

Approved

Board of Directors: Jennie Rozycki, President (No. Bennington), Sue Dowdell, Vice President (Springfield), Janet Clapp, Treasurer (Rutland), Holly Hall, Secretary (Jericho/DRowson), Starr LaTronica (Brooks),

Attendees: Lynne Fonteneau-McCann (Bennington), Wendy Sharkey (Bennington), Jill Tofferi (Ludlow/Fletcher), Bridget Stone-Allard (Georgia Public), Kendra Aber-Ferri (Morristown), Catherine Goldsmith (Starksboro),

Not Present: Sarah Snow (Ainsworth), Cheryll DeRue (Brigham/Bakersfield), Clare McFarland (Norman Williams), Sarah Wiles (The Putney School), Emily Zervas (Putney), Tony Pikramenos (Reading), Amy Williams (Rutland), Tyler Strong (Royalton), Rene Cressy (West Rutland), Rachel Muse (Waterbury), Cathi Wilkens (Guilford),

Catamount Library Network, Inc.

Board of Directors GoTo Meeting

Tuesday, August 24, 2021 at 10:00 AM

Jennie called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM

Additions to the Agenda – Janet requested that “Nominating Committee” be added to New Business

Public Comments – none

Minutes of July 12th, 2021 meeting - *Motion by Janet and seconded by Sue to accept the Catamount Library Network Board Minutes of July 12th, 2021 as presented. Motion passed unanimously.*

Treasurer’s Report (Janet)

Janet presented the report, which is also posted on Basecamp.

Lynne asked how many libraries are now using OCLC (5)

Jill asked how much of the \$40,863.36 balance is encumbered. Janet said there are outstanding payments to be made in the amounts of \$4745.75 and \$700 and there would be approximately \$35K left in the bank at the end of the calendar year as a contingency. CLN needs to keep that surplus under \$50K

New Member Updates (Wendy/Jennie)

Wendy reported that Westminster West is still in process of adding records.

Jennie reported that Dorset should be submitting their application soon and that Village School of North Bennington does not meet our criteria.

ByWater Call Update (Wendy/Sue)

Wendy reported we will need to change the date of our monthly call. Upgrade near end of year and the test server would be upgraded in September. Sue added that we do not have too many tickets out.

Catalogers Group Report (Catherine)

Catherine (in chat) – productive discussion at the last meeting. Discussion went beyond cataloging.

*Doodle poll will be used to find a date for training session and that Kelly from Bywater can do the training. Catherine will continue to collect feedback on topics for class and submit them to Kelly. Wendy and Catherine reassured all that the training will be live, interactive sessions with our Koha test server

(not a canned webinar). Catherine indicated it may be more than 2 hours of training and run a final lesson plan with Kelly and Wendy.

*Collection codes:

Janet asked about the Golden Dome collection code approval. Wendy indicated it seems more of a change than an addition because of the name change. We kept the DCF as it needed to stay the same. The Cataloging Group recommended adding Manga as a new collection code. *Janet motioned, seconded by Starr to add Manga as a new collection code. Motion passed unanimously.*

*Hardcover vs. Paperback records – Catherine asked if the paperback has the same dimensions and pages are exactly the same. Wendy said our procedures say yes. However, the cataloging group may discuss further, if needed. Procedures do not need to come to the board, according to Janet and Lynne.

Loans Group Report (Bridget)

Reminders about Procedures

- if issues arise, then use the ticketing system instead of calling /emailing Sue or Wendy.
- Changes need to go through loan group first who can vote to make a recommendation to the board
- New status – clarified that for books it is six (6) months and for DVD/Media it is twelve (12) months.
- Patron types - Discussed temporary versus new patron type and how each could be used

Holds dispersal – equity discussion. Concerns regarding the large number of loans being filled by the largest library. Wendy shared a spreadsheet that showed the borrowing vs lending of each member library. Loans Group proposed using Wendy’s solution – using a randomized order system for 3 months (September 1 – November 30). If adopted, the loans group would evaluate the change in October. *Janet made a motion, seconded by Sue, to approve the trial change for 3 months. Motion passed unanimously.* Changes will take place on September 1st.

Old Business: Much of the Aspen/Budget discussion was grouped together. (Captured as best as possible – please view recording for all specific conversation – starting at minute 28:37, ending at 1:44:00)

- Aspen Discovery
- 2022 Budget

Jennie stated that both Cataloging and Loans group have recommended that the board implement the Aspen Discovery Plug-in. Starr indicated that Tom McMurdo (VTLIB) said that ARPA consortia funds would likely be able to be used for the set up cost of ASPEN (\$7500). Discussion of the timing of ARPA funds, we agreed that we cannot move forward with the ‘purchase’ until we have a signed grant award.

Concerns and discussion revolved around the cost impact to small libraries if the base price is increased or if the \$400/library cost is shared by all libraries. There was also discussion of the impact to large libraries if just the formula is used. Also there was discussion regarding how to plan for the increase for the current fiscal year. Wendy indicated there would be a 6-month lead time for Aspen implementation. Our Aspen quote was only valid until September, but we can ask for an updated quote (Wendy?). Current quote is \$7500 for set up and \$8000 annual hosting cost. ARPA can only be used for set-up, not the annual hosting cost.

Janet shared a spreadsheet that showed cost impacts to each library with various scenarios (this will be shared to Basecamp):

Option A: the cost to each library if all remained status quo without adding Aspen Discovery
Option B: the worst case scenario if adding Aspen without any funding help, using the formula only
Option C: the costs if adding Aspen and using \$7500 of ARPA funds for the setup, using formula only
Option D: the costs if adding Aspen with each library dividing annual ASPEN cost (&ARPA) \$400 each
Option E: the costs if adding Aspen with each library paying \$280 for annual ASPEN cost (&ARPA) – Janet used this figure as this was a lower number that was actually needed, rather than the \$400.
Option F: the costs if adding Aspen using ARPA funds for set-up, raising minimum from \$700 to \$800, and then following formula, incorporating annual Aspen costs.

Jill asked if anyone asked Bywater if overall costs could be lowered. Jennie said she asked and there was no movement.

Kendra asked if annual hosting costs go up each year. Discussion was that it should be rolled into the current contract but that would need to be confirmed. Jennie believed the renewal would be in 2022.

It was mentioned that the research and development fund and the contingency fund have not been used for a few years. Currently we have not budgeted anything in those accounts since they have not been used. It was determined that we have \$9K in research and development and \$11,643 contingency funds. Discussion about using research and development costs for the first couple of years in order to plan for future costs.

Sue made a motion, seconded by Holly, that the board adopt the addition of Aspen, pending all the details being figured out.

Discussion: If we propose a budget then the membership do have the power to decline the proposed budget. Discussion regarding including the budget numbers along with the Aspen approval. Starr suggested providing all scenarios for the budget at the annual meeting and explain the proposal. *After further discussion, Sue withdrew the motion.*

Proposed budget must be finalized and presented to the membership 30 days in advance of the annual meeting.

Jennie made a motion, seconded by Holly, that the consortium adopt Aspen with the idea that the cost per library would not exceed Option B in the spreadsheet that Janet shared, which may be further reduced by ARPA funding and CLN R&D funds.

Discussion: Sue said she would not be able to vote in favor of the motion as the largest libraries will take the brunt of the increase. Jill disagreed that it should be only the formula, and not change the basic fee. Janet did not think the fee formula is part of the bylaws and there has not been a huge increase in the costs. Janet stated the cost cannot fall exclusively on the small libraries or on the large libraries. Bridget stated this Option C would be the worst case scenario. Kendra felt time was needed to review figures. Catherine stated these ARPA funds is a one-time gift to the Catamount for the setup cost. Further discussion regarding how to present the information to the full membership at the annual meeting.

The motion failed: 0 AYE, 5 NAY

Holly made a motion, seconded by Starr, that the board propose the adoption of Aspen with the budget Option C, with the understanding that the actual costs would be subsidized by available funds. The motion passed: 4 AYE, 0 NAY, 1 abstention (Janet).

Sue made a motion, seconded by Janet, that CLN use \$3000 of R&D funds toward the first year of Aspen hosting. Discussion: this would be part of the option C budget. The motion was approved unanimously. Janet can edit the Option C with the \$3000 used from the R&D money.

Suggestions regarding adding notes to budget explaining our process. The budget must be finalized by September 25th. The CLN board will need to meet before that date to finalize its approval.

- Member Library Outreach Updates – Jennie, Sue, Starr and Jill reached out to member libraries to make better connections. All reported fruitful discussions reminding about annual meeting, Aspen, etc. Smaller libraries have challenges to attend meetings due to scheduling and time constraints as some of the directors do not have time off the desk or work multiple jobs. They often listen to recording and contribute on Basecamp. Liaisons can make calls before the meetings to get their input on proposed agenda items. Lynne suggested making meetings after hours. Jill indicated that one library did not respond to her. Starr indicated that one/more would not be able to attend an evening meeting due to other jobs/commitments and not everyone will be able to be at the meetings live. It was emphasized that the annual meeting is required by ALL libraries. Sue indicated that her 3 library directors were appreciative of the contact. Rachel (Wtby) wanted to know if we were still looking at an in-person annual meeting. The group agreed we would do a virtual meeting this year again. Starr thanked Jennie for her leadership on this. Jennie suggests that directors add an hour or so each month in their budgeting to allow for these off-the-desk meetings.

New Business:

-Bylaws (proposed changes must be posted 60 days before Annual Meeting, by Aug. 27) – discussion regarding missing meetings, and incentives or penalties. However, no changes were proposed. We are hopeful that our liaison connections will help as well.

-2022 Budget – was discussed earlier and will be approved at the next Board meeting.

-Nominating committee: Jennie and Starr volunteer for the committee to nominate two board members. Officers will be elected after the board is seated. Holly indicated her willingness to continue to serve as secretary.

Next Meeting Date/ Annual Meeting

The next CLN board Go-To meeting will be held at 10AM on September 21st.

The annual meeting (Go-To) will be virtual on October 26th.

Motion was made by Holly, seconded by Sue, to adjourn at 12:08 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Dowdell, for Holly Hall