

Southern System Meeting
Vandalia, Illinois
July 14, 2010

Present

LCLS: Leslie Bednar, JoAnn Nabe, Diane Steele, Linda McDonnell, Erica Pyle, Amanda McKay, Juliette Douglas, Harriett Zipfel, Hugh Westbrook, Kevin Becker, Ron Coleman, Bonnie Kilmurray

LTLS: Jan Ison, Allen Lanham, Roseanne Reidner, Pat Boze, Ramona Rollins

RPLS: Beverly Obert, Nina Wunderlich, Valerie Green, Dick Helton, Mike Szymkoski, Lacey Wright, Ann Adkesson, Julia Welzen, Anita Walters, Joan Rhoades, Nancy Huntley, Doris McKay, Sarah Hjeltness-Garley, Amy Ihnen, Lee Ann Fisher, Maria Dent

ShLS: Ellen Popit, Karen Bounds, Marian Albers, Judy Groom, Tambree Krouse, Troy Brown, Randy Domineck

ISL: Anne Craig, Lauren Tucker

Ellen Popit welcomed everyone to the meeting, asked those present to introduce themselves. Ellen also indicated that those around the table were System Directors and elected System Boards members. The meeting's discussion would happen with those present at the table. However, there would be two opportunities for public comment from others, who were present in the public gallery, during the meeting.

Jan asked for the group to contribute to ground rules – on how meetings should be run. These included:

- All comments are important
- Don't everyone talk at once
- Be concise
- Think of the citizens of the state
- Stay on topic
- Be realistic in comments
- Vote/Consensus

Leslie asked if everyone had a copy of the financial comparison document and opened the discussion up for questions. There were questions about unemployment liability differences between each system, the CMC (Catalog Maintenance Center's) grants and amount for FY2011, and LCLS's IMRF liability. Others had questions about what is the CMC and whether it will continue to be funded. Leslie said that ISL has indicated both CMC grants will be funded in FY2011.

Ellen facilitated a discussion about the draft Goal/Outcome for the Planning Process. There was discussion about the shared automation (LLSAP) wording, with a suggestion to change the wording to 'including providing shared

automation services and delivery. The Goal/Outcome, with the slight wording change, was accepted by consensus.

Jan and Leslie reviewed the DRAFT – Planning Process document developed jointly by the four system directors for the meeting. The document incorporates design of a Planning Panel group process and steps through organization and processes that could be put in place to facilitate the work of the panel. This includes development of a web site location (Cooperation Today) for sharing documents, use of project management software to record milestones (Basecamp), recorders from each system who would jointly assist with notes and summarizing meetings. The plan includes consensus decision-making, which means everyone agrees, as opposed to some for/some against or a voting majority decision. There was a review of the proposed timeline. This is a working document that can be changed as we move forward.

There was then a facilitated discussion on each section.

Planning Panel– Planning panel will need to discuss how to get and receive input from system libraries so we know how to move forward with their interests in mind. Perhaps there should be a ‘roles of the member libraries’ section. There was a suggestion that at each of the planning panel meetings to reserve time to allow each system to report on concerns from members to the entire planning panel. The following was added: each system panel group is responsible for reporting issues from their system member libraries; this may include using surveys as tools.

Process and Meeting Facilitators - Subcommittees should be planning panel members who can bring in expertise as needed. Not all expertise may come from the system staff; expertise could come from others who assist the subcommittee in gathering information. Subcommittee of the planning panel has final say in what to recommend, but can utilize expertise from others outside of the panel. It was also proposed that the Planning Panel could create other working groups as needed.

On the subject of meeting facilitators, several said ‘what directors did today is working very well’ – directors have knowledge of what is going. If someone is hired from the outside, they will still require a ‘leader’ from the group to give them direction, and this can be expensive. Rolling Prairie wants to maintain objectivity with a neutral facilitator and voted at a previous Board meeting that they wanted an outside facilitator. There was concern about how the meetings were going to work, but everyone likes the collective input of the four directors. There is concern for the four directors to continue to communicate and work together, as well as the amount of work involved. As long as the four directors can get along together, this process at today’s meeting is working well. Just want to make sure we can continue to move forward. We should continue to review the need for an outside facilitator during the process. Directors believe this is the work that they

are supposed to be doing – it's the directors' job right now, to manage this process.

Proceeding Recorders – Directors and staff involved will take care of posting documents to Cooperation Today web site as well as compiling documents. Directors will designate staff as recorders– these people may change through the process. Staff member from each system will take notes and then share them with each of the other system recorders for review and sharing on Cooperation Today. Cooperation Today website will be used to post all public documents pertaining to the process. Basecamp (project management software) will be used to maintain workflow, assign tasks, and mark completed tasks. There must be mechanism for public to make comments to documents and submit issues and questions about the process.

Tools – add Face-to-Face meetings and online surveys to the list.

Givens – remove 'must create ground rules' because those were created at the beginning of the meeting.

Decision-Making – rearrange order as follows:

1. The front line decision makers are the Planning Panel.
2. The Planning Panel will operate by consensus for decision-making
3. Key milestones of the planning process will go to Boards for decision-making
4. Ongoing decision makers are the Boards of the Systems
5. The ultimate decision makers are the member libraries.

Key Decision Points – change the word 'Key' to 'Preliminary'

Additional Decisions –

- Add Legal Consulting as needed (but must be a decision made on how this will be funded)
- Financial Decisions for each system

Timeline – the timeline is aggressive but do-able.

There was additional discussion that the Planning Process document should be revised and revisited by the Planning Panel at every meeting.

Public Comment

Bev facilitated public comment sessions. Much of the public comment focused on the need for member library representation on the Planning Panel as well as continued need for an outside, neutral facilitator. There were also comments about the Panel size, Board quorum issues related to Open Meetings Act, structuring communications so library members can have knowledge about and input to the process, and how to relate information back to the member libraries.

After the public comment section, the group discussed assumptions and agreed on the following:

1. All meetings will be held in accordance with Open Meetings Act
2. All systems should provide access to the public documents concerning the process
3. Documents should be made available on the Cooperation Today website and must be open for comments
4. We are undertaking this process in a good faith effort
5. Positions currently held by staff are not guaranteed
6. Members of the Planning Panel are responsible to report to System Boards and bring issues back from those Boards to the Planning Panel
7. Any assumptions made here are not set in stone.

Jan Ison updated the group on the status of Northern Systems.

1. All five system boards had agreed to sign the Non-binding Letter of Agreement at their June board meetings.
2. They agreed to contribute \$10,000 each to the process.
3. They plan to have a new governance structure in place by November.
4. They plan to hire in January or February a new Executive Director for the merged system.
5. Their first meeting is planned for the first part of August.

Bev Obert facilitated the discussion on recommendations. The following recommendations were drafted to take back to the System Boards for official action:

1. Board is asked to endorse the Goal/Outcome statement as amended.
2. Board is asked to endorse and support the planning document in principle set out by this committee and as amended during the discussion.
3. Board is asked to formally appoint 4 representatives and 1 alternate to the Planning Process group.

Once the recommendations were set, the group finalized the makeup of the Planning Panels. It was decided that each System would appoint 4 board members from each system for the planning panel. An alternate would be assigned, but would only participate as a voting member if one of the 4 members weren't available. The alternate can come from either a Board position or a library member. Consider holding these meetings in the beginning of the month to accommodate for later in the month board meetings.

Additional Public Comment:

Still need facilitator

Leave it up to each system to determine 4 people. Not necessarily from the board, could also be member librarians.

Reword the comment about employment and be more positive. "Juliette Douglas suggested that the wording of the "Assumption" regarding employment might be better framed in a positive light by saying, "All new positions will be filled through a competitive process.'" Those participating in the discussions accepted this rewording

Jan reviewed the items placed in the 'Bin'

- Will ISL continue to fund two CMC's if we merge?
- Continually assess need for outside facilitator
- Member library input – need more specific things to put in the planning process on how this happens.
- Names of panel members and contact info on Cooperation Today web site. – www.cooperationtoday.info

Next steps:

- Post documents on Cooperation Today web site
- Plan for a first meeting of the Planning Panel during the first two weeks in August