

Southern System Planning
Thursday, December 2, 2010

Lincoln Trail Libraries System
1704 West Interstate Drive, Champaign, IL
Phone 217-352-0047

10:30 AM – 4:30 PM

Attending:

LCLS: Ron Coleman, JoAnn Nabe, Dianne Steele, Harriett Zipfel (Alt)
LTLS: Rochelle Funderburg, Allen Lanham, Nina Pals, Rosanne Reidner, Anita Trame
(Alt)
RPLS: Richard Helton, Amy Ihnen, Mary Ann Pohl (Alt), Nina Wunderlich
SHLS: Marian Albers, Karen Bounds, Tom Turner

Absent:

LCLS: Linda McDonnell
LTLS: Scott Drone-Silver (Alt)
RPLS: Val Green, Brenda Larison (Alt)
SHLS: Arlene Dueker (Alt), Andrea Witthoft, Susan Yallaly (Alt)

Others Present:

LCLS: Leslie Bednar, Juliette Douglas, Elaine Steingrubey (Alt)
LTLS: Jan Ison, Pat Boze, Ramona Rollins
RPLS: Bev Obert, Doris McKay, Mike Syzmkoski
SHLS: Ellen Popit, Traci Edwards, Christine Fine

ISL: Anne Craig and Lawren Tucker

Audience: Eleanore Brown, Judy Groom, Marsha Grove, Sandra Hayes, Tina Hubert, Casey Jones, Beth Kent, Kay Marshall, Susan Mendelsohn, Joan Rhoades, Barbara Rhodes, Sarah S Sagen, Molly Scanlan, Diane Yeoman.

Agenda	
Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
Start Ups: Welcome	Jan Ison welcomed everyone to LTLS.
Review of Purpose and Desired outcome	In reviewing the agenda there were no additions requested.
Agenda/Additions?	The minutes from the November 10th (PDF) meeting were reviewed.
Approve Minutes of November 10 th Meeting	Action on the November 10th minutes: Tom Turner moved that the minutes be approved. Marian Albers seconded the motion. The motion passed with all ayes. Nays- none.
Report on Issues/concerns from Members	Bev asked for comments received from the membership. ShLS – Marian Albers reported that at the SILNET meeting

	<p>that members expressed concerns about membership standards and and delivery. They also had questions about what would happen to the LLSAP if the system dissolved. Marian made the suggestion that the systems have a trustee day to discuss the entire process. Arlene at Kaskaskia CC would be willing to serve food. Ellen Popit addressed LLSAP concerns. Vtel to other systems. List to look at Vtel.</p> <p>LCLS – Diane Steele was concerned that voting should not be consensus because of the important issues coming up. Recently in ratification. Naves were not called for and there needs to be a Roll call vote.</p> <p>Harriette, LCLS members concerned about losing representation. May need a neutral person to help. Libraries are already hurting and feeling added costs due to lack of consultants in LCLS. The consequences to the libraries Diane Steele indicated that there were concerns about new board’s make up.</p> <p>RPLS – Amy Inhen indicated that RPLS members felt that all Subcommittees’ minutes should all be posted on CooperationToday. Delivery committee members should be required to go on a route. The members also want CooperationToday updated more frequently. Panel was working well and members fears had been alleviated.</p> <p>LTLS - Rosanne Reidner indicated that there had been no feed back on the dissolution.</p> <p>Others - Dick Helton - Delivery committee had received Marsha Burgner’s email, and she was concerned about libraries having a choice in geographic communities for delivery. Harriette Zipfel – Libraries are concerned about the added costs to the libraries because of Community Delivery and the need to allocate additional space for delivery. There is also concern about how Automation is funded differently in different systems, as how will we be serving the un-served? Will there be a statewide card?</p> <p>Allen Lanham reported that he will be reporting to the ILA board on our process.</p> <p>Marian Albers moved and Diane Steele seconded the motion that Allen Lanham be named as the Southern System Planning Panel liaison to the ILA board.</p> <p>A voice vote was called: Ayes – all. Naves- none. Abstentions -none .</p> <p>Action on the roll call votes: Allen Lanham moved that all financial, policy and personnel matters be put to a roll call vote, and that all other votes be roll call when any member asks for a roll call vote. Ron Coleman seconded the motion.</p> <p>A voice vote was called: Ayes – all. Naves- none. Abstentions –none. The motion passed.</p>
Mission, Vision and Values	<p>Rosanne Reidner presented the draft of the Mission, Vision and Values and asked that it be taken to systems for comments. [See Mission, Vision and Values document (PDF)]</p> <p>~~~~~</p>

	<p>MISSION: XXX is a community of multitype libraries developing partnerships and sharing resources in pursuit of excellent service.</p> <p>VISION: We envision a future where all libraries & information partners collaborate to provide accessible & innovative services.</p> <p>VALUES: We value--</p> <p>Open access and sharing of resources. Cooperation, collaboration and contribution among members & information partners. Quality customer service. Honest and open communications among stakeholders. Respect and integrity in all interactions. The diversity of our members and their communities. Fiscal stability and accountability. The protection of Intellectual Freedom and Privacy. Innovation and creativity.</p> <p>~~~~~</p> <p>Rosanne asked for suggestions and/or contributions. She indicated that the information came from the survey and was presented in the way that the members categorized the values in the survey.</p> <p>Action on the Mission, Vision and Values:</p> <p>A motion was made by Diane Steele to take to the Mission, Vision and Values statement to the system boards for approval. Tom Turner seconded the motion. A voice vote was called: Ayes – all. Nays- none. Abstentions –none. The motion passed.</p>
<p>New board structure and tasks</p>	<p>Diane Steele presented for the Legal, Governance and Membership subcommittee the proposed structure for the new system board. The draft Board Structure document is available on Cooperation Today in pdf format.</p> <p>Option 4 is the structure preferred by the Legal, Governance and Membership subcommittee. They will seek two public library trustees from each of the current system boards with at least one year remaining in their term. System submissions on Librarians, with no more than two from each system. The goal is to get a balance of representation from each of the systems. It was thought that perhaps there could be councils from geo areas which could communicate any questions and concerns to the new board.</p> <p>First board 4 reps from 3 systems and 3 reps from one. The subcommittee looked at the representation of types of libraries : 261 schools, 231 publics 65 schools & 38 academics in selecting the representation for the new board. [8 public trustees (2 from each current system), 3 school librarians, 2 public librarians, 1 academic librarian, 1 special</p>

	<p>librarian]</p> <p>Diane Steele moved Allen Lanham seconded the motion that the Proposal be taken back to the current system boards for approval.</p> <p>There was an extensive discussion of the issues of serving on the new board. It was noted that everyone would need to be trust the new board and the people appointed. Roseanne Reidner asked if there was a discussion of size of library, and it was noted that it had been deliberately left out due to the legal limits imposed on the size of the board and the difficulty finding individuals willing to serve such a large area. Allen Lanham noted that as trustees it would be their responsibility to represent all types of libraries not just their own library. JoAnne Nabe noted that she had concerns about representation for small libraries, and noted that they need to volunteer to be on the board. Nina Wunderlich noted that proper representation depends on the people not necessarily the size of library. Jan Ison was concern that only one special and one academic were represented. She suggested that they eliminate the public librarians in favor of additional seats for the Academics and Specials. Jan would prefer that they not necessarily be librarians.</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding whether the Legal, Governance and Membership subcommittee was seeking comments or ratification of the proposal. It was decided that the motion currently was to take this proposal to the system boards for approval. What about input? Vote down and the panel would have to start over. It was noted that it can't be approved if they are making change. Nina Wunderlich noted that Legal, Governance and Membership subcommittee was hoping to have the board in place soon in order to hire an Executive Director. The motion was then amended to state that rather than asking the boards to approve the proposal that the Planning Panel get their reactions to the proposal and that the Planning Panel would be making a decision at the next meeting. Diane Steele so moved and Allen Lanham agreed to the amended motion.</p> <p>The question on taking the Legal, Governance and Membership subcommittee's proposal to the local system boards for comments with the intent of having the Planning Panel vote on the board makeup at the next Planning Panel meeting was called:</p> <p>A roll call vote of all the members present was taken [Rochelle Funderburg was present and voted rather than Anita Trame (Alt), who was present and voted for LTLS earlier.] Ayes –all, Nayes – None, Abstaining – None. The motion passed.</p>
<p>Public Comment on: Mission, vision and values; New board structure and tasks</p>	<p>Comments</p> <p>Leslie Bednar requested comments from the public in attendance.</p> <p>Jan Rhoades noted that she felt that it is important to have Public librarians on the board.</p> <p>Kay Marshall noted that on the board one special or academic is fine. Public trustees bring you the general public point of view. The public should have an opportunity to</p>

	<p>comment on the board makeup. Librarians should also be on the board.</p> <p>Sarah S Sagen stated that it is difficult to get people involved and would like to encourage reaching out to small libraries to be represented on the board.</p>
<p>Report from committees</p>	
<p>Resource Sharing</p>	<p>Ellen Popit noted that the Resource Sharing subcommittee had met twice.</p> <p>Amy Inhen reported for the Resource Sharing subcommittee. Amy noted that Ellen had done a great job of merging the Resource Sharing and ILL policies from each of the four systems together, and that they had much more in common than not. The subcommittee hopes to have to the full panel the Resource Sharing and ILL mashups on basecamp by Christmas.</p> <p>LLSAP managers reported on the process and interface to merge the automation systems together. The process is going well. The subcommittee heard further from the LLSAP managers regarding a description of what a shared system means. They also reviewed Jan Ison’s thought piece on LLSAPs. They looked at existing policies of all systems, including the format. They are using “responsibility of” structure for the documents.</p> <p>Harriette Zipfel noted that the LLSAP policies may be an issue for legal review. Amy noted that there would be a need for the Legal, Governance and Membership subcommittee to review the grievance policies. Each of the systems have different practices for a reciprocal borrowing card.</p>
<p>Break</p>	
<p>Delivery</p>	<p>Leslie Bednar noted that Delivery Committee has met twice. Dick Helton met via phone with the delivery supervisors, and the subcommittee hopes to have face-to-face meeting with the working group in two weeks. There are a lot of maps to look at. It has been decided that delivery drop-off centers should be called Regional Hubs rather than community centers, as they may be a pickup point for more than one town. In looking at the impact of Regional Hubs, it reduces the 400-500 stops to 250 stops. Delivery would be to Public libraries and others would come and pick up the materials. This would save time and gas. Allen Lanham noted that there would be several cases where due to the volume both the school and public would receive delivery. Delivery is also looking at mailing books to smaller volume libraries. Possibly having the system pay the postage on mailing the books. Determination of the cost of postage vs the cost of a delivery stop. Problems with drivers going to libraries that ARE closed and no one is at the library. Proposing fines on libraries (\$50 min) and costs to be determined by the system board. Warnings should be issued with no delivery until the fine is paid. The problems caused with delivery are often due to not having keys to some of the buildings. In order to get delivery the library must give driver a key or go before the board and ask for an exception. Possibly using keyed delivery boxes outside the building. Bids from delivery</p>

	<p>company to do delivery. Leslie is working on an RFP for delivery.</p> <p>DOG – Delivery On the Go. – Route on to and mark in a special way, so that those books can avoid being handled twice and it means that a book can be delivered more quickly. Colored sheets to show the items are delivered on to another library later on the route. Banding books for several books going to the same location regardless of whether they are on the same route. Convenience points for delivery. Have the books near the door or at least on the same floor. 15-30 min per stop. Time saver. Marian Albers noted that for now there would be four delivery hubs, and they would be working at becoming more efficient. Harriett Zipfel reminded the subcommittee that in looking at an outside Delivery company; what about a no strikes. DOG is a good idea. Libraries need to be aware of the route. How do earlier libraries benefit? Banding books takes space. LCLS the drivers bring their own carts why is there an extra cart. Delivery area on the first floor. Allen Lanham resource for other libraries. Drivers are providing good service meeting and greeting staff and a minimal number of stops would make this more efficient. Marian Albers – try to save sorting time by doing what they can at the libraries. Nina Wunderlich asked about giving and getting the rubber bands. Non sticky tape was more of a problem. It works out over time. Diane Steele – Are there a lot of libraries that haven't submitted keys? Consequences... are necessary. Bev Obert indicated that book drop boxes might be a solution to this problem for some libraries. Banding books. Rochelle Funderburg – You should offer an alternative to the key, as there may be liability issues associated with handing out keys. Educating the library public that libraries are not free. Here are what it costs to get this service. In response to Jan Ison's question on delivery volumes being proposed, Leslie Bednar noted that based on the FY2010 library volume she had developed a map using Batch Geo and the suggested volume ranges for delivery indicated below.</p> <p>Mail for 49 or less 50-299 2 days 300-499 3 days 500+ 4 days 5 days based on discretion of the delivery supervisor or the system. The result of use of Regional Hubs would reduce the number of stops down to 233 from individual stops of 568. The goal is to share this information with working the group to see if this makes sense.</p> <p>Rochelle Funderburg left the meeting. Juliette Douglas – Consider if it is just one year, you may have lost your opportunity. Is it forever, or is it the time to consider outsourcing.</p>
<p>Legal, Governance & Membership</p>	<p>Nina Wunderlich reported for the Legal, Governance & Membership (LGM) subcommittee that they felt the Intergovernmental Agreement was ready to take to a lawyer. Nina requested that the LGM subcommittee be authorized to hire Phil Lenzini to review this document as well as future documents such as bylaws, etc. for the subcommittee. Jan Ison pointed out that on page 4 it should say, planning panel, and that the Lincoln Trail zip code</p>

	<p>should be 61822.</p> <p>Nina Wunderlich made the motion to authorize the Legal, Governance & Membership (LGM) subcommittee to hire Phil Lenzini. Rosanne Reidner seconded the motion. A roll call vote of all the members present was taken [Anita Trame (Alt) voted rather than Rochelle Funderburg, as Rochelle was not present.] Ayes –all, Nayes – None, Abstaining – None. The motion passed.</p> <p>Nina noted that the LGM subcommittee planned to post the proposed membership criteria for public and academic libraries for public comment by Christmas. Bev is going to meet with a school representative from each system to get feedback before the school membership criteria are made available for public comment. It is hoped that they will be available in January. At that point it is agreed and sent to System Boards for review and posting to membership.</p> <p>LMG would like to recommend that a working group of fiscal officers be created to develop and present financial information to answer the committee’s questions regarding the salary information for the system director, surplus property and procedures of disposal, and building operating costs. Allen Lanham requested that it be presented in a written format. Jan Ison requested that that information be made available to the entire planning panel, not just the LGM subcommittee.</p> <p>The job description is being created and should soon be up in bootcamp as a draft.</p> <p>This new entity needs a “Name”, so please consider this over the holidays.</p> <p>LGM will be meeting by conference call in December. Panel</p>
<p>Public Comment on: Committee reports</p>	<p>Comments</p> <p>Kay Marshall – Thanked the panel for their work.</p> <p>Casey Jones - Are we able to get the service we’ve been getting? Are we looking at old solutions in regards to delivery? 19th century solutions to 20th century problems. Technology is downloading books. Have they thought about a regional download service instead of spending on delivery?</p> <p>Marian Albers - We do Overdrive, but we still have 4,000 items per month that need to be delivered.</p> <p>Joan Rhoades – DOG = We love it. We will change right away where the delivery driver walks to pick up our items. According to my co-director Carli gets 5 day per delivery regardless of volume. Where is the parity?</p> <p>Barb Rhoades – I know from experience that if you remove</p>

	<p>the word system from the name you will confuse people. Please disregard removing the word system. Consider an efficiency expert. We are turning a corner, the survey invited us to respond to what we remember. We don't need what we had, hoping that you will be brave enough to take the next step. Next generation things that will need to be defined. Do we need consultants waiting at their desk. Do we need cataloging? How can we deliver services in a different way Hopes... don't go back to what systems were. Deliver services in a different way.</p> <p>Sarah Homer - We still have paper books. The new system will need to think about the future. Automated independently, we don't have a community where we are likely to be able to expand to join a new LLSAP.</p> <p>Judy Groom Freeport Lib – Visual maps of delivery are wonderful. Would like to see them posted for the public. Leslie Bednar indicated that when there was a proposal and when they were as clean and accurate as possible, they would be posted.</p> <p>Tina Hubert, Six Mile Library, asks that you not sweat the details. Make them good enough, don't worry about making them perfect. Don't make yourselves crazy with the wording. You need to meeting as much as possible. There is a lot to be done. You have fabulous momentum. Don't lose it. Thank you, you are doing a fabulous job. Delivery – recognize the huge change for the members. May increase costs on the other end. Once it is figured out, help along to visit as many of the libraries as possible. Help people to recognize the new ways of doing things.</p> <p>Harriette Zipfel – Loved what Barb had to say. IL has been leader. Reinvent ourselves. Reestablish ourselves as a library leader and to become trailblazer. Need to gain energy and synergy---trailblazers. Maybe a good name.</p> <p>Susan Middleson LCLC, personnel requirements should be left to the new Executive Director, who will make those appointments.</p> <p>JoAnne Nabe– Kindle won't participate in Overdrive.</p> <p>Ron Coleman – the new Executive Director from should be from IL.</p> <p>Rose Ann – Homer thanks everyone and encourages the posting of comments.</p> <p>Jan Ison thanked the audience for the challenging us to think differently.</p>
Review of Key Milestones	<p>Bev asked, "Are we on track?" Key milestones. – Progress. JoAnne Nabe was concerned that we might have trouble meeting the timeline.</p>

	<p>What might we adjust?</p> <p>We are ahead of the game even though we have a lot of work to do.</p>
<p>Desired outcomes for next meeting</p>	<p>List items</p> <p>Full panel will not be able to meet in January, so subcommittees will meet. Full panel will meet twice in February, early and late, probably in Effingham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thursday 10 • Fri & Sat 25 & 26 <p>Final action on board makeup, executive director job description, resource sharing, vision values, strategic directions, governmental agreement.</p> <p>Jan sending out visions ahead for comments so can take to boards before our next meeting. Also on coop2day for public comment.</p> <p>Rosanne thanked everyone for their comments. Encouraged all to watch coop2day and make comments.</p>
<p>Meeting and Facilitation Review</p>	<p>Plus/Delta</p> <p>Bev – Intergovernmental agreement will be ready in January with the others in February on Basecamp.</p> <p>Turn the heat on.</p> <p>Public comments are very helpful.</p> <p>Allen concern because of helter skelter of the documents in basecamp. Need to be more organized, perhaps color coded by committee. Staff time organizing for this board.</p> <p>Dated – Advanced list helped. Notebooks and ready to go.</p> <p>Karen – Project documents to be discussed on the screen, so that all will know what the document looks like.</p>
<p>Adjourn</p>	<p>At 5:02 Ron Coleman moved that the meeting be adjourned. Tom Turner seconded the motion. The motion passed with all ayes.</p>