

# V-Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee Meeting



1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Remote meeting via GoToMeeting

Wisconsin Valley Library Service Meeting Room  
300 First Street - Wausau WI, 54403

## Meeting Minutes (draft)

(prepared by Katie Zimmermann)

### *Attendees:*

**Committee Members:** Erica Clarkson – Medford, Debra Kiefer – T. B. Scott, Heidi O’Hare, Tomahawk, Tammie Blomberg – Rib Lake, Dominic Frandrup – Antigo, Kay Heiting – Granton, Katie Zimmermann – WVLS **Others:** Peggy O’Connell – Minocqua, Joshua Klingbeil - WVLS

*The meeting was called to order at 1:01p.m. by Erica Clarkson, Committee Chair.*

### **Approval of Agenda**

None opposed.

### **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: February 2020**

Motion to approve minutes was made by D. Frandrup, seconded by T. Blomberg. Motion carried.

### **Review of information gathered from other library systems and Presentation of preliminary information examples of models with V-Cat data**

#### **Nicolet Federated Library System and Outagamie Waupaca Library System’s OWLSnet Administrative Advisory Committee**

E. Clarkson reported that OWLSnet uses weighted voting. Votes are weighted based on each library’s annual membership fee payments. Each library’s last annual membership fee payment is divided by 1000 and rounding up to the next whole number.

All actions of the committee require two-thirds (2/3) majority of participating libraries and a two-thirds (2/3) majority of annual membership fee weighted votes are needed for approval.

No action shall be approved if more than one-third of participating libraries or more than one-third of annual membership fee shares cast a negative vote. When less than two-thirds of participating libraries and annual membership fee shares vote affirmative and less than one-third of participating libraries or annual membership fee shares vote negative, the vote shall be deemed inconclusive.

Whenever a vote is inconclusive, the official contacts, or alternates, from all participating libraries not in attendance when the vote is taken will be polled for their votes. The vote count

will become final after the official contacts, or alternates, from all participating libraries have been polled.

#### **IFLS' MORE Network Advisory Committee**

H. O'Hare reported that votes are assigned in two ways, first as a single vote for each member library present, and secondly votes are assigned in accordance with annual membership fees.

Motions on a budget, and motions on bylaws are decided by three quarter (3/4) majority vote of the member libraries present and three quarter (3/4) majority vote based on membership fee vote distribution. Both majorities are required for a motion on budget or the adoption of amended bylaws are required.

All other actions will be decided by 51% vote of member libraries present and 51% based on vote distribution.

Proxies are allowed, but a form must be completed in advance of the meeting to designate a proxy.

#### **South Central Library System's LinkCat ILS Committee**

K. Heiting reported that the South Central model is very complicated. It is a multi-tiered system. Votes are weighted by budget share, but there are different weights depending upon the area of service such as Network, ILS, Infrastructure, PC etc. The ILS budget share formula includes Building fee + Share of Circulation + Share of total items Owned. (Building Fee = 15%, Circulation = 42.5% Holdings = 42.5%) K. Heiting provided a document showing weighted vote distributions.

The system is also divided into 13 clusters, mainly by County; each cluster votes to elect a representative who then sits on all the various committees and depending on the group they meet monthly or bimonthly throughout the year. In March there is a meeting to set the budget and all libraries attend.

K. Heiting noted that she spoke to a small library in SCLS and they reported that it works, but it isn't necessarily beneficial to the small libraries.

K. Zimmermann asked whether cluster representatives votes were equal or if they carried the weight of each library's votes with them. K. Heiting responded that it is her understanding that the cluster representative is in charge of the decision for their cluster.

H. O'Hare asked how often the clusters meet. K. Heiting reported that the representatives of each cluster sit on every committee, but she did not know how often the clusters themselves meet.

#### **Winding Rivers Library System's WRLSWEB**

P. O'Connell reported that they operate similarly to V-Cat and the Northern Waters Library System with one voting representative per library.

#### **Nicolet Federated Library System & Outagamie Waupaca Library System & Winnefox Library System proposed bylaws for NOW shared ILS**

K. Zimmermann shared information about another model proposed during planning stages for a shared ILS between NFLS OWLS and Winnefox Library System. Library Voting Share would be calculated by averaging the past three years of a Participating Library's percentage of the NOW Consortium file size (total materials plus total registered borrowers) and its percentage of total NOW Consortium circulation. The average is multiplied by 10,000 and rounded to a whole number. Library Voting Shares shall be calculated annually using the average of the Participating Library's annual report data from the most recent three years.

A quorum shall consist of the representatives of Library Directors of at least 60% of Participating Libraries and possessing at least 60% of total possible votes. A library staff member representing their library and authorized to make decisions shall be counted for the determination of a quorum. A person holding the proxy for another Library Director shall count the absent library towards the determination of a quorum.

The Directors Council shall attempt to arrive at its recommendations by consensus. When consensus cannot be achieved, action will be taken by vote.

A roll call vote may be taken at any meeting of the Directors Council provided the item is on the agenda and announced at least one week prior to the meeting.

All motions shall require the affirmative vote of 60% of Library Directors and 60% of Library Voting Shares for approval. Both majorities are required for a motion to pass.

There is a director's council as well as an executive committee. Library on the Executive Committee are determined at the system level, according to the percentage of the cost of the NOW Consortium allocated to each System. These costs shall be recalculated every 5 years or whenever a library joins or leaves the Consortium. Initial apportionment shall be:

- a. Nicolet 3 Representatives
- b. OWLS 3 Representatives
- c. Winnefox 4 Representatives

#### **Additional Discussion**

K. Zimmermann noted that many of the models are using budget share as a primary factor in determining the weight of a vote, but that library systems vary in the method by which budget shares are calculated.

T. Blomberg asked to committee to think about what counting weighted votes would look like at a typical V-Cat meeting.

K. Zimmermann noted that decisions could still be made primarily by consensus and counting weighted votes would only come into play when a roll call vote was necessary.

D. Frandrup reported that when he was at an OWLS library that an Excel spreadsheet was used to calculate votes so everyone could see the results.

K. Heiting found it interesting that none of the models use net lending or net borrowing as a factor for weighted voting. She indicated that how much a library lends to the other libraries in the system could be a factor to consider.

D. Frandrup noted that if a model includes net lending/net borrowing as a factor, libraries that do not have a high demand shelf would be at a distinct advantage because new materials would be going out to other libraries right away. If a library wanted to gain more votes, it would be in libraries best interest to allow materials to leave their library right away.

K. Heiting mentioned that most V-Cat libraries don't want to give up their practice of using high demand to fill local holds on new materials first, but sharing books immediately does contribute to the greater good.

Additional discussion followed about weighted voting including the large difference in share size between libraries within V-Cat.

T. Blomberg proposed the idea of weighting libraries based on grade.

### **Presentation of preliminary information examples of models with V-Cat data**

K. Zimmermann noted that many of the models are using budget share as a primary factor in determining the weight of a vote, but that library systems vary in the method by which budget shares are calculated.

#### **K. Zimmermann shared preliminary examples of the following weighted voting models:**

OWLSnet weighted voting model using V-Cat library budget shares, dividing by 1000 and rounding up to the next whole number.

It was noted that there may be a difference between how OWLSnet shares and V-Cat shares are calculated.

Discussion followed. Committee members expressed concern about the need to vote twice for each motion and the possibility of waiting for results of an action after a meeting is adjourned.

IFLS MORE weighted voting model using V-Cat library budget shares based on holdings and circulation, similar to the way V-Cat currently calculates its budget shares and granting 1 vote for every 0%-1% share.

SCLS LinkCat weighted voting model using V-Cat library holdings and circulation data, as well as number of buildings.

D. Frandrup noted that the distribution of V-Cat votes using the SCLS weighting model is very similar to the distribution of V-Cat votes using the IFLS model of weighting, not accounting for any cluster representation.

K. Zimmermann reviewed calculations for the SCLS voting models, noting that since South Central incorporates a building fee, the calculation of budget share is different than the current V-Cat budget calculations.

**Discussion followed regarding the differences in weight across the three models.**

K. Zimmermann noted that rounding up to the next whole number is done so that any library that has less than 1% of a share still has a vote. Also, the percentage of total vote for each library varies across the models.

H. O'Hare encouraged the committee to consider not only how the votes are assigned or weighted, but also how many votes are required to pass a motion.

It was noted that there could be a significant difference in results whether voting is limited to libraries present during a meeting and voting when all libraries are required to respond outside of a meeting.

Considering preliminary V-Cat models with weighted votes as few as seven large libraries would be needed to carry a 2/3 majority of the weighted vote. This could be concerning for small libraries and illustrates the benefit of the models using a dual vote with weighted and non-weighted votes being counted. This requires that some small libraries must also vote for the motion for it to pass.

Discussion followed regarding different types of motions requiring different majorities. For instance, with the IFLS model budget and bylaws require a 2/3 majority, but all other motions require only a 51% majority.

Committee members agreed that they would like to see a model that gives larger libraries an adequate say without losing the voice of smaller libraries.

D. Frandrup noted that OWLS changed the calculation of weighted votes recently, and that the rules are not set in stone, but can be changed over time.

K. Zimmermann reviewed the larger systems in Wisconsin and their voting models:

- IFLS Library System – Dual voting: weighted voting + one vote per library
- Nicolet Federated Library System / Outagamie Waupaca Library System – Dual voting: weighted voting + one vote per library
- Northern Waters Library System – One vote per library
- South Central Library System – Weighted voting
- Winding Rivers Library System – One vote per library

D. Frandrup noted that systems around the state are using weighted voting when there is a much larger population center somewhere in the system to give the libraries serving a larger population more of a voice.

The committee confirmed the collective desire to see a model that gives larger libraries an adequate say without losing the voice of smaller libraries.

The committee discussed whether or not libraries must be present to vote. Considering what kind of follow up voting could happen if a vote is inconclusive.

The committee discussed what types of important decisions would require roll call voting, and the need to be very explicit in the bylaws what motions require a particular type of vote or majority.

### **Request for agenda items**

The committee will meet again to further explore a dual voting model, and explore the following aspects of V-Cat data:

- Circulation
- Holdings
- Budget shares
- Net lending/borrowing
- Population size or library grade
- How many years of data are used to calculate weight of votes

The committee will also consider the following:

- When to use weighted vote vs. when to use one per library vote
- When to require 2/3 majority vs. when to require 51% majority
- What motions have been particularly difficult in the past for V-Cat Council

### **Set next meeting date**

The next meeting will be held towards the end of May.

### **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by H. O'Hare, and seconded by D. Frandrup. Motion carried.

*The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m..*