**WACTCLC Meeting Minutes**

**Date: October 13, 2017, 12:15 PM – 1:35 PM**

**Location: Spokane Community College**

Attendance: Christie Flynn (chair), Kennedy James (chair elect), Tim Fuhrman (treasurer), Wade Guidry, Howard Fuller (secretary), Andrew Hersh-Tudor (past chair), Samantha Hines (member-at-large), Melinda Harbaurgh (LLC chair elect), Vivienne McClendon, Jane Blume, Mindy Coslor, Tammy Siebenberg , Aryana Bates, Lynn Kanne, Leslie Potter-Henderson, Jennifer Patterson, Gerie Ventura (Zoom).

**Call to order: Christie Flynn called the meeting to order at 12:15 PM**

1. Christie asked Howard to provide an overview of the documents that are currently informing the Consortium’s thinking. Those documents are:
	1. The 21st Century Library project documents
	2. WACTCLC Bylaws
	3. The following ALMA project planning documents found on the LLC wiki:
		1. April 2015 LLC Alma discussion\_Shared Value Question
		2. ILS project\_being a 21st century library\_LLC (April 2015—Spring Meeting)
	4. One of the differences between the Consortium and LLC is that all employees at all the CTC libraries are members and only the deans/directors are members of LLC.
		1. Is it then possible to create program areas, e.g., systems staff/faculty, who can then support each other professionally and answer each other’s day-to-day questions? How might something like this function and operate?
2. Parking lot of questions about the Consortium and its work that arose during the meeting. Note, one purpose of this meeting was to further flesh-out the work of the consortium, its structure, and relationship to LLC.
	1. How might we finance or make sure we have enough money to purchase specialize databases, especially those that specifically support BAS programs?
	2. Can the Consortium lobby the State Legislation?
3. We need to think about the Consortium’s boundaries differently in how we think about LLC’s. LLC’s boundaries are more akin to human boundaries, i.e., human’s know where our property lines are. The consortium is not constrained by property lines as it can function (more like a neighborhood cat) programmatically or a ‘think tank’ and pull select people together from across the State (or from outside the State).
4. Christie lead the group in a “donut activity.”

The donut activity presents the participants a ‘donut’ drawn on a piece of paper, essentially three circles drawn concentrically on the paper. In the smallest circle participants list those activities that are definitely the work of the Consortium. In the middle circle participants list those activities that could be the work of the Consortium, and in the largest circle participant list those activities that are never the work of the Consortium.

Some of the activities and issues discussed are:

* 1. Lobby legislature
	2. Purchasing shared databases for BAS programs
		1. Or is this really leveraging the size of the Consortium in negotiating contracts with either a vendor, Orbis Cascade, or other group?
	3. How do we leverage our work with the SBCTC?; How do we deliver consistent messages and ‘ask’s’ of the State legislation?; How do we work with/or guide the SBCTC and Mark Jenkins?; Or is this the shared work of LLC and the Consortium?
		1. And all the above knowing that our work pattern for most issues, weather databases or shared project money, is :
			1. Needs / proposal;
			2. Research phase;
			3. Political work;
			4. Planning; and
			5. Implementation.
	4. We need to identify projects where the leverage of the Consortium can most effectively….[fill in the blank].
	5. Why did we create the Consortium?

What can it do that LLC can’t do?

What about any project places it in the Consortium?

* 1. The Consortium has fiscal agency (LLC cannot have fiscal agency).

The ALMA/Primo project launched the Consortium. It is needed to employ staff (e.g., Wade and Shellie), and is better positioned for single payment options (as we currently do with ALMA/Primo).

The Consortium can work directly with vendors in a way State Council’s cannot. For example, the consortium can invite vendors that are not yet under contract into meetings.

* 1. Provide professional development and organized workgroups in program areas, e.g., systems group or cataloging/meta-data group.
	2. Provide on-going training with ALMA/Primo.
	3. Group purchase of a good citation tool.
		1. It was suggested for this kind of tool it might be prudent to: identify need (with data) and work with LLC to leverage SBCTC purchasing and influence. This might lead to longer term financial support.
	4. Design work—or other kinds of groups that lead to the larger more staffed college in supporting smaller colleges (as need arises).
		1. This could look like an ‘on-call’ support, or
		2. Could be program specific where one college employs a subject matter expert who is made accessible to all colleges.
	5. Structurally, WACTCLC.ORG is being designed/organized with lead’s assigned to (ALMA) topics, i.e., designed around ‘go-to’ people for assistance.
		1. One model would require work group leads (with assigned roosters) having designated time to produce a work deliverable. This time would be provided to the Consortium and allocated by respective deans/directors. The Orbis-Cascade model has group leads providing a few hours per week to the consortium.
			1. It is believed Mark Jenkins may be interested in this model as the SBCTC is using a similar model to move forward project work (for example, CTClink). This model could be used to solve issues and work toward a common need.
				1. CTClink People soft model….

Bring programmatic people from various colleges together, eg, source schedulers.

On day one they all present their respective process and practices

Leading to shared commentaries, questions, and pressure testing of presented processes and practices

Leading to a joint agreement of one process and practice to be shared among colleges (and in CTClink).

* + - 1. A library example: several libraries jointly hiring a CJK cataloger, ie., one shared resource.
	1. What might be the Consortia work with eLearning (note, eLearning at about 1/3 of campuses reports to the dean of the library?
		1. “consortial elearning mini-conference / training”
	2. Shared or procurement of resources or services that have or add value, eg, shared staff or SME or in-kind service.
	3. Organizing and managing working groups and participation in them
	4. Professional Learning Communities
	5. Christie asked all participants to indicate on their donut the one thing that is of most importance to them.
	6. This ended the donut activity. Christie compiled the results which are found at the end of the meeting minutes.
1. Wednesday evening meeting minutes were reviewed and in particular a section titled “Ideation – the work of the Consortium” was more closed walked through. Consortia model’s presented at the Wednesday evening were also shared with the WACTCLC meeting participants. LLC and WACTCLC were differentiated as:
	1. LLC’s focus is: policy and strategy; and membership is comprised of CTC library deans and directors.
	2. WACTCLC’s focus is: technology; shared purchasing; shared work groups/PLC’s; and membership included all CTC library employees.
2. Christie asked for feedback on the structure and timing of the Consortium meeting. Currently the structure is: An in-person pre-LLC meeting at the site of the LLC meeting; a 30-60-minute meeting on the LLC agenda, and a 1-2 hours post-LLC meeting at the site of the LLC meeting. Feedback included:
	1. Who attends, or is welcome to attend, the Consortium meetings? Any CTC library employee, as all are members, is welcome to attend Consortium meetings. As opposed to LLC membership which is formally made up of library dean/directors.
	2. Should we have regional meetings
	3. Should we provide the opportunity to have groups (working groups?) that may leverage synergy so we can move out of our college silo’s.
	4. One piece of work that executive committee should do:
		1. Is to take what we have so far and develop what core/initial working groups might look like or at least develop a model ---- minus ALMA/Primo as this is occurring via Wade and Shellie.
		2. Is to deliberately connect people doing like programmatic work.
		3. Who gives permission for these programs or anoints these groups? And who provides permissions for those who participate in these groups?
3. Other business the Consortium is (discussing) taking on:
	1. Possibly funding participation in Eluna this Spring. Note: Eluna will be in Spokane, WA.
	2. How do we engage non-ALMA libraries and ALMA libraries that belong to other consortia, e.g., Clark College is a member of Orbis-Cascade.
	3. Next Meeting date/plans?
		1. It was suggested the executive leadership from LLC and the Consortium meet to noodle out inter-group communication and report out structure.

**Meeting Adjourned: 1:35 PM**

**Results of the Donut Activity:**

**ALWAYS THE WORK OF WACTCLC**

Numbers in parenthesis indicate number of people who cited the item on their list. Asterisks indicate the number of people who chose that item as their first or second highest priority.

* Strategize ways to acquire/fund databases for BAS programs (2)\*
* Provide training in Alma/Primo (4)\*
* Work Groups by functional area (3)\*
* Other Professional Development for librarians and staff (5)\*\*\*
* Consortial purchasing of licensing agreements (3)\*\*\*
* Consortial purchasing of software (1)
* Consortial purchasing of other shared resources (4)\*\*
* Commit % of FTE in the form of $ or staffing to the consortium for access to shared resources
* Systems support
* Development of common processes
* Driving ILS
* Coordinating regional or project needs
* Collaborative support - connecting experts within the system with needs
* Catalog projects - such as shared catalog/simplified searching across colleges
* Fiscal agency
* write contracts, employ staff
* shared staffing
* Courier service contract
* Work with SBCTC for library funding & to help with their mission
* Project management
* Learning Community Formation/ coordination

**POSSIBLY THE WORK OF WACTCLC**

* Work closely with e-learning Council or consortial equivalent to track and support acquisition/subscription & management of e-learning resources
* Lobbying legislature (5)
* Accessibility
* Research (2)
* Professional Development
* e-learning
* shared staffing
* shared cataloging & processing
* Professional Development outside of Primo/Alma\*
* Library learning communities\*
* Identifying needs
* Communications with State Board

**NEVER THE WORK OF WACTCLC**

* Policy making
* Lobbying legislature (3)
* e-learning
* IL/instruction projects
* Research solutions to problems identified by LLC
* Identify problems/needs of 21st librarians
* Working with SBCTC to seek leadership on statewide projects for political capital & legislative asks
* Library policies

**Notes**

Consortial purchasing and Professional development/training were the two items most frequently mentioned and the most consistently identified as priorities.

Lobbying the legislature was noted 5 times as possible work of the Library Consortium, but was cited 3 times as being never the work of the consortium. One person noted that lobbying the legislature should be done as individuals, not as state employees.

One person cited BAS database acquisition and funding as highest priority.