

**Minutes of the August 12, 2010
Meeting of the Southern System Planning Panel**

Place: Effingham Knights of Columbus Hall

Date: August 12, 2010 at 1:40 pm

Attending:

LCLS: Ron Coleman, Linda McDonnell, JoAnn Nabe, Diane Steele

LTLS: Rochelle Funderburg, Allen Lanham, Nina Pals, Rosanne Reidner

RPLS: Val Green, Richard Helton, Any Ihnen, Nina Wunderlich

SHLS: Marian Albers, Karen Bounds, Arlene Dueker (Alt), Andrea Witthoft

Absent:

LCLS: Elaine Steingrubey (Alt)

LTLS: Anieta Trame (Alt)

RPLS:

SHLS: Tom Turner

Other's Present:

LCLS: Leslie Bednar, Juliette Douglas

LTLS: Jan Ison, Pat Boze

RPLS: Bev Obert, Mary Ann Pohl (Alt), Doris McKay

SHLS: Ellen Popit, Tracy Edwards

Ann Adkesson, Susan Carr, Maria Dent, Louise Greene, Janet Hicks, Kim Keller, Kay Marshall, Annette Mills, Erica Pyle, Joan Rhoades, Judy Thompson, Anita Walters, Lacey Wright

Introductions begin at: 1:45

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
<p>Start Ups: Introductions Purpose Desired outcome Agenda/Additions?</p>	<p>Jan Ison facilitated the introductions, review of the purpose and desired outcomes. It was asked that the second from the last outcome be changed to add, "& working groups."</p> <p>Jan Ison reviewed the agenda and asked if the panelists had any additions to be made to the agenda. Val Green asked for the addition of "Ground Rules for Facilitators." It was agreed that this would be added to the agenda before the review of the System Laws.</p>
<p>Approve Minutes of July 14 Meeting</p>	<p>Marian Albers moved and JoAnn Nabe seconded the motion that the minutes from the July 14th meeting be approved. The motion passed.</p>

<p>Report on Issues from Member Libraries</p>	<p>Ellen Popit facilitated the reporting on issues from member libraries.</p> <p>LCLS: Diane Steele noted that there had been no feed back yet, but that members were being apprised of the process.</p> <p>LTLS: Rochelle Funderburg noted that the LTLS board would like to have the possibility of an Intergovernmental Agreement consideration, as well as the option of having two alternate panelists, special libraries want to be included in the process.</p> <p>RPLS: Val Green reported that as noted before that the RPLS board had passed a motion to require the use of an independent facilitator in order to participate in these meetings and while the motion had not been rescinded that by consensus they had decided to continue participating. Member librarians have expressed concerns regarding controlling and minimizing the impacts of costs to the members, the use of an independent attorney and planning for the new entity beyond current physical boundaries.</p> <p>SHLS: Karen Bounds reported that ShLS board had approved all three of the recommended actions, but would ask that the system be allowed to appoint two alternates to the panel. Arlene Dueker noted that there were concerns that no changes be made to delivery.</p> <p>Action Items: Decision on two alternates, and voting vs consensus. The panelists express the desire to vote individually. The panelists agreed to allow the selection of two alternates, not necessarily members of the respective boards. Diane motioned for each system to have two alternates, Karen second, approval by concensus. Aye votes of the whole gave Unanimous approval.</p> <p>Discussion followed about vote counting – each person on the Panel has a vote. Also, Motions give clearer picture of what is being voted on, followed by one vote per panel member. This is to be added to the Planning</p>

	Process document.
<p>Review proposed revised planning document Member Input Section Rules of Engagement for Public Comment</p>	<p>Ellen Popit presented and Leslie Bednar facilitated the proposed revisions to the planning document regarding the new sections, Rules of Engagement for Public Comments and Member Input.</p> <p>Diane Steele requested that the types of meetings be clarified in the Planning Process document. (ie. Library Advisory) There was a discussion about to how best insure that member comments made on the CooperationToday website were addressed by the panelists.</p> <p>Action items: Clarify types of system meetings in the Member Input sentence - “Through other meetings at systems”- Planning Process document. Report on new issues and comments on the CooperationToday website are to be posted on BaseCamp. It was agreed that both of these would be changed and that the revisions would be made to the Planning Process document.</p>
<p>Added agenda item to add to the planning document the “Ground Rules for Facilitators.”</p>	<p>Ellen Popit presented and Leslie Bednar facilitated the proposed revision to the planning document regarding the “Ground Rules for Facilitators.”</p> <p>Ground rules from the July 27th meeting of System Directors and Staff were posted on the flipchart as a starting point for discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● System Directors will create good agendas at least one week prior to the scheduled Planning Process meetings and posted in BaseCamp and on CooperationToday. ● The draft Planning Process minutes will be posted within five working days. ● Acronyms should be defined. ● Flip chart pages should be posted in Cooperation today as separate

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> section. ● All documents posted on Coop2Day ● Flipchart takes precedent over the notes. ● Final Draft of Minutes duty should be rotated. <p>Val Green asked that board Panelists be allowed to submit agenda items as a suggestion to the whiteboards. It was suggested that this be the last agenda item at each meeting to allow panelists to make suggestions for agenda items for the next meeting.</p> <p>Action items: It was agreed that this should be added to the Planning Panel process document.</p>
<p>System Law/Administrative rules, & Anne Craig Memo dated July 19, 2010</p>	<p>Bev Obert presented and Leslie Bednar facilitated the discussion of the Anne Craig Memo from July 19, 2010 and the library law and Administrative Rules regarding the restructuring, liquidation or merging of system.</p> <p>There was a discussion of the use of webconferencing to facilitate the process when the geographic area covered was sufficiently large. Val Green asked if there might be LSTA money available to facilitate the merger process and associated costs. There was a discussion about funding and questions about if the Illinois State Library (ISL) had been invited to the meeting. It was noted that the ISL had been invited but was not able to attend. Nina Pals asked if there were any laws regarding Inter-governmental agreements that might be applicable to forming an over-arching agency rather than merging. Rochelle Funderburg indicated that she did not think that it would be prohibited. It was asked if the only options were to Merge or Die.</p> <p>Action items: Contact ISL regarding LSTA funding and Inter-governmental agreements.</p>

<p>Subcommittees/ Working Groups Definition, Subcommittee Charge Timeline,</p>	<p>Jan Ison presented and Bev Obert facilitated the discussion of the draft document on the Subcommittees and Working Groups.</p> <p>Marian Albers indicated that she felt that there should be one panelist on each working group and serve as the liaison.</p> <p>Val Green asked if it was really necessary for the system directors to facilitate the subcommittees, since there would only be four people on the subcommittee. There was a discussion of the system director's access to necessary information, and it was suggested that the system directors be an operational resource person rather than a facilitator. There was a discussion of who would be the leaders of these groups and it was suggested that each would select their own. There was an extended discussion about how the groups would get comparable financial data, and whether or not there was a need for a financial working group made up of the business managers. [Bin: The financial working group was added to the bin.] A 15 minute break was taken.</p>
<p>Public Comment on Subcommittee/ Working Group proposal</p>	<p>Leslie Bedinar facilitated the Public Comments on the Working Group proposal. Kay Marshall made a comment that she felt that while they were working to form one system and that up to one-third of the current panelists were likely to be members of the new board, so that they should approach this as one panel working for one system. Juliette Douglas suggested that since each system has a business manager that they should be working together as a group providing consistent financial information.</p>
<p>Subcommittees/ Working Groups Definition, Subcommittee Charge Timeline, Appointments/Volunteers</p>	<p>Jan Ison facilitated the discussion on the subcommittees, working group definition, subcommittee charge timeline, and appointments/volunteers.</p>

	<p>It was suggested that either the business managers could be 1) a resource 2) a working group 3) Wait</p> <p>Action items: It was agreed that the system directors would be referred to as coordinators rather than facilitators in the draft document.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the working groups should have one panelist who is the liaison.</p> <p>It was decided that the role of the business managers would be a future agenda item.</p> <p>Panelists were selected for each of the subcommittees.</p> <p>Strategic Planning: Val Green, Linda McDonnell, Rosanne Reidner, Andrea Witthoft</p> <p>Legal, Governance & Membership: Rochelle Funderburg, Diane Steele, Tom Turner, Nina Wunderlich</p> <p>Delivery: Marian Albers, Ron Coleman, Richard Helton, Allen Lanham</p> <p>Resource Sharing: Karen Bounds, Amy Ihnen, JoAnn Nabe, Nina Pals</p>
<p>What information does the panel feel they still need?</p>	<p>Finances Current # of employees? What is each system still doing? System status update Physical assets (over \$10,000) Needed by September 1st.</p>
<p>Organizational Meetings of Subcommittees.</p>	<p>This was done after the meeting.</p>
<p>Report Back</p>	<p>This was done after the meeting.</p>
<p>Review Bin Next steps-</p>	<p>Financial working group discussion was listed as a future agenda item. Next step of boards: appoint 2nd alternate</p>

<p>Meeting Review including facility & facilitation</p>	<p>+ great location ▲Difficult to hear, meet at each system</p> <p>There was a discussion about meeting dates. The second Thursday seemed to be the preferred date, but it conflicts with the October System Presidents & Directors meeting at the ISL.</p> <p>September @ Carterville October @ Edwardsville November @ Decatur December @ Champaign</p> <p>Calendaring program will be used to arrive at an October meeting date.</p>

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.