 months. After the first available bibliographic record date, we want it to go to the actual date the hold is placed. It is an if-then scenario. David recommends that it is forwarded for someone to approve. Alison said this might be the point that it is put in formal language and sent to Innovative to request a quote. David makes a motion that Alison make a request to Innovative to get a cost, Betty seconded. Motion carried.

2. Polaris Update—Alison Hoffman

a. LEAP

LEAP is still not full functional due to the telephone, and Robert is looking into it and working with AT&T and that may require a contract. Robert and Amy are looking into password policies, and it should be coming out soon.

b. Polaris Social

The reviews are active on the training server and documentation has been shared with the group. It includes settings that need to be agreed upon in terms of access (Twitter accounts, age restrictions, et cetera) before it can be activated on a live PAC. Alison asked for there to be a discussion list for the committees so we can share ideas.

c. Future Polaris Upgrade

Alison spoke to the site manager and it is not official, but said the next release will be May or June, but definitely by July 1st. The webinar she listened to said that Polaris 5.5 will include significant changes to the PAC theme, improved searching, integration of Recorded Books, Zinio, Hoopla, an app, eCommerce, and more. She is not sure whether all of these will be released in July.

d. Update on database cleanup and/or general Monarch catalog status

The database cleanup company said that for about \$16,000 it could clean up a small amount of the database. Work continues to move forward on processes that were paused during implementation work last year. System staff are working to deduplicate new materials within a week of addition to new materials. Alison says that some money needed to do gap

file processing in the amount of \$13,500 should be available as it has been set aside but needs to confirm with Amy.

e. *Concerns or issues*

None.

8. Other Business

None.

9. Meeting Schedules

a. Next scheduled meeting May 9, 2017 at Theresa

b. Locations and dates for the remaining meetings for 2017

Patrick would like a list of times and places for the next meetings. July 11th at Lakeland, September 12th at Neiderkorn in Port Washington, November 14th at Kewaskum/West Bend tentatively at 10 AM for each.

10. Adjourn

Betty made a motion to adjourn, Tom seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 12:21 PM

Minutes submitted by: Jackie Rammer