

Metropolitan Library Service Agency Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Friday, August 4th, 2023

Roseville Library

10:00am-12:00pm

Advisory Board Members/Representatives Present:

Anoka:	Colleen Haubner (virtual)	Ramsey:	Pang Yang
Carver:	Jodi Edstrom	Saint Paul:	Lisa Motschke
Dakota:	Margaret Stone	Scott:	not present
Hennepin:	Amy McNally		
Washington:	Cate Sering		

Staff Present: Abigail Dillon, Gina Goettl, Kathleen James, and Scott Vrieze

I. Call to order

Temporary Chair Stone called the meeting to order at 10:11 am.

II. Introductions and Public Comment

III. Consent Agenda

a) Approval of agenda

Motion to approve the agenda by McNally. Second by Edstrom.

Roll call vote:

ACL – aye HCL - aye SCL – not present

CCL - aye RCL - aye WCL – aye

DCL - aye SPL - aye

Motion carried.

b) Approval of meeting minutes (June 16, 2023)

Motion to approve the meeting minutes by McNally. Second by Yang.

Roll call vote:

ACL – aye HCL - aye SCL – not present

CCL - aye RCL - aye WCL – aye

DCL - aye SPL - aye
Motion carried.

IV. Discussion/Action Items

a) Formula distributions to member library systems

A draft of the funding formula allocations was distributed in the meeting packet. The current formula for distributions has been in place for a long time, and the last time it was reviewed, the advisory board decided to keep it the same. It is likely too late to make any changes to the formula for the budget this year, but some library directors expressed an interest in revisiting the formula for next year's budget (ideally by March 2024).

Motion to set up team to explore changes to the formula by Yang. Second by Sering.

Roll call vote:

ACL – aye	HCL - aye	SCL – not present
CCL - aye	RCL - aye	WCL – aye
DCL - aye	SPL - aye	

Motion carried.

Directors interested in being on this team will email Vrieze and Stone, and the meetings will take place virtually. Haubner left the meeting at 10:30am.

Motion to approve the existing formula distribution for this year (to be approved by trustees on October 9th) by McNally. Second by Edstrom.

Amendment to motion: with the understanding that we are forming an advisory team to look at 2024 formula distribution by McNally. Second by Edstrom.

Roll call vote:

ACL – not present	HCL - aye	SCL – not present
CCL - aye	RCL - aye	WCL – aye
DCL - aye	SPL - aye	

Motion carried.

There was some discussion about the timeline for the new team. It was agreed that it was too late to make changes to the formula for this year's budget and there should be a focus on revision to the formula for next year's budget.

b) E-Resources Team collection development policy draft

This draft was distributed in the meeting packet. The team is working to develop an evaluation process to examine the usefulness of each resource through usage reports and user feedback. They are also looking at additional subject area coverage not currently represented such as crafting and music instruction. The team will have a report with more specific usage information to be distributed at the trustees/joint meeting in October.

c) Consideration of CD Team proposal for Overdrive/Libby collection

The Collection Development team has requested an additional \$500,000 for the Overdrive/Libby collection per year. The intent is to shorten wait times, as well as free up the individual budgets for member libraries to develop their collection in more specialized ways based on their population. The team has expressed that they are currently in a position of holds management instead of collection development because the demand is so high. Historically, \$150,000 has been dedicated to the Overdrive collection at the end of the year, and they are also asking that this amount be folded into the overall Overdrive collection budget at the beginning of the year.

Sering suggested that we also look ahead to the future – as the highest circulating consortium on Overdrive, we may have some legislative power with publishers because e-book pricing has increased exponentially over the past several years. Vrieze commented that Overdrive may have more leverage with publishers than anyone else, so it may be worth having an advocacy conversation with Overdrive.

Motion to change the description of the “E-Book Collaborative Project” to “Collaborative E-Book and E-Audiobook Collection” to reflect MELSA’s commitment to providing the service. Motion by Yang. Second by Edstrom.

Roll call vote:

ACL – not present	HCL - aye	SCL – not present
CCL - aye	RCL - aye	WCL – aye
DCL - aye	SPL - aye	

Motion carried.

Motion to add the \$150,000 to the permanent budget starting in January 2024.

Motion by Motschke. Second by McNally.

Roll call vote:

ACL – not present	HCL - aye	SCL – not present
CCL - aye	RCL - aye	WCL – aye
DCL - aye	SPL - aye	

Motion carried.

The motion to grant the \$500,000 request is tabled until the September advisory board meeting. Dillon asked what information the directors would like before the September meeting. Yang mentioned demographic information (whatever is collected, such as zip code) and commitment to race equity (such as Spanish language materials). Yang also wanted to hear from collection development managers about what the value of the Overdrive collection is for them. If additional money is allocated to this budget, a promotion of Libby is important since MELSA has not done this before and MELSA wants to make sure that everyone in the metro area is more aware of Libby (and that this is provided by the libraries).

d) MELSA-funded library staff training

Currently, each system receives an annual professional development allocation of \$11,000. Training from this allocation is coordinated and spent at the local level. There is also regionally coordinated training with a budget of \$19,700 for member library staff training in 2023 and \$25,000 in 2024. In past years, MELSA has used these funds to coordinate staff training on a variety of topics related to library management, customer service, programming, emerging trends, etc. open to all eight systems.

The library directors agreed that they would like to see an increase to the \$11,000 annual professional development allocation. They also suggested that the numbers should differ by member library based on number of staff (for example, HCL should receive more than CCL) or a “base plus” approach. Vrieze will work on drafting a proposal for this new type of distribution.

MELSA will continue to look for training opportunities and be more intentional about offering these options to member libraries.

Minitex is planning on having a training summit in the fall, and this could be helpful to MELSA and the member libraries.

e) Innovation/new project funds

As part of MELSA’s strategic outcomes project, we proposed creating an “innovation fund” to help fund and incentivize innovative/new projects and services in our member libraries. One of the barriers for some of our systems is finding “startup” funds for pilot projects or projects that simply need some upfront \$ to get the program started.

There have been hints that such a fund could work outside the confines of the distribution formula we use for both Formula (\$1 million) and Phase (\$500,000) Funds. Because both rely on a calculation that has a strong population factor, the result for smaller systems is that their portion doesn’t cover potential startup or innovative projects costs.

One trustee has proposed that we allocate up to \$50,000 per system (possibly \$400,000 in total) in a new Innovation / New Project Fund. Such a fund would enable funding one-to-two-year pilot projects and programs or would pay for initial costs for something that has a lower ongoing maintenance cost once the initial amount is expended.

It is possible that this fund would best be treated as a fund balance assignment, which could potentially grow or shrink depending on the size of fund balance available in a particular year.

HCL used to have a seed grant fund, and the hardest part about having a competitive process is the work involved in administering these funds and making decisions about who gets this money. McNally suggested another option that each member library could have its own seed grant fund and that MELSA could distribute a certain amount to each member library. Shared tools could be another option (such as Logic training), as part of the formula or Phase funds.

V. Reports & Communications

- a) Executive Director and MELSA staff updates
- b) Report on CRPLSA meeting discussion
 - 1. Professional Development – the possibility of the state creating a certification process
 - 2. Legislative advocacy – priorities for upcoming session (“off year”): additional money for ELM collection, library construction bill. Vrieze will send an email to the directors, asking them for information about their potential library construction projects.
- c) Program review updates – Promotions review

Stone adjourned the meeting at 12:41pm.