

## MONARCH CIRCULATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Cedarburg Public Library

**February 2, 2017**

**Called to Order: 9:35 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; Diane Kallas, Sheboygan; David Nimmer, Cedarburg; Elizabeth Daniels, Iron Ridge.

**Call the meeting to order:** David Nimmer, Chair called the Monarch Circulation Committee Meeting to order at 9:35 am at Cedarburg Public Library, W63N589 Hanover Ave, Cedarburg, WI.

**Public Comment and Correspondence:** No public present.

**Approval of Minutes, January 5, 2017:** Rabideau moved for approval of the January 5 minutes, Sullivan seconded. Motion carried.

### **ILS Committee Follow Up:**

**a. ILS Committee Standards:** Bylaws and standards were discussed at the ILS meeting yesterday (2-1-2017). Standards were reviewed and adjusted at this meeting. Nimmer had copies of the standards for us to review. The Executive Committee is also reviewing this document at their meeting today; it will go to the Directors Thursday, 2-9-17, where it may get approved or may go through another round of revisions. Libraries should abide by these standards. If rules aren't followed, what happens? The Monarch Board would handle any required discipline. Those that are concerned about items not being on their shelf should investigate options available to them, such as local holds first, lucky day collections and the in demand collection. Nimmer noted that the crossover borrowing report will be interesting to see with new libraries added. Hopefully by next month a crossover borrowing report will be available for us to look at. Nimmer noted that the crossover borrowing only lists things going back and forth between libraries, and does not count patrons from other libraries coming to your library to check out.

Daniels asked about the in demand collection. Kallas mentioned that they started this in September or October. Kallas mentioned that determining what to purchase is sometimes difficult for items not yet published because libraries are not putting item records in when they order, so they don't know if the forthcoming copies will fill the demand or if more should be ordered through in demand (and how many should be ordered). Daniels is concerned that the in demand collection cannot address spikes in holds if only using the ratio report to determine what is ordered. A suggestion was brought up that maybe they should look at items with few copies but higher holds. These might not be showing up on specific libraries' ratio reports because holds are scattered amongst libraries. Daniels mentioned that it is hard for smaller libraries to get new materials and have them go out on the van for holds right away; Garcia mentioned that this happens at all libraries. Swart mentioned that there may be one going out on the van, and one coming to their library, so it all evens out.

**b. ILS Committee Follow Up, Reconciliation of Lost Book Fees-Details:** Swart asked about the proper procedure for collecting lost/damaged fees until a reconciliation report is

determined. Nimmer said to forward those fees to the owning library for now. Once more details are known, we will set a day for the reconciliation procedure to begin.

Nimmer provided samples of reports that are currently available with Polaris. Both reports showed payments collected by Cedarburg for a specified time period. One included branch information but did not provide the detail of the fine (whether an overdue fine, a lost material, etc.). The other report showed the detail about the fine (overdue, lost, etc.), but did not show branch library. ***Our ideal report would be able to single out certain types of payments (damaged, lost, processing and collection agency fees) while also including collection library and library where the payment is owed. We would then reconcile it on a to-be-determined basis. Goals include to prevent the hassle of libraries sending money back and forth, provide more accurate reimbursement for materials and realize cleaner accounting.*** Kallas thought it would be useful to still be able to see overdue fines collected, just for the information. She feels it will be a wash but would like the proof. Nimmer did a comparison for his library, and did find a difference; it was higher than he thought it would be, but not overly significant.

Discussion involved timing of when reconciliation of funds would take place. Should it be run in November so payment can be made in the same calendar year? Or should it be done twice/several times per year? Who decides this? No recommendation was made.

Refunds were discussed. The committee agreed that if the patron would like a refund, they would need to negotiate with the owning library. Libraries could assist the patron if they choose.

Discussion went back to what this report should look like, and clarified that the current Polaris offerings will not give us exactly what we are looking for. Nimmer thought it should look like a crossover borrowing report, indicating amounts each library collected for our selected types of fines and what library they are owed to. Maybe there should be two parts or two different reports—one with itemized detail on who owes what to whom, and a second one that indicates net amounts owed or due. Hoffman said that we could take existing Polaris reports as a base example, and indicate to Polaris added features we would like to see in the report. There would need to be some back and forth, and testing. Nimmer will work on a mock up and send it out to us for review before sending it to the ILS group.

#### **Best Practices:**

- a. **Merging Patron Records guide approval:** It was noted that duplicate cards involving Lakeland University should not be merged. Kallas mentioned that one main reason to merge records is when both cards have fees or blocks that you want to retain. If one is expired with no blocks or fees, it is just easier to delete the card that is expired and free from fees and blocks. Nimmer wondered if we should have guidelines system-wide for how long we keep expired patrons. Statute dictates expired patrons should be deleted every 3 years. Can we globally purge expired cards? Hoffman mentioned that an existing report will automatically purge patrons, or libraries can choose to have the list of patrons go into a record set and can manually delete patrons. Hoffman said libraries can set criteria for automatic purging, such as fine threshold. Hoffman mentioned that she felt that last activity date plays a role in purging as well. Rabideau would like a list of the patrons purged so they can remove registration cards. Sullivan, Kallas and Nimmer mentioned that they no longer keep paper cards/forms. Discussion included who keeps paper and who does not. Garcia mentioned that prior to the purge, possibly a report or a find tool record set could be created for Rabideau of the patrons that will be purged so she could update her paper file.

Nimmer called for volunteers to work on a document that will be sent to libraries to define automatic purging options. Initial criteria will be library cards expired 3 years ago or longer. Hoffman will send out a summary of current options available in the Polaris report. Kallas and Sullivan will work with Hoffman on this.

Also mentioned is that the merging patrons document is helpful but a title page with some guidelines would be helpful, including when to merge and when to delete; to instruct libraries to ask Hoffman about permissions if they are blocked from merging or deleting; to instruct libraries to not delete Lakeland University cards. Garcia volunteered to start a title page, but would like a seasoned Polaris librarian to look at it. Nimmer said she could send it to him.

Discussed was how libraries could locate duplicate patrons. Sullivan will send out directions on how she located patrons living in other locales with your library's library card; or patrons who live locally but have cards from other libraries. Mentioned was that it would be wise for us to get the long expired cards out of the database first, there would then be less patrons to look at and deal with.

- b. Patron Registration, more work on guidelines:** The ILS committee wants us to consider developing a recommendation on whether or not to allow cards on phone apps or a picture of their card, or allowing checkout if they have their card number memorized. Regardless of what we decide with allowing patrons to check out without their physical card, it should be done with an abundance of caution. Kallas feels every field needs to be filled out in registration—birthdate, etc. Middle initial is important. If a patron brings in a photo ID and the library allows for checkout, libraries should verify several different pieces of data to be certain staff has the right patron. Staff should also double check when the patron is up on the checkout screen to be sure. Sullivan mentioned that her board is requesting they lessen restrictions, as they require a library card to do anything with a patron's account. The ideal scenario would be to find a balance between assuring we have the correct patron and providing good customer service to patrons. We will discuss more next month and make a recommendation.
- c. Address Check/Expiration Check terms:** A question was raised regarding address checks vs. expired registration, and should there be any standardization of this system-wide? Nimmer tried to look up statutes concerning this, but could not find a guideline there. Sheboygan and Mequon haven't encountered address check; Nimmer wondered why. Nimmer concluded that since at least a couple of libraries are not getting the "address check" block, possibly we do not have to worry about this. And, since many patrons would be deleted after 3 years, address check may not be a significant concern. Hitting control U while in registration will automatically update expiration date and address check terms per the registered library's settings.

**Open Discussion:** Swart encountered a patron with a library card that had two library barcodes on it. Daniels and Garcia mentioned that this was common when libraries had barcode stickers. This would allow a patron to have only one card (but two barcodes), and that would work at two different libraries (more often in this case those libraries reside in different systems/ILS environments.)

Garcia brought up the issues that arise when we can't cancel holds that have been shipped. Primarily, the item arrives, is scanned and the patron is called almost immediately. Kallas thought there was a work-around for this and was going to look into it.

Cancelled holds notices were discussed (in lieu of putting notes on cards), but this resulted in some problems in the past. Cancelled holds will go on the agenda for next month, as there may be some time saving features for staff.

**Next Meeting:** March 2, 2017 at 9:30 am at Mayville Public Library, 111 N. Main St, Mayville, WI.

**Adjorn:** Sullivan moved to adjourn, seconded by Swart. Adjourned 11:52 am.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Pamelyn Garcia".

Pamelyn Garcia, Monarch Circulation Committee Secretary