

Meeting summary for AAC (03/14/2024)

Attending: Jane Chirgwin (RENS), Phil Berardi (BETH), Lisa Neumann (RCS), Joe Thornton (UHLS), Ryan Moore (COLN) and Mary Klimack (NGRN)

Meeting started at 2:05 PM

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM

Meeting Summary: Jane's Term Ends and AI Tool Discussion

Jane initiated the meeting and confirmed the attendance of five people, including Mary who was taking minutes. Jane confirmed her list of attendees and mentioned that her term ends in June and she will not be renewing it. She added the task of finding a replacement to the agenda. There was a discussion about using an AI for summary making. Phil brought up a tool called Tixkeeper.

Remote Library Card Applications Debate

There was a discussion about the implementation of remote library card applications. Jane highlighted that the number of people utilizing this service would likely be small. Lisa shared an experience of a successful remote card application. There was a debate about how to handle this service, with suggestions that each library should decide if they want to offer it and that there might be potential issues with patrons being missed if their addresses are not easily recognizable. The team agreed that the current system, where libraries run ad hoc reports to identify patrons, could lead to potential issues. Jane concluded that at present, they were not contacting anyone for this service.

Updating Records and Library Card Issuance

There was a discussion about the process of updating records and issuing library cards. It was clarified that Rob's role is to delete online accounts that haven't visited a library or issued a physical card in 30 days. The team also discussed a new note field for online applications to track how many have rolled over to become a permanent card. However, there was a concern about the time-consuming process of looking up people's addresses. The conversation ended with Joe mentioning a proposal from a previous meeting about standardizing the process for issuing library cards.

Online Library Card Registration System Proposal

In an effort to help reduce the workload of libraries, Joe proposed a system where UHLS would verify addresses of online applicants. Jane and Ryan agreed that this system would be beneficial. The proposal is in the early stages and requires much further discussion within UHLS to see if it is feasible. They also discussed the process of online registration, focusing on verifying patron information and the issue of patrons receiving physical cards.

Patron Information Verification: Security and Privacy Concerns

Jane, Joe, and Phil discussed the issue of verifying patrons' information. They considered sending physical cards and asking patrons to mail their driver's license photos, but Joe raised concerns about security and privacy. Phil added an insurance liability component, which Joe confirmed they could not take on. The idea of requesting driver's licenses or school IDs via email was also discussed, raising privacy concerns. The team agreed on the need for a verification method without requiring sensitive information and proposed using Patron Point, a validation service used by Mastercard. However, there were uncertainties about the cost and management of this system. The team agreed to revisit the Patron Point system in the future and include Jill Dugas-Hughes from EGRN in the discussion as AAC had discussed it in previous meetings. The team emphasized the importance of finding solutions for people who cannot visit the library in person.

Homebound Patrons: Policies and Services

The team discussed the topic of homebound patrons and how to handle library services for them. They noted that many libraries have specific policies for these patrons, but there is no universal policy. The team agreed to gather existing policies for review and potentially develop a new, universal policy. Jane was tasked with asking the Directors Association how their libraries manage homebound patrons

Library Card Duplication and Online Resource Accessibility

The team discussed the issue of patrons who repeatedly apply for library cards using gibberish, and the challenges of managing duplicate accounts and records. Jane proposed merging duplicate records, but there was no clear solution to blocking patrons who repeatedly apply. There was also a discussion about the library's online resources, with a focus on making them more accessible without the need for a physical library visit. The team agreed on the need to prevent patrons from using multiple cards and reapplying, but there was no consensus on how to handle these situations. The conversation ended without a clear solution to the issues discussed

Patron Retention and Outreach Strategies

The team discussed the issue of patrons not returning to the library and the challenge of retaining patrons. Jane shared her strategy of sending welcome emails to new applicants to foster patron retention. The team also discussed the problem of expired library cards and the difficulty of reaching out to non-users. The idea of using postcards as proof of address was suggested, but concerns were raised about the cost and effort involved. The team agreed that it was important to maintain contact with patrons, especially those who may not have an email address.

Costs, Fees, and AI Leadership

The team discussed the cost of mailing postcards, with Jane clarifying that stamps for a postcard cost 35 cents. Ryan then raised a concern about non-resident patrons, noting that the annual fee at COLN increased from 25 to 50 dollars. The team also discussed the addition of a new paragraph to the document about what to do if someone comes to the desk with an online application. Finally, they considered the topic of AI, agreeing to discuss it with Nate Heyer since he was attending an AI conference. Discussed the idea of an elevator pitch for a [ticker project?](#)

Museum Pass Management System Implementation

Phil discussed the implementation of the TixKeeper system for managing museum passes. Phil explained that the system, which was adopted late last year, allows users to reserve digital passes for museums. Some of these passes are printable on demand, while others are purely digital. The system has been integrated into the library's setup, with a link for the Bethlehem TixKeeper to be shared in the chat. There is no residency requirement for museum passes, but there is for digital passes, which are currently in a pilot phase. The system also provides usage reports to help assess its effectiveness. The anticipated launch date for the system is either next Thursday or two Thursdays from now

Costs and Procedures for TixKeeper

Phil presented preliminary cost information for Bethlehem to join a new program, with upfront costs of \$600 for the calendar year. He also discussed the costs for different scales of libraries, ranging from \$540 to \$610 per library per year. Phil emphasized that the program would require some agreements on loan and pass procedures at a system level. He suggested that it might be beneficial for the group to consider standardizing loans for a digital museum pass. The discussion also touched on the integration of certain sets with Sierra and the potential for libraries to print museum passes on demand. Jane agreed that the idea was worth investigating further and asked Phil to

send her the information he had already gathered on the subject. The group ended the conversation by scheduling their next meeting

Next steps

- Jane will look into the guidelines for filling her position on the committee.
- Jane will share the two Google documents via email after the meeting.
- Ryan will gather homebound policies from other libraries and share them with the group.
- Jane will send the updated document to the DA email list.
- Phil will send more information about Tixskeeper to Jane for discussion at the next meeting.
- Consider discussing AI at the next meeting.

AI-generated content may be inaccurate or misleading. Always check for accuracy.