ATTENDEES: Katie Aldrich (Northcentral Tech College), Julie Blankenberg (Forest Product Labs), Jeff Brunner (WiLS), Paula Ganyard (UW-Green Bay), Sara Gold (WiLS), Cathy Markwiese (Milwaukee Public Library), Stef Morrill (WiLS), Jill Thomas (Lawrence).

ABSENT: Diane Kastelic (Kenosha Unified School District), Lee Konrad (UW-Madison), Melissa Matz (Elmbrook SD), Vickie Stangel (Dodgeville PL)

Meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS:

• Ask ICOLC if they have pricing issues for products and electronic resources as institutions. Are other consortia doing any sort of awareness with vendors to advocate for lower pricing for institutions. Ask if other consortia if have received print books stickered with single user use only.
• Stef will complete feedback survey based and include feedback from Coopac in the survey.
• Jeff, Sara and Andi will meet to brainstorm how to better serve/include our special libraries members.
• Sara, Jeff and Stef will meet revising new vendor process
• Jeff will contact Wiley to see about Elsevier journals – type arrangement.

2. Review agenda: No additions to the agenda

3. Report on SERU (Jeff Brunner)

Jeff discussed the Shared Electronic Resource Understanding created to simplify the convoluted process of licensing electronic resources. Vendors and libraries can elect to use SERU by registering via NISO. SERU has not yet been adopted widespread by either vendors or libraries. Some vendor partners report that their licenses have been streamlined based on SERU. Libraries often want to customize license terms so they use the traditional license agreement. Group decided there is not enough use to warrant exploring further at this time

4. Discussion: Ethics of vendor pricing (Katie Aldrich)

Katie discussed the fact that some vendors require institution rather than individual rate for physical products such as DVDs and print books. She asked if others have run into similar situations. Julie said that she was denied the ability to purchase an industry journal because she was an institution.

Jill reports she has had the same experience with DVDs. Prices are up to 10x the price of a price to an individual.

New York Times electronic version is also a problem.

Katie also has encountered an issue where she has purchased print books including study guides that have been designated as single user titles.

5. Discussion: Feedback survey for cooperative purchasing services

As part of a new “continuous feedback plan” being implemented at WiLS, we will be surveying ¼ of the cooperative purchasing contacts each quarter of the year. We are in the process of developing this survey for implementation in June and would like to discuss potential questions. Some potential areas of interest for us:

a. Value of aspect of cooperative purchasing service (with examples including product awareness, vendor problem resolution, single invoice, lifecycle management, licensing, discounted pricing, and other)

b. Responsiveness of WiLS staff

c. Approachability of WiLS staff
**d. Expertise of WiLS staff**

**e. Potential cooperative purchasing improvements** *(with examples including additional products/product lines, training on products, statistics, more product awareness, more information exchange among members, industry news, etc.)*

**f. How people are getting information about cooperative purchasing**

Julie said that she supports Cooperative Purchasing even though it isn’t necessarily cost-effective for them.

Cathy suggested a forum for exchanging marketing ideas.

## 5. Report and discussion: New trial process results (Jeff Brunner and Sara Gold)

Jeff reported on his Nursing trials which ran through March. Unfortunately, he received no feedback at all. He will circle back with his members to see what happened and try to figure out how to better tailor trials to best utilize his time.

Various members gave feedback as to what may have happened with low response to trial citing budget cuts, timing, would summer be better?, etc.

Sara reviewed the trial process for the k12s. She noted that site visits have provided a tremendous amount of feedback from both k12 and public libraries. In addition, she has been using the product spotlights in the Coop Newsletter.

Cathy likes the personal touch of vendors and Julie would really like more trials for specials. She suggested including her in the academic trials. The WiLS team will meet and brainstorm how to better serve our special libraries.

## 6. Report and discussion: New vendors

Feedback included liking the idea of putting new products out right away that the WiLS team thinks we would be of interest to our members. Niche Academy was cited.

It was mentioned that some libraries may not be looking for new products given the economic climate. WiLS thinks it is important to keep ahead of the curve in terms of new products and services for members even if it doesn’t translate into immediate sales.

Idea of a page on our website that includes new products which would include feedback rating system.

There are aspects of the new vendor process we’ve established that we have found beneficial. It provides us with a process that we can share with “cold call” vendors and gives us the opportunity to solicit feedback from our members. That being said, we have found some limitations to the process:

*COOPAC’s responses to the survey may not be representative.*

While COOPAC has representatives from all types of members, not all COOPAC members respond to the surveys sent. The response rate can often be quite low. Also, the small number of people on the committee may not represent all member viewpoints. Because of this, products may not be considered until the full member survey that many members would be interested in. The prioritization of rolling out new products and vendors based on COOPAC’s response may not be reflective of how the membership as a whole would prioritize these products or vendors.

*The current process limits what WiLS is able to promote and share with members.*

If COOPAC is not interested, yet WiLS feels like there may be a need for such a product, the process does not allow for promotion of a product to gauge interest. It also makes it difficult for us to keep members informed of product developments that may be of interest to the entire membership but not to COOPAC.

*The survey does not give us information about the whys.*

The survey does not provide information about why a COOPAC member votes yes or no about the product, which makes it difficult to provide feedback to the vendor or to determine if there may be wider appeal.
We would like to have a discussion about what might work better. Some specific questions for you to consider:

a. How can we best promote new products to our community?

b. Is it appropriate for WiLS to vet new vendors to eliminate those that seem inappropriate for our community?

c. Should products be presented in more context, and what might that context be?

7. **Renewing terms of CooPAC**

*CooPAC members and chair serve for one year, and we try to keep the appointment schedule similar to our board appointment schedule. We will be renewing terms in August. Please let us know if you’d like to continue on the committee, either during the call or after!*

Paula Ganyard will not participate next year.

Julie Blankenberg is interested in continuing.

Others please send your interest to Stef at smorrill@wils.org

8. **Adjournment:**

Meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

RECORDER: Sara Gold