

WiLS Board Meeting - Minutes

May 29, 2026 | 10:00 am – 3:00 pm

South Central Library System | 1650 Pankratz St, Madison



Board Members (☐ indicates absent)

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Renee Anhalt (Madison College) | ☒ Sarah Miller (WiscNet) |
| ☐ Michelle Byholm (Chequamegon School District) | ☒ Kim Olson-Kopp (Viterbo University) |
| ☒ Jennifer Chamberlain (WiLS, ex-officio) | ☐ Margaret Ottenad (Kettle Moraine School District) |
| ☒ Jennifer Follett (Madison Metropolitan School District) | ☐ Tasha Saecker (Appleton Public Library) |
| ☒ Frank Foss (Milwaukee Art Museum) | ☒ Andrew Prellwitz (Ripon College) |
| ☒ Jennifer Gurske (Madison Trust for Historic Preservation) | ☒ Jill Roth (Demmer Public Library) |
| ☒ Kristina Gómez (Milwaukee Public Library) | ☐ Shannon Schultz (SCLS) |
| ☒ Mindy King (UW - Stevens Point) | ☐ Brenna Weston (Polk County Historical Society) |

Guest: None

Staff attendees: Sara Gold, Tom Klement, Lisa Marten, Melissa McLimans, Rebecca Rosenstiel

Minutes:

1. Board Photo & Warm-up Activity

J. Gurske led the group in a warm-up activity - what's your latest obsession!

2. Call to Order and Consent Agenda

- Today's Agenda
- [March 24, 2026 minutes](#)
- March 2026 Financials – T. Klement
[Balance sheet](#), [Budget with Actuals](#)
- [Director's Report](#) – J. Chamberlain

S. Miller moved to approve the consent agenda, F. Foss seconded the motion. Motion carried.

3. Chair's Report: Election Results

J. Gurske shared the results from the latest board election. We will be welcoming two new members. Jennifer thanked the outgoing board members for their service!

4. Presentation: WiLS community survey - Kim Kiesewetter, Data Analyst

K. Kiesewetter shared the [results from our recent member and community survey](#). Highlights include:

- This is WiLS' 3rd member survey, conducted every two years.
- The 2026 survey was not restricted only to WiLS members, so more participants were reached.

- Response rates by library type were largely comparable to previous years, with the two differences being that more public libraries responded in 2026, and fewer public library systems responded.
- In the future-planning sections:
 - non-members' responses were included.
 - Slide 21 only displays organization types where enough data was available to determine top priorities. Sample sizes were too small to determine an accurate "top priority" for organization types not represented on this slide.

There was a question about the relationship between the two "prioritization" slides; K. Kiesewetter clarified that the first slide combines all of the data from all organization types, and the second slide breaks down the top priorities by organization type. J. Gurske asked if we know why the organization type cultural organizations receive low participation despite seeing more members in this area. K. Kiesewetter estimates that generally, people who are more involved with a service are most likely to complete a survey; and convenience sampling plays a role. This doesn't mean that these organization types are less engaged, just possibly less interested in completing a survey. For future WiLS community surveys, WiLS staff may ask Board members for other listservs/groups that we could connect with to share survey information to.

There was also a question about the "neutral" responses, and what this might mean? Since we don't know who is responding to the survey, we don't know how they are personally utilizing WiLS' services; it could be that WiLS doesn't apply to them. There might be a correlation between the *use of services* and the responses of neutrality that we could explore. It might also be that newer members were responding and haven't had the opportunity to utilize many services. It might be worthwhile to add another question to the next survey that asks how long the respondent has personally been involved with WiLS.

5. **Group Activity: Survey Results in Your Context - Melissa McLimans, Rebecca Rostenstiel, Jen Chamberlain**

The board participated in a group activity to consider survey results within their own contexts and to brainstorm ways WiLS can respond to member needs.

Ideas shared:

- Within the mixed groups, groups found that they each had overlapping concerns but different needs. For example: Engaging with patrons/users on how to use tools, particular with AI use.
- In both the like-organization and mixed groups, it became apparent how important it is to know there are other similar organization-types within WiLS membership: WiLS fosters connections and brings like-orgizations together in unexpected or unanticipated ways. This is seen as both an affirmation and an opportunity.
- Hosting the annual meeting in-person could help bring different member types together to discuss similarities, sharing ideas; broadens the scope of engagement.
 - There has been a noticeable decrease in many library staff wanting to travel and/or attend in-person events. This could be a shift in perspective- more staff are finding value in connecting with peers online; or it could be because of work/life balance limiting the desire to travel.

- Instead of thinking about WiLS members by organization type, could think instead of themes like “new library professionals”. Organization Type still feels too large.
- WiLS is an avenue for organizations/staff to not feel quite as isolated, especially when individuals are unable/unwilling to travel. Use of groups/listservs such as WAICU and CLC are a great resource; could WiLS support more small-group email listservs or groups to bring more connections between similar groups? (While wispublib is a helpful resource, it reaches too large of an audience.)
- Marketing: WiLS is great at marketing itself; is there a way to expand this?
- The fact that individuals carry WiLS with them from place to place speaks to their engagement with WiLS.
- Academics are always thinking about Advocacy & Marketing. WiLS sets really good examples with engaging storytelling; could WiLS find ways for other organizations to develop/tell powerful and engaging stories? Stories are more memorable than a bullet-point list of items.
- Advocating for the relevancy of libraries as AI discussions on campuses occur.
 - In K12s, staff will often come to the library for assistance; their role is as communicator and support for school staff. As K12 libraries see this more, where can *they* get support?
- Cultural organizations see a lot of the same challenges as libraries, especially with funding. With over 700 cultural organizations in Wisconsin, there could be opportunities for reach and support.

6. Discussion & Action: FY27 Budget approval – Jen Chamberlain

The board reviewed the working FY27 budget, which was reviewed by the WiLS Finance Committee.

The board noted their preference for the budget narrative that they received ahead of this meeting. J. Follett asked if there has been any feedback from K12 cooperative purchasing members about the new fee structure. L. Marten confirmed that they haven’t received any feedback from K12 members.

K. Gómez moved to approve the FY27 Budget as presented, J. Follett seconded the motion. Motion carried.

7. Action: Forming the Nomination Committee – Mindy King

Per the current WiLS Bylaws, the chair-elect and two other board members comprise the Nominations Committee. The chair-elect serves as the committee chairperson. This committee only needs to seek a vice-chair candidate - Kristina Gómez will continue on as our treasurer as the bylaws allow that position to serve a two or three year term.

Kim Olson-Kopp volunteered to serve alongside Mindy.

8. Lunch

9. Preview of New Consulting Projects - Melissa and Rebecca

M. McLimans and R. Rosenstiel shared an update from consulting highlighting three new projects:

- WHS Toolkit & Resource Library

WiLS, in partnership with the Wisconsin Historical Society is developing a Strategic Planning Toolkit & Resource Library for WHS to share with local history affiliates who wish to learn about and get started with strategic planning. The project will include the following phases:

- Collaborative content planning
- Toolkit and resource library development
- Editing and finalization

- Strategic Planning Coaching

Within the last year, WiLS has introduced a new strategic planning method, strategic plan coaching, which is a hybrid of our 1:1 custom planning and the small library strategic planning cohort. It is intended for organizations that:

- May not have the time, need, or budget for a fully custom strategic planning process,
- Are serving a community that is too large to qualify for the Small Library Strategic Planning Cohort (or can't make the cohort's timeline work for their library), and
- Have the time and capacity to carry out their own strategic planning, data gathering and plan writing.

WiLS provides the process and resources for carrying out each phase of the strategic planning journey while serving as a thought partner and someone to come to with questions and for support and inspiration. We provide a timeline and check-in points during the process for accountability during each phase. Like the Small Library Strategic Planning Cohort, coaching does not involve WiLS writing the strategic plan and like the cohort, participants can have us take care of the community survey should they want one.

- Documentation Lab

The Documentation Lab is:

- a supportive, judgment-free, guided group-learning-and-doing experience.
- An eight week cohort experience
- An opportunity for participants to walk through exercises and activities to help them locate, centralize, and organize their team's documentation, as well as help them plan to update or develop new documentation as needed.
- It is in direct response to members saying they want dedicated time to accomplish a project (often a POS - project of shame).
- It is a pilot service - Participating organizations will receive a discount and will be asked to help evaluate the service along the way through short polls, questionnaires, or other forms of feedback. The reduced pilot price is \$685.00 per organization.
- Meant for any type of organization, though probably best for a director or organization leader.

Documentation Lab is not succession planning. While clear, shared documentation is an important piece of succession, there are so many other components to that work. We are focusing on part of the puzzle and can imagine developing future components or modules in the future to help organizations be future ready.

Timeline: This is an eight-week experience starting in late summer/early fall 2026. There will be 2-3 synchronous events scheduled during the eight weeks. We are looking for a minimum of five participants to run the cohort, and we'll cap enrollment at eight to keep the experience personal and engaging.

The Board found Documentation Lab interesting. M. King noted that the timing isn't ideal, but admitted that there isn't an "ideal" timing for academic libraries. K. Gómez added that during this timeframe, many public libraries' directors and top-level management staff are working on annual budgets. J. Roth shared that their library's timeline on budgets runs earlier, and this timeline works best for their library/library type.

It was asked if the materials housed within Coda would be exportable? R. Rosenstiel and L. Marten confirmed yes- tables completed could be exported as a CSV file, and other materials could be exported as a PDF.

J. Gurske asked what the difference was between Documentation Lab and succession planning? M. McLimans shared that succession planning typically focuses on other topics/areas that wouldn't be covered in Documentation Lab, for example hiring workflows. Documentation Lab could certainly be a part of succession planning, but wouldn't include specific, actionable goals related to Succession Planning. However, for some organizations, it might be that this *is* succession planning.

10. Discussion & Action: Approving Bylaws - Bylaws review committee

The bylaws committee incorporated feedback from the board as well as the WiLS attorney to present this draft revision to you.

J. Gurske asked the board:

- What does the board think about limiting the number of consecutive terms (pg. 6)?
- Are there any remaining concerns or unresolved issues board members would like to discuss before adoption?
- Anything that needs further clarification or revision?
- Does anyone feel any substantive issue still needs additional discussion?

It was asked if the lawyer provided a reason why the number of consecutive terms should be limited? J. Chamberlain shared that this was suggested to match best practices, and to allow fresh voices to serve on the Board; there is no legal reason for it. J. Demmer asked if there was a history of high turnover on the WiLS Board? There is not. Further, in cases where a Board member is re-elected to serve, the Board can vote to appoint a nominee that did not get elected. M. King asked how CUWL appointments are made; is there a mechanism between WiLS and CUWL? J. Chamberlain confirmed that she and CUWL discuss Board terms and appointments.

The Board was reminded that it is a majority vote to pass all motions. J. Gurske noted the value of allowing individuals to serve consecutive terms- organizational histories are less likely to be lost, and they can act as a mentor to new members. The Board agreed not to limit the number of consecutive terms.

The Board agreed with the updated Chair/Vice Chair population process.

A. Prellwitz asked if guests are also invited to executive discussions? J. Gurske shared that their meeting invitation to guests includes language that states guests are not permitted to attend executive discussions and will be asked to leave when that portion of the meeting begins. There has never been an issue with this. WiLS will develop and include language to alert guests that they cannot attend closed sessions.

A. Prellwitz moved to accept the revised bylaws, F. Foss seconded. Motion carried.

11. Roundtable Discussion: WiLS AI Guidelines and AI in your libraries - Melissa & Jen

J. Chamberlain shared an overview of WiLS' approach to integrating AI in our work. WiLS has AI Guidelines that are two years old and already in their third revision!

M. McLimans led the group in a discussion on AI use and considerations in their own organizations.

- What intrigues you most about AI?
- What worries or concerns you most about AI?
- Where do you see your organization heading in this space?
- Is there anything you wish you had to help you navigate this technology?

- J. Gurske shared a story where she composed an email to a concerned guest and submitted it to AI, which provided feedback and suggestions for the email, but also added comforting language directed to Jennifer. AI creates a weird feeling; it's disjuncting and uncomfortable. But also in a way it feels a gap, since there wasn't a coworker to consult before reaching out to the guest.
 - This is intentional: AI uses this as a way to keep the user using it.
- F. Foss shared that AI use should always be reported, and especially when generative AI is used.
- K. Olson-Kopp shared that she is a copilot for AI at Viterbo and shared some best-use tips:
 - Users should remember that AI is not a friend, and they do not need to use placating language.
 - For the best results, a prompt should include language that requests "just use the facts".
 - Use more than one platform: take the answer from, for example, ChatGPT and enter it into Gemini and see what the differences in answers are.
- J. Roth took a class on how to form prompts, and shared some tips:

- Prompts should include language like “do not lie”, “if you cannot find the answer, do not make something up”, and “provide citations”. This doesn’t eliminate all problems, but helps cut them down.
- K. Gómez shared that in Milwaukee, they are limited in what platforms they can use so they can’t use AI professionally. Programs, workshops, and learning opportunities hosted by MPL now tend to include the topic of AI; they aren’t always marketed as AI, but AI is now a part of most of them anyway.
- J. Follett wants to use it intentionally, but worries that use will take away authenticity and creativity. Trying to work around/through personal feelings on AI and the professional aspect, deciding on how/when to approach students on AI use. MMSD is in the early stages of implementing AI literacy; hopeful for support from the district instead of needing to lead alone.
- M. King shared that especially since a lot of platforms and databases have AI embedded that can’t always be turned off, they are teaching students how to use AI. Personally, has been using AI with writing, to help save on time and wordsmithing; and still goes through to edit and keep it in her voice.
- M. McLimans asked how faculty approach AI in academic libraries. M. King shared that faculty do come to the library to get information on AI, and assistance developing “authentic” assignments, going back to blue books and oral exams.
- K. Olson-Kopp added that using Co-Pilot has been helpful, and is like having an assistant; Microsoft’s AI is a closed system, and so access to all Microsoft data (emails, documents, etc). Recently, Co-Pilot was able to alert Kim that “you had this conversation via email with *person* 4 years ago”, which had been forgotten about.
- Approach AI use with other background knowledge: if you don’t know your stuff, you’re not going to find the errors.
- J. Chamberlain asked if anyone is Notebook LM? K. Olson-Kopp is using it, and finds it helpful. M. King knows that some students use it, while others refuse to engage it.
- F. Foss shared that there has been a creation of “opt out” contracts within organizations, so that staff aren’t penalized for not utilizing AI.
- M. McLimans shared the idea of slow librarianship that has been talked about among WILS staff. WILS is in a privileged place and can make a choice on how fast- or not- to approach, think about, and apply AI.
- J. Chamberlain shared that she’s been seeing disclaimers in newsletters, for example, where people are calling out where AI *isn’t* being used.

12. Proposed 2026-2027 meetings (10 min)

July 1 or July 8, 2026 | 3:00 - 3:30 pm (all board), 3:30 - 4:00 pm orientation for new members

August 20 or 21, 2026 | all day, in person at UW Stevens Point

November 3, 2026 | 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm | Zoom

January 12, 2027 | 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm | Zoom

March 23, 2027 | 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm | Zoom

May 28, 2027 | all day, location TBD

J. Gurske asked the board to review the proposed meeting dates.

The group decided July 1 would work best for the special meeting to welcome new members and hold elections.

The group in attendance could not determine which August date would be best. J. Chamberlain will send out a poll to the full 2026-27 Board to find the August in-person meeting date that works for the majority of members.

The remaining dates appear to work well for most board members.

13. Adjournment

J. Chamberlain thanked J. Gurske for her term as the Board Chair this year!

14. SCLS Delivery Tour & Farewell

Next meeting – Watch for a meeting poll in June to set the 2026-2027 meetings