Cooperative Purchasing Advisory Committee (CooPAC)
November 1, 2016

CooPAC members present: Katie Aldrich (Northcentral Technical College, Chair), Julie Blankenburg (Forest Products Laboratory), Joe Davies (Kenosha Public Library), Noreen Fish (La Crosse Public Library), Dana Franco (DeForest School District), Diane Kastelic (Kenosha School District), Cathy Markwiese (Milwaukee Public Library), Melissa Matz (Elmbrook School District), Amy Rachuba (Ripon College), Cheryl Nessman (UW-Colleges), Jill Thomas (Lawrence University)

CooPAC members excused: Cory Mitchell (UW-Stout)

WiLS staff present: Jeff Brunner, Sara Gold, Stef Morrill

Call to order
Chair Katie Aldrich called the meeting to order at 2:04.

Welcome and introductions
K. Aldrich welcomed everyone.

Review agenda
No changes were made to the agenda.

CooPAC member expectations review (including term length)
The group reviewed the member expectations, which are as follows (with additional information included):

- Attend and participate in all meetings, unless excused: we want to hear all voices!
- Prepare for meetings by reviewing provided materials: we often have a lot to cover in an hour, so it’s beneficial to review materials ahead of time.
- Respond to requests for feedback via email or other electronic channels.
- Assist WiLS in planning for cooperative purchasing by identifying and sharing areas of need and trends: looking at current issues, improving relationships, etc.
- Hold proprietary and other information in confidence.
- Ask for additional information, as needed, to assist with meeting expectations.
- Approach the work with a spirit of innovation, positivity, and respect for fellow CooPAC members, WiLS staff, and members.

CooPAC members serve one year terms with the option for infinite renewals. Terms will run from October 1 – September 30.

No questions were asked or concerns were raised.
Review of annual calendar
CooPAC will meet three times per year, but not in the Summer time. The meetings will be:

- November 1 at 2:00
- February 21 at 2:00
- May 9 at 2:00

We may correspond via email in between the meetings.

The group reviewed the recurring items for 2016-17. The quarterly survey review and future directions are on all three meetings. Members are encouraged to contact S. Morrill or K. Aldrich with ideas and concerns. We would really like to add the ideas from the group!! There were no additional questions or concerns.

Quarterly survey review
WiLS has a continuous feedback plan that includes quarterly surveys to cooperative purchasing members. Each cooperative purchasing contact is surveyed once per year, with approximately ¼ of contacts surveyed each year (Summer is a smaller sample, as it does not include K12s). The first quarter survey results were reviewed. S. Morrill shared some information about the results that compared importance and satisfaction (0-2). Don’t Know and Not Applicable should both be present, so WiLS will add them if they are not there. It seems that there is the potential for improvement in pricing and training. The question was asked about separating results by library type. The question was not in the first survey, but will be added for future surveys. It may be possible that certain responses would vary by type. We will be allowing for multiple focuses for improvement based on type and responses.

The group discussed their impressions of training needs and what could be beneficial to their institution or library type. It would be good for us to investigate what vendors already have before WiLS takes on providing any training. Available training could be something to find out during negotiation. The libraries are usually on the mailing list for the vendors, so they are receiving information on training. Some are pulling out good training and linking to them for their students/patrons. It could be helpful for WiLS to keep a page of training opportunities with active links. It would be helpful to have one location to find all that information. Others felt like they could go directly to vendors’ pages for that information. Another option could be reminders in newsletters about training. It may be possible that people aren’t happy with the training they are receiving from vendors for staff or patrons. WiLS will keep an eye on this item for the next two surveys and then do a more extensive survey around training if it seems to be an ongoing concern. If CooPAC members could let WiLS know about perceived training gaps or ideas for training, it would be helpful.

Creation of a cooperative purchasing survey panel
One of the challenges WiLS faces is related to trials. We arrange trials for individual members, and those are successfully used. However, when we create trials on a regular schedule and send to all members, they often don’t get used and we don’t get feedback. We don’t want to spend time on something that isn’t useful to members, but we do want to provide an opportunity for members to provide feedback to vendors on products, both to have input and also to provide a tangible benefit to our vendor partners. One potential solution could be a cooperative purchasing survey panel. Members
interested in providing feedback to vendors on products could sign up to be part of the panel. We would work with vendors who are interested in getting feedback on developing a brief survey for members. Members could complete however many surveys they would like, and there would be some incentive to encourage survey completion. For K12s, there is a rolling trial period, and that period runs from October to February and it has been pretty successful because it allows for a longer period of time for the members to review products, which makes it less overwhelming. After ALA midwinter, there are products that are released and added to the trial group. For the public libraries, trials run in the Fall and when people ask or when a new product is released.

The group discussed the concept. So many vendors have canned webinars about the products. One direction could be to have the canned webinars available with a survey to get an idea if people want to trial and vendors would also get a sense of what is right or wrong about the product. It’s a slow absorption process and the feedback component would be beneficial. For some members, it is beneficial to provide a matrix to compare multiple products, both for library use and for patrons/student use. It’s important to have that comparison to know if they want to stay with what they have or do something new. Could WiLS or CooPAC help with developing these grids that show the major differences between products? In many libraries, even when staff have requested a trial, no one uses it. One way to improve the amount a trial is used in an institution is to take the learning webinar and then present at a librarians meeting, which increases the likelihood that they will try it themselves. It can be difficult for people to participate in trials because they haven’t had the training on the product and just do not have enough knowledge to even judge.

If we were to do larger group pricing, we would need to have an idea of who would possibly be interested. In order to be interested, members would need to know about the product. The vendors ask about webinars, but members don’t often attend. Are there any ideas about how we could bring a group of potentially interested people together? Some libraries may have different fiscal years that would prevent them from doing a group purchase on the same schedule.

Since we do trials for individual institutions, we could share the trials in the newsletters with the person who requested it. There was some feeling that it might not help to include the person, but that sharing trials made a lot of sense!

It may be possible that someone is at the point where they want to re-evaluate and not know who the competitors are. WiLS can help to identify the competitors, which is a service we should be marketing. We currently provide this service when individuals ask us, but we could advertise it and share the results from requests that we research. The vendors would like this, too.

For right now, we’ll table the idea of the survey panel. WiLS staff will discuss some of the ideas internally and bring some results back to CooPAC.

For some members, the only time to view webinars is while on a public desk. It would be beneficial for webinars to be subtitled or to be screencasts that do not require sound.

**Future directions for cooperative purchasing service**

Future directions for the cooperative purchasing service is a standing agenda item for CooPAC.

WiLS staff presented some new things happening with the cooperative purchasing service:
• S. Morrill shared that the MyWiLS portal is being redeveloped to make sure that our code is stable and can be upgraded/maintained easily. The back-end database (Sugar CRM) will stay the same but the front-end will be changed. The features of the current system will be maintained, but hopefully improved.

• J. Brunner and S. Gold spent time at WLA connecting with vendors. We are continuing to expand into other product areas. S. Gold shared that WiLS will be working with Brodart for discount on books, which we haven’t had in the past. We also are developing new relationships with Demco for new products they are marketing. The power of the Gold, Silver, Bronze program is very evident when we attend a conference because the vendors notice their ribbon at the conferences and that we have been able to keep renewal prices lower. J. Brunner met with some potential vendor partners as well, too, including a physical assets vendor, which is outside of our existing realm.

• Kajeet was suggested as a potential product.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00. Due to time constraints, the remaining agenda items will be addressed through email.