

## MONARCH CIRCULATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Mayville Public Library

**March 2, 2017**

**Called to Order: 9:36 AM**

**Adjourned: 11:52 AM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alison Hoffman, Monarch Library System; Jane Matko, West Bend; Pam Garcia, Waupun; Camrin Sullivan, Mequon-Thiensville; Sarah Rabideau, Lomira; Rhonda Klemme, Mayville; Colleen Swart, Oostburg; David Nimmer, Cedarburg; Elizabeth Daniels, Iron Ridge.

**Call the meeting to order:** David Nimmer, Chair called the Monarch Circulation Committee Meeting to order at 9:36 am at Mayville Public Library, 111 N. Main St, Mayville, WI.

**Public comment and correspondence:** No public present.

**Approval of minutes, February 2, 2017:** Rabideau moved for approval of the February 2 minutes, Daniels seconded. Motion carried.

### **ILS Committee Questions:**

#### **a. ILS Committee Standards:**

System Fine Amount: The ILS committee wants us to consider a \$50 accrued amount, rather than a \$100 accrued amount, for restricting patrons system-wide. If patrons reach this threshold, they will be blocked from all library services until their balance is \$0. Daniels mentioned that in MWFLS, the standard block was at \$10, but as long as you were under \$10, you were ok. Every library has slightly different standards. Nimmer mentioned that sometimes patrons would travel to different libraries and be given privileges, because prior there would be some libraries that would only block for fines accrued in their library. This block would be a second blocking threshold where the patron would be blocked from services system-wide, in an attempt to prevent this library-hopping behavior. We would apply a restricted, no activity code to these patrons until their balance was \$0.

Matko mentioned that they would support a lower (\$50 rather than \$100) block, because they are cracking down on patrons abusing libraries/racking up large fines. Garcia mentioned either would be fine.

Nimmer asked if there were any other questions about the ILS standards document. Daniels wondered about the ratio of 5:1, is 5 is too low of a number for some libraries budget-wise? Same for DVDs. Maybe for books 7:1 or 8:1 and DVDs 12:1-15:1? Nimmer pointed out that we want to consider how long we want patrons to wait for materials. 5:1 is 2 ½-3 months. Everyone should participate so that everyone is at the same level. The in-demand collection helps with this by bringing the overall ratio down. This comes with some understanding that you cannot purchase everything. If a book or DVD shows up on your ratio list, it should be at least considered for purchase. It was noted that purchasing using 5:1 would be the same coverage as if it was changed to 7:1 or 8:1.

Daniels asked about 2c, citing an example of some TV Series sets received from other libraries checking out for 1 week, and typically MWFLS libraries allow these out for 2 weeks. There isn't a way in Polaris currently to address this, unless everyone would put their TV series sets into a TV Series collection code. For now, you will have to extend these manually, which is permissible.

Daniels asked about payment of fines from other libraries. After discussion, it was recommended that if a library is transacting with the item (checking out the item, renewing the item, checking the item in), they can make a judgment call in regards to handling fines. Daniels thought this should be clarified in the ILS Standards document.

Also discussed was what to do when a library is the last owning library of an item, it becomes unavailable and it has hold(s). The hold(s) should be cancelled and a note should be placed on patron(s) card(s) indicating the item(s) are no longer available.

***Rabideau moves to decrease the system fine level to \$50, and send a note to the ILS committee about clarifying 2., d., iv. regarding waiving other libraries' fines. Daniels seconds. Motion carried.***

**b. ILS Committee Follow Up:**

Reconciliation of lost book fees, Custom Report: We received the go-ahead to investigate reconciliation options and begin creation of a custom report. Nimmer called for two people to work on parameters for the custom report. Nimmer and Garcia volunteered to work together on the parameters.

**c. Request for Request Time to Fill Custom Report:**

This report provides information on how long it takes to fill holds from when the hold is placed to when the hold was filled. The problem with this report is that it looks at the record creation date instead of the first available date, so if on-order records are considered, the numbers are skewed.

***Swart moves to request a rewrite of the existing Request Time to Fill Report to consider first available date instead of creation date. Klemme seconded. Motion carried.***

**Best Practices:**

**Merging Patron Records guide approval:**

Sullivan moves to approve the merging Patron Records guide and send the guide to all libraries. Rabideau seconded. Motion carried.

**a. Patron Registration, more work on guidelines:**

More work needs to be done on patron registration guidelines, but with time running short, we plan to make more time for this at a future meeting.

**b. Address Check/Expired Patrons/Expiration Check Terms/Automatic Purging**

We discussed purging library cards after a period of inactivity. What should that period be? SRLAAW has come out with a document recommending address checks every 18 months, at least, to keep patron records current in regards to cross-border reimbursement. This document is not final, but is planned to be finalized at the WAPL conference in April.

In regards to Polaris, the circulation committee thought that address checks and expiration are somewhat of a duplication of efforts, and the goal is not necessarily expiration but rather address checking. An automatic purge report looks at last activity date, and not expiration date, which we felt looking at last activity date makes the most sense.

We determined two possible paths to keep up with purging of inactive patrons and compliance with address checking per SRLAAW:

Path 1. Cards will not expire but address checks will take place at least every 18 months. We can use Polaris to identify patrons with a last activity date of a to-be-determined prior

point in time (3 years possibly?). Polaris can either automatically purge the records, or send those records to a record set for manual deletion by libraries. Individual libraries can decide whether to automatically purge or to manually purge. (Possibly, a procedure could be enacted where a record set is created, then patrons automatically purged.)

Path 2. Cards expire every 12-18 months, but no prompting for an address check. Expired cards could be reinstated after addresses are verified. Libraries would run a report to identify expired cards at least once every three years, but the automatic purge report does not look at expiration date.

The circulation committee prefers path #1 because address checks will still take place as recommended, but card deletion takes place with regard to activity date rather than expiration. Both paths, of course, require proper address verification upon registration, with possible future integration of a separate database for address verification.

Hoffman mentioned that the auto purge procedure has several options libraries can select to avoid deleting cards with excessive fines and other flags. Libraries can email her to set this up immediately if they so choose.

**c. Issuing Cards for other libraries.**

We discussed how libraries should issue cards for individuals living in other libaried communities. ESLS and MWFLS as separate entities handled these patrons in different ways.

ESLS libraries would often have cards for other communities on hand, and would issue cards to coincide with the patron's community in which they live. (So, if a patron went to Cedarburg to get a library card, but lived in Mequon, a Mequon card would be issued, along with registered library changed to Mequon.)

In MWFLS, libraries would issue the card of the library the patron is registering at, regardless of community in which they reside. "Registered library" would be the library where the patron registered, and not the library of the city where the patron lives. (In this case, say a patron living in the city limits of Fox Lake came to Waupun to get a library card. Waupun would issue the patron a Waupun card, and "registered library" would be Waupun.)

We discussed what method we should use moving forward. Some ex-MWFLS libraries will not send library cards to other municipalities to have on hand for issuing cards related to their "home" library. Daniels and Nimmer talked about a possible general Monarch library card that could be issued in the case of libraries that wish to issue a card other than the card where the patron is registering (but do not have on hand a card from that patron's municipality).

A question was raised regarding why it matters where the card resides? Nimmer felt at least the "registered library" in registration should reflect the community where the patron lives. Libraries could possibly choose from several options, as long as registered library is the community where the patron lives, and statistical class is accurate.

Options considered as possible acceptable methods include having library cards on hand for other municipalities; issuing cards from the library where the patron registers; and having a general Monarch card for issuing to patrons from other municipalities. Or, some sort of combination of the above.

Discussion/thought should take place over the next month, with possible direction from the ILS committee, and a recommendation will follow.

**d. Polaris Social**

We discussed Polaris Social. This is a module that interacts with the PAC and allows patrons to do things such as write material reviews, connect with other library patrons, create book clubs and link to social media outlets to share information, as desired. This is currently set up in the test PAC, look at it to familiarize yourself with it.

**Open Discussion:**

Klemme mentioned she is having some Issues with people not getting notified. A patron had items go to lost, but the patron didn't get overdue notices. Calls said they were completed, but it turns out the number was not set up correctly. Hoffman asked Klemme to send her specifics and she will look into it.

We discussed LEAP briefly, a main issue resides with phone number formatting. Robert is trying hard to figure out the issues but there is no test environment, so this makes it difficult.

**Next Meeting:** April 6, 2017 at 9:30am at Mead Public Library in Sheboygan.

**Adjorn:** Rabideau moved to adjorn. Swart seconded. Adjourned 11:52 am.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamelyn Garcia, Monarch Circulation Committee Secretary