

V-Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee Meeting



10:00 a.m. – 11:30 p.m.
WVLS Conference Room

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:** Joshua Klingbeil – WVLS

The meeting was called to order at 10:01 by Erica Clarkson, Committee Chair.

Review of committee purpose and goals

The committee reviewed the charge from the V-Cat Steering Committee to evaluate a variety of voting models and provide input to the Steering Committee was confirmed.

Excerpts from relevant guiding documents including the WVLS Mission & Purpose, Agreement for Participation in V-Cat and the statements of V-Cat Council vision from the 2017-2018 V-Cat Strategic Plan were presented by K. Zimmermann.

Review of V-Cat bylaws regarding voting

Review of Article 4: Structure – Meetings f., g. and h.

At least 51% of the V-Cat representatives must be present for a vote.

A 2/3 majority of the total representatives in attendance or via proxy will carry the vote.

A 2/3 majority is considered a “super majority.”

Review of Article 3: Participation 1, 2.

Each participating library is granted one vote.

Review of preliminary information on voting models in use at other library consortia

K. Zimmermann shared basic information gathered on larger Wisconsin library systems’ shared ILS governance and voting models including the following:

- Nicolet Federated Library System and Outagamie Waupaca Library System’s OWLSnet Administrative Advisory Committee
- IFLS’ MORE Network Advisory Committee
- Northern Waters Library Service’s Merlin Consortium
- South Central Library System’s LinkCat ILS Committee

The committee discussed aspects of the voting models including:

- majority and supermajority required across the board or for different types of motions
- representation and weighted voting
- possible formulas for weighting including population, circulation, net lending/borrowing, funding, collection size
- the use of weighted and unweighted models within one system requiring two votes on each motion
- whether or not members need to be present at a meeting to vote on a motion, or if voting is allowed for libraries who are not present

It was clarified that current V-Cat representation is one council member per library, not per building. For example, Antigo and Marathon County both have multiple branch locations but only have one V-Cat representative.

It was clarified that voting models and funding models can be independent of one another.

Origin of this committee following the June 2019 V-Cat Council meeting and the September 2019 V-Cat Steering Committee meeting was discussed, as well as the role of the Steering Committee in reviewing V-Cat bylaws and recommending changes.

K. Heiting proposed that the committee look at more in-depth models that are available and give some consideration to what that might look like for V-Cat and take it back to the Steering Committee.

Committee members expressed a desire to have a voting model that is easy to understand, efficient and fair based on criteria.

The committee agreed to gather more information about voting models and weighting formulas in place at the following consortia:

- Nicolet Federated Library System and Outagamie Waupaca Library System's OWLSnet Administrative Advisory Committee
- IFLS' MORE Network Advisory Committee
- South Central Library System's LinkCat ILS Committee
- Winding Rivers Library System's WRLSWEB

The committee choose not to explore additional alternative models at this time.

Request for agenda items

Committee members will report on information gathered at the next meeting.

Documents can be sent to Katie Zimmermann to facilitate sharing before the next meeting.

Set next meeting date

The next meeting will be the third week of March, 2020.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:54.

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..

V-Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee Meeting



Tuesday, June 2, 2020

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Remote meeting via GoToMeeting

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

Meeting Minutes

(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:** none.

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Erica Clarkson, Committee Chair.

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve agenda was made by D. Frandrup, seconded by H. O’Hare. Motion carried.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: April 2020

Motion to approve minutes was made by D. Kiefer, seconded by H. O’Hare. Motion carried.

Review of Previously Discussed Models With V-Cat Data and Discussion of Models

The committee reviewed V-Cat library **circulation data** for one year and three years as a means to calculate weighted votes.

The committee discussed the rounding of percentages to calculate votes. It was noted that many voting models round up to the nearest whole percent to ensure that any libraries with less than one percent share have a vote. The committee found that this over inflates some libraries’ votes by giving a full additional vote for any fraction of a percentage. For instance, 1.01% rounds to two votes, as does 1.8%. The recommendation was made to round any percentage under 1% up to 1, and round other percentages over 1% to the nearest whole percent. Following that recommendation, 0.4% would round up to one vote, 1.01% would round down to 1 vote and 1.8% would round up to two votes. It was also noted that depending upon the partial percentages and rounding, the number of total votes may vary slightly across models.

The committee reviewed V-Cat library **holdings data** for one year and three years as a means to calculate weighted votes.

Cost per circulation was shared as a possible factor to consider, and the committee chose not to pursue additional data to fully consider a model based on cost per circulation.

Service population and required library director certification levels were also reviewed as a possible factors to consider, and the committee chose not to pursue them further.

The committee looked at **combined circulation and holdings data** that V-Cat uses to calculate annual V-Cat budget shares as a means to calculate weighted votes. T. Blomberg noted that the budget share averaged over three years seemed to be a balanced and fair way to determine weighted votes. D. Frandrup agreed that the three year average seems to offer consistency year over year.

Some concern was expressed over the perception that libraries who pay more money have a larger vote. K. Heiting noted that although holdings and circulation and other factors can be manipulated to some extent, libraries are not likely to manipulate anything that results in paying a higher maintenance share. D. Frandrup agreed that this seems the fairest method. H. O'Hare also agreed that using a three year average and using the share percentage as a basis for voting seems fair. D. Kiefer agreed that budget share seems the most fair and consistent.

Net lending and net borrowing data from the 2019 totals report were considered as an additional factor for calculating weighted votes. A ratio of the number of items sent for every item received was considered as a factor. If libraries lend more, they are providing an additional benefit to the other V-Cat libraries. If libraries borrow more, they may be doing more to encourage patrons to order items from other locations. Or it could be that some libraries have more demand than they are able to fill with their local materials. The committee would like to pursue offering additional weight to net lending libraries. More consideration is needed to integrate net borrowing/lending as a factor for calculating weighted votes.

The committee reviewed V-Cat library **registered borrowers data** for one year and three years as a means to calculate weighted votes. Committee members noted that this factor is very easy to manipulate by either not cleaning up records regularly or by pushing new card applications for babies and young children. Standard guidelines for cleaning up patron records were discussed. If registered borrowers data was to be used as a factor for weighted votes the guidelines would need to be reviewed and enforced. The thought behind using registered borrowers comes from a proposed, but unsuccessful, project to merge ILS between Winnefox, Nicolet Federated and Outagamie Waupaca library systems. In the proposed funding model, registered borrowers data was used in calculating budget shares as well as voting shares with the thought that if a library's fee is based on the number of item records in the database, it could also be expected to pay for its number of patron records in the database. Since this is not a factor in the V-Cat funding model, it may not make sense to include it as a factor in weighted voting.

K. Zimmermann reviewed the point that factors in the funding model make good factors for weighted votes. If factors in the funding structure are also used in the voting structure, a library may be less likely to manipulate its records to inflate its numbers because it has the potential to increase the library's costs. D. Frandrup agreed.

K. Zimmermann presented a possible method for weighting votes by **county representation**, giving each county a set number of votes divided out by library. The idea behind the method is that libraries join a system by county. It offers a regional grouping similar to the cluster representation in place in the South Central Library System.

D. Kiefer thanked K. Zimmermann for presenting the numbers and information in an easy to understand way.

Additional Discussion

T. Blomberg stated that the budget share looks like the best option and encouraged the committee to further explore factoring in net lending. D. Kiefer also agreed that using net lending as a factor gives some recognition to what libraries are giving to the group. D. Frandrup noted that it could help for some libraries that have a half percent or are between percentages. H. O'Hare mentioned that it contributes to the concept of collaboration within a system and helps to focus on what libraries have to offer the group - even if a library is small it is an important part of the whole. After a preliminary look at how to calculate votes based on V-Cat shares with a bonus for net lending, the committee realized that more careful consideration of how to incorporate net lending was needed.

Discussion of Information to Present to the V-Cat Steering Committee

When the committee is ready, the information considered, and recommended model will be presented to the V-Cat Steering committee.

Request for Agenda Items

- Review of using V-Cat Shares plus net lending as the basis for a weighted voting model
- Review of what motions have been particularly difficult in the past for V-Cat Council
- Discussion of when to use weighted vote vs. when to use one per library vote
- Discussion of when to require 2/3 majority vs. when to require 51% majority

Set Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held in July.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by D. Frandrup, and seconded by K. Heiting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 a.m.



V-Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee Meeting

Thursday, July 16, 2020
9:00-11:00 am.

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

Due to precautions concerning COVID-19 this meeting will be held by remote attendance only.

Meeting Facilitator: Erica Petersen, Committee Chair

Meeting Minutes

(prepared by Katie Zimmermann)

Attendees:

Committee Members: Erica Petersen – 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

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Erica Petersen, Committee Chair.

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve meeting agenda was made by K. Heiting, seconded by T. Blomberg, seconded.
Motion carried.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: June 2020

Motion to approve meeting minutes with minor correction was made by T. Blomberg, seconded by D. Kiefer. Motion carried.

Review of Net Lending as a Potential Factor in a Weighted Voting Model

K. Zimmermann presented data for calculating a net lending factor. Interlibrary loan numbers were pulled from the WVLS statistical booklet for 2017, 2018, and 2019. A net lending factor was calculated from a three-year average of items sent divided by items received. Subtracting one from this number yields an average amount of items lent above or below an equal exchange of items. This number can be used to add an additional factor to a library’s weighted vote, but can be capped at one.

Committee members agreed that this is a fair way to factor in member libraries’ net lending to the voting model.

The committee reviewed the data for calculating a weighted voting model using a three-year average of V-Cat Shares plus a net lending factor. It was noted that the net lending factor should be added to the three-year V-Cat share average before the numbers are rounded to calculate a weighted number of votes.

Review of Difficult V-Cat Council Motions

K. Zimmermann presented review of V-Cat motions from 2017 to the present date. Motions that required a roll call or ballot vote, because consensus could not be reached, include the following:

- Give precedence to local holds circulation option – May 2020 (18 Y, 1 opposed)
- Recommendations for Check Out Periods on Books, Audiobooks and Non-Series Visual Materials – February 2020 (21 Y, 3 opposed)
- V-Cat Recommendation for magazine circulation with variable – September 2019 (15 Y, 5 opposed, 2 abstaining)
- Recommendation for magazine circulation (multiple votes were taken to determine factors in the final motion) – June 2019 (final vote 14 Y, 6 opposed, 3 abstaining)

K. Zimmermann reported WVLS staff could only remember one other difficult motion in August of 2014 regarding a potential ILS Merger between NWLS and WVLS. The motion had a majority vote, but not a supermajority of two-thirds and did not pass. The final vote was 14 yes, 8 no and 1 abstaining.

T. Blomberg stated that motions on something that libraries cannot opt out of are likely to be of concern.

The committee reviewed magazine circulation motions from June of 2019 were reviewed and it was noted that a couple of factors made the motions more difficult. First that the motion included too many details and second, that the original recommendation changed during the meeting, and members were asked to vote without the opportunity to consult with their library staff or boards.

It was noted that minutes from June 2017, November 2018, February 2019 and June of 2020 were not included in this review and could be consulted before the next meeting.

V-Cat Council Budget motions were reviewed, and it was noted that budget motions have passed by consensus in 2018, 2019 and 2020 without the need for roll call votes.

V-Cat Bylaw Changes were reviewed. The last bylaw changes were made in 2014. The changes were presented at the February 2014 meeting, a revision was requested, and the revised bylaws were passed at the April 2014 meeting by consensus and a roll call vote was not necessary.

A review of motions shows that V-Cat has been able to operate making decisions by consensus without the need to have frequent roll call votes.

Discussion of When to Employ Weighted Voting or One Vote Per Library and When to Require a 2/3 Majority or a 51% Majority

The committee reviewed information from the April Voting Models Exploratory Committee meeting on voting models in place at public library consortiums in Wisconsin regarding how and when weighted models are used, and when a supermajority is required.

The committee discussed the practice of arriving at decisions primarily by consensus and the ability for members to call for a roll call vote. The committee discussed the difference between a roll call vote and a ballot vote and did not want the bylaws to be too restrictive.

The committee agreed that the preferred option is to start by seeking consensus, and if an outcome is unclear, then a vote would be taken.

Two concerns arose during the discussions. One that libraries dis-satisfied with a consensus could call for a weighted vote, causing the final outcome to be the opposite of the consensus vote. Secondly, that a large library could have enough votes to block a consensus vote depending upon the majority or supermajority required to pass a motion.

When considering majorities and supermajorities, note that the number of votes and weights are going to shift over time as collection sizes and circulation numbers change. It is unlikely, however, that changes will be dramatic.

The committee agreed that input further direction from the Steering Committee would be helpful in considering the impact of each voting model and level of majority.

Discussion of Information to Present to the V-Cat Steering Committee

The committee agreed that suggestions and feedback from the Steering Committee are needed if the Voting Model Committee should take this work further.

The committee agreed that the report for the Steering Committee should include the Voting Models Exploratory Committee meeting minutes, and examples for weighted voting models using the following data:

- V-Cat Shares
- V-Cat Shares with a net lending factor
- V-Cat Shares with net lending and net borrowing factors

Request for Future Agenda Items

The committee will meet to review a report for the steering committee.

The committee will discuss what the process of calling for a vote will look like.

Set Next Meeting Date

Doodle poll will be sent to set next meeting

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by H. OHare, and seconded by K. Heiting. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.



V-Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 13th, 2020
1:00-3:00 p. m.

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

Due to precautions concerning COVID-19 this meeting will be held by remote attendance only.

Meeting Facilitator: Erica Petersen, Committee Chair

Meeting Minutes

(prepared by Katie Zimmermann)

Attendees:

Committee Members: Erica Petersen – Medford (left at 1:29), Debra Kiefer – T. B. Scott, Heidi O’Hare, Tomahawk, Tammie Blomberg – Rib Lake, Dominic Frandrup – Antigo, Katie Zimmermann – WVLS, Kay Heiting – Granton (arrived at 1:23 p.m.),

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. by Erica Petersen, Committee Chair.

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve meeting agenda was made by D. Frandrup, seconded by H. O’Hare. Motion carried.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: July 2020

Motion to approve meeting minutes was made by H. O’Hare, seconded by T. Blomberg. Motion carried.

Review Information Prepared for Report to V-Cat Steering Committee

K. Zimmermann reviewed numbers for net lending and net borrowing. The committee affirmed the previous conclusion that there is not a need to reduce shares by a net borrowing factor.

The committee verified the formulas for calculating weighted votes and the spreadsheets to be shared in a report to the V-Cat Steering Committee.

T. Blomberg moved to take what the V- Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee has prepared to the V-Cat Steering Committee to get their advice and comments on a 2/3 majority, or $\frac{3}{4}$ majority of weighted vote, or some combination of weighted and non-weighted vote.

D. Frandrup seconded.

Discussion followed regarding the desire to present weighted voting models and the use of net lending as a factor.

Tammie amended her motion, and moved to take what the V- Cat Voting Models Exploratory Committee has prepared to the V-Cat Steering Committee to get their advice and comments on

a 2/3 majority, or ¾ majority of weighted vote, or some combination of weighted and non-weighted vote, and whether or not to include net lending as a factor in the weighted vote.

Seconded by K. Heiting.

Motion carried.

Request for Future Agenda Items

The committee will wait to receive feedback or further direction from the V-Cat Steering Committee.

Set Next Meeting Date

The committee will wait until after the V-Cat Steering Committee to schedule another meeting.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by K. Heiting, and seconded by D. Keifer. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.