

**MINUTES**  
**MORE Budget Hearing and**  
**MORE Executive Committee**  
*Thursday, June 15, 2023*

**Present/Attending:** John Thompson (IFLS), Joleen Sterk (Menomonie), Karen Furo-Bonnstetter (Woodville), Shelly Rae (Sand Creek), Allison Lutz (Turtle Lake).

**Also Present:** Lori Roholt, Kathy Setter, Bridget Krejci, Katelyn Noack, Samma Johnson (Cadott), Mary Hebda (Ogema), Barbara Krueger (Deer Park), Cecelia Cole, Lori Gilles (Durand), Kristina Kelley-Johnson (Somerset), Jenna Beyer (Plum City), Su Leslie (St. Croix Falls), Stacey Brown (Bloomer), Monica LaVold (New Richmond), Becky Puhl (Phillips), Bonnie Carl (Milltown), Cricket LaFond (Clear Lake), Christy Runquist (Pepin), Reb Kilde, Rachel Thomas (Rice Lake), Tiffany Meyer (Ellsworth), Meagan Bennett (Bloomer), Rob Ankarlo (Cumberland), Tori Schoess (Roberts), Leann French (Dresser), Jenna Chapman (Chippewa Valley Technical College).

**Absent:** None.

**Call to Order:**

Rae (SA) called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

**Establish a quorum:**

Rae (SA) established a quorum was present.

**Certification of Compliance with  
Open Meeting Law:**

Certification of compliance with open meeting law was confirmed.

**Agenda:**

*Thompson (IF) moved to approve the agenda. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) seconded. Motion carried.*

**Minutes:**

*Sterk (ME) moved to approve the minutes from May 5, 2023. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) seconded. Motion carried.*

**Budget Hearing on 2024 MORE Budget:**

Roholt posted a draft of the 2024 MORE Budget on June 5, 2023, with updated numbers and what is being reviewed today. New products have not been included in the draft budget.

### **Possible New Products:**

**LibraryIQ--** is a library analytics tool that has been in use by 9 MORE-member libraries in 2023. MORE contributed the \$5,000 implementation fee and the participating libraries shared the remaining 2023 costs of \$10,000.

Those in attendance were asked to share their feedback and reactions from the libraries that demoed Library IQ. A handout on LibraryIQ use was also provided by libraries with pros and cons outlined.

LaVold (NR) is more in favor of LibraryIQ. There is a learning curve to using the software and understanding the data. Not all the data is the same as libraries currently receive from present products. It is more user-friendly to obtain the information. Thomas (RL) is also in favor of LibraryIQ because of the additional services it offers outside of Decision Center, specifically within collection development. It is a good tool and with regular usage, the learning curve would be slight. The benefits of LibraryIQ outweigh the kinks. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) inquired if Decision Center will be doing any updates that may add functionality that LibraryIQ has. Roholt noted that Innovative is still updating Decision Center, but that LibraryIQ pulls data from outside of the ILS to compare to what libraries have (e.g., book lists). Decision Center only works with Sierra data.

It was noted that since Innovative is part of a larger company they may be able to develop their products further, though likely not anytime soon. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) inquired if Library IQ does what the dashboard does. Roholt noted that it doesn't seem to have the same functionality as the dashboard for those quick statistics. Thomas (RL) added that they still use the dashboard. The limitation is that we cannot provide any patron information to Library IQ for privacy reasons. Circulation Statistics in Library IQ are circulation of a library's collection versus from the location, which is different from how we presently track transactions. This information is obtainable from Web Management Reports but not many libraries use this software. Web Management Reports is used to compile the data for member library annual reports.

Thomas (RL) asked if the dashboard would still be accessible if the council decided to go with Library IQ instead of Decision Center. The dashboard could still be utilized as Library IQ would not show web visits. Setter clarified that the dashboard is separate from Decision Center.

Johnson (CA) asked if Decision Center would be kept for some time if they decided to go with Library IQ or would it be replacing Decision Center. The preference would be to remain with the known product from a cost efficiency perspective and keep an eye on Library IQ for future purchase. Sterk (ME) was in agreement and excited about Library IQ but it currently has too many limitations. Sterk (ME) would prefer to stay with Decision Center.

Lutz (TL) inquired if Decision Center was included in the standard charge for Innovative. Roholt noted that Decision Center is a separate line item, and the price is about the same as Library IQ.

LaVold (NR) does not find Decision Center useful as it is difficult to understand and run reports. The learning curve for any new person would be easier with Library IQ than Decision Center.

Johnson (CA) asked for examples of reports from Library IQ that were not currently available in Decision Center that were helpful. It was noted that DEI reports for collection development were a big reason for the initial interest in Library IQ. Thomas (RL) ran reports for weeding and the ability to edit searches and the lists also showed BISAC which was helpful for time saving.

Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) noted that there was more extensive training in the past on Decision Center and perhaps the reason she is partial to remaining with it and noted it wasn't fair for some new people to try to learn Decision Center by themselves.

Johnson (CA) observed the divide between a large and small library and there is no need for BISAC when the collection is smaller and they know most of the materials in it. Johnson (CA) reiterated that Library IQ doesn't have enough incentives to want to switch away from Decision Center.

It was asked if Library IQ or Decision Center could determine collection percentages (i.e., percentage of Children's Asian materials). LaVold (NR) noted that the data is ever present in Library IQ and there is no report that needs to be run to determine this. The search can be further narrowed in real time as well (i.e., percentage of picture books in Childrens Asian materials). She further noted the list of diverse titles available from Library IQ to help with collection development. Thomas (RL) added that the graphs can display trends in collections and can be used as an advocacy tool.

LaFond (CL) noted that she rarely uses Decision Center and instead uses Create Lists. If the decision is to keep Decision Center, there should be additional training so that it is more heavily used. LaFond (CL) found Library IQ useful and easy to use. Rae (SA) noted that Decision Center can be frustrating to learn and agrees that if it is kept, additional training would be beneficial.

Kelley-Johnson (SO) observed that Library IQ can be used to better understand the collection but felt like Decision Center was more trustworthy in the data provided.

Roholt clarified that the cost between the two products is comparable.

Leslie (SC) noted that whether we continue with Decision Center or go with Library IQ there should be additional training. Leslie (SC) asked Roholt to clarify the reports that would be lost that we currently have with Decision Center. Roholt noted that weeding lists are the most used. Decision Center includes more data in a weeding list than Create Lists would. There is also the ability to schedule and deliver reports in Decision Center (i.e., items in transit). In transit items are hard to produce in Create Lists and it is unlikely libraries would do it. The top titles list in Decision Center for time frames and reports on patron use by Act 150 location are the big-ticket items.

Setter clarified that IFLS does NOT use Decision Center to compile annual report statistics. For patron confidentiality reasons, Roholt clarified that we would never have patron data available in Library IQ.

Sterk (ME) inquired if MORE could facilitate a group purchase of Library IQ for interested libraries. Roholt agreed that is possible as it has currently been working for this trial run.

Rundquist (PE) prefers Decision Center so we wouldn't have to pay for the implementation fees again.

Lutz (TL) liked the idea of a group purchase for Library IQ but voiced concerns for Roholt's use of Decision Center for her job. Roholt noted that the in-transit lists and systemwide search lists would be harder to produce but could still be done. Roholt did struggle a bit with Library IQ to get it to show the data we want and expect. She does not feel she has enough experience with Library IQ to determine its full potential working with the vendor. She agrees that training would be great and encourage libraries to reach out to IFLS staff with any questions.

Roholt does not have a concrete price if a subset of libraries would pursue the purchase Library IQ on their own or how cost distribution would occur. There was some discussion on buying Library IQ and keeping Decision Center. Roholt pointed out that the cost is proportional. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) wanted a quick hand raise of people's preferences. (Hands for Decision Center: 8 / Hands for Library IQ: 5 / Hands for both: 6).

**Text Messaging Service**—MORE's long-term, free method for delivering Sierra notices to patrons as text messages (email to MMS) is no longer reliable, though patrons who are using it successfully can continue. Our Sierra vendor has a forthcoming text messaging product, but information is scant. MORE could opt to include a budget placeholder for this forthcoming service, maybe: \$40,000. It is expected that push notifications about holds ready for pickup and overdues will eventually be available from the MORE Libraries app, but no timeline estimate is available. Library Elf has a way to send SMS messages to patrons. Patrons must opt in and configure on their own.

Brown (BB) wondered if Library Elf marketing could be increased because it is a cost-effective option. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) asked if we could find out how many people are using Library Elf. Perhaps that isn't even necessary due to the increased email notifications. Roholt noted that Library Elf is a consistent, basic, and inexpensive tool. She could search and guess the number of users. Roholt assumes around the lower thousands for MORE. Johnson (CA) agrees that additional promotion could be useful. Kilde offered to develop a marketing campaign for libraries to utilize for services patrons may not be aware of. LaVold (NR) is interested in a texting service, but not for a \$40,000 cost. She recommends keeping an eye out for a service because there is a need, and it is important. Lutz (TL) agrees and noted that a lot of patrons sign up for the texts even though she clarifies that they don't always work. She would like the MORE app to have push notifications and supports Kilde's suggestion of additional marketing. Roholt noted that the App developer stated they cannot get the right data from Sierra for push notifications. Roholt reminded members to think about whether a placeholder should be added to the budget. Starting at the end of July, the MORE App will support multiple accounts which is something families appreciate.

**Additional Audiobook Source**—An additional audiobook source offering that wasn't included in the meeting materials is a product from Blackstone Audio called Blackstone Unlimited. It offers simultaneous use and is a flat price rather than price per use. There is no pricing at this time, although it has been requested. IFLS investigated a couple of audiobook sources to supplement OverDrive's offerings and reduce wait times.

Puhl (PH) is concerned about audiobooks as well as eBooks and would like to address both. It was noted that patrons could walk into the library and get the book, but many libraries don't have the audiobook, or they need the audio version because vehicles don't have CD players. Puhl (PH) respectfully disagrees and thinks that people will not come in to get the book and rural customers may only want the ebook to not have to travel to the library.

Rundquist (PE) wants to emphasize that the wait times in OverDrive is the issue and thinks that instead of an additional product, increasing the funds to the OverDrive Advantage account would best address the issue. Thomas (RL) agrees with Rundquist that the focus should be on the hold issues. Kelley-Johnson (SO) noted an increase for OverDrive Advantage in the draft budget. Roholt clarified that the Resource Sharing Collection Development committee recommended an increase. She further noted that OverDrive Advantage is the easiest way to "prop up" an area of the collection. While additional funding may alleviate some of the hold's issues, the demand keeps increasing as well. Kelley-Johnson (SO) agreed with keeping patron attention on one platform and focusing the efforts there. LaVold (NR) agrees with the increases for OverDrive Advantage, but the monetary increases don't really seem to make a visible impact. Rather than just keep "adding money to it" the focus should be on the availability aspect for a better user experience. Johnson (CA) noted that these issues are being discussed at the Wisconsin Public Library Consortium (WPLC) as well because it is a statewide trend. They noted the difference between HDH and other genres and how some of these HDH are no longer available for digital purchase (e.g., Outlander). It is a digital license as well as a monetary issue. Cole agreed with Johnson about licensing models from publishers as an issue that everyone faces. It is a problem for every platform and makes it challenging to address the demand for materials.

### ***Current Products:***

***Niche Academy***—Several directors spoke in favor of dropping Niche Academy as they were under the impression it would be more robust. Roholt noted that Niche Academy is not super easy to create and publish original content and for MORE training purposes, Niche Academy public content is not very useful. We would need to create our own personalized content. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) is in favor of reducing the number of products that MORE subscribes to and Niche Academy hasn't been very heavily used. Johnson (CA) is wondering if there was a lack of promotion for Niche Academy and that is why it isn't heavily used. She would be in favor of keeping it for another year and increase the marketing. It could be reevaluated next year. Sterk (ME) noted that having Libby How-to on the catalog is useful and saves staff time. Rundquist doesn't like having to constantly add to Niche Academy, but since the product is inexpensive, it might be worth keeping it another year and increase the marketing. LaVold (NR) appreciated the privacy tutorials that are available. Thomas (RL) noted that Rice Lake uses the Libby content on Niche Academy to train patrons and likes how the content is available on the catalog and is in favor of keeping Niche Academy for another year. Leslie (SC) noted that Niche Academy can be used remotely if patrons cannot get into the library.

Roholt welcomes additional ideas for public facing content that can be made available for patrons, such as the Libby and Flipster tutorial information.

**Content Café**—MORE's source for cover images as displayed in the online catalogs. Most of these types of services work the same and pull from the same area. This service will be locked in for 2024 and will be year 3 of a 3-year subscription.

**Other:**

Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) questioned the IFLS Management Charges (line 15) of the 2024 Draft budget. Thompson noted this line includes adding a half-time cataloging position, some overlap when Setter's position is replaced, health and wage increases. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) wondered about future increase estimates noting the lack of carryover into the future. Thompson noted that the cataloging subsidy costs were restored in this draft budget. He also noted that CABS need an additional staff person to maintain their services. He said if the volume increases, are libraries okay with waiting longer for records. This is a decision the libraries will need to make. Thompson noted that the Library of Things and other kits are unique and can cause original cataloging increases over the standard books or DVD purchases and donations. He further added that the pace of purchasing (e.g., end of the year) can create a backlog in record creation and processing. Thompson estimated a difference of \$13,000 without the additional cataloging position. Sterk (ME) noted that the percentages for administrative costs were reasonable. She feels that an investment needs to be made in the staff. Rundquist (PE) noted she is willing to wait for records by a few more days and likes that she can purchase odd items because of IFLS catalogers. Thomas (RL) appreciates learning about why there is an increase and noted she appreciates the cataloging for their library of things but is hesitant to not invest in personnel. Roholt noted that there is a lot of coordination involved in CABS, with adding sites (Durand/Cornell/Hawkins). LaVold (NR) voiced concern about reducing quality services to cut costs and feels that the MORE budget in general is so much more than libraries could do on their own and supports the budget despite the increase. Lutz (TL) voiced her support as well.

Roholt noted that the Conferences line in the budget (line 19) has historically been used for IUG for IFLS and Library staff. There was not any interest from library staff this year. She noted if there is no longer interest from library staff to attend the IUG conference, this line can be decreased. Roholt estimated \$5,000 would still accommodate IFLS staff. Rundquist (PE) suggested leaving the amount as it is since if IFLS is adding new staff, that may be needed.

*Sterk (ME) moved to adjourn the budget hearing at 12:32 pm. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) seconded. Motion carried.*

*(Break from 12:32 pm until 12:41 pm.)*

**Discussion and Action on 2024  
MORE Budget Recommendation:**

Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) asked some clarity questions about MARCIVE (line 4) the ongoing authority processing service. Roholt noted that around the state there is an initiative for all systems to use an authority vendor. Krejci noted that the task manually is very tedious and time intensive.

Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) is interested in remaining with Decision Center for the statistical and collection development tool (line 8) as it is an Innovative product. Lutz (TL) inquired what the cost would be for both Decision Center and Library IQ. Roholt explained the method for

determining the library percentage of the cost. Rae (SA) is interested in remaining with Decision Center but increasing the training.

*Sterk (ME) moved to approve the 2024 MORE Budget. Furo-Bonnstetter (WO) seconded. Motion carried.*

**Adjourn:**

*The meeting adjourned at 1:03 pm.*

Katelyn Noack, Recorder  
Joanne Gardner, Minutes