

Minutes of the November 10, 2010 Southern System Planning Panel

Place: Decatur Public Library
130 N Franklin
Decatur, IL

Date: November 10, 2010

Attending:

LCLS: Linda McDonnell, JoAnn Nabe, Dianne Steele, Elaine Steingrubey (Alt)
LTLS: Allen Lanham, Nina Pals, Rosanne Reidner
RPLS: Val Green, Richard Helton, Amy Ihnen, Mary Ann Pohl (Alt),
SHLS: Marian Albers, Karen Bounds, Tom Turner, Susan Yallaly (Alt)

Absent:

LCLS: Ron Coleman, Harriett Zipfel (Alt)
LTLS: Rochelle Funderburg, Scott Drone-Silver (Alt), Anita Trame (Alt)
RPLS: Brenda Larison (Alt), Nina Wunderlich
SHLS: Arlene Dueker (Alt), Andrea Witthoft

Others Present:

LCLS: Leslie Bednar, Juliette Douglas,
LTLS: Jan Ison, Pat Boze, Ramona Rollins
RPLS: Bev Obert, Doris McKay, Mike Syzmkoski
SHLS: Ellen Popit, Traci Edwards

ISL: Ann Craig and Lawren Tucker

Audience: Ann Adkesson, Debbie Campbell, Jan Dungey, Sarah Garley, Sandra Hayes, Janet Hicks, Deanne Holshouser, Libby Letterly, Susan Mendelsohn, Joan Rhoades, Suzy Saunders, Nancy Simpson, Cheryl Soerensen, Miranda Sowers, Lacey Wright, Diane Yeoman

Introductions began at: 1:30 pm following meetings of the Subcommittees and a tour of the Rolling Prairie Library System headquarters.

Agenda Item	Discussion and Decisions
<p>Start Up Welcome Purpose Desired Outcomes Agenda/Additions Approve Minutes of October 13 meeting Affirm changes to planning document</p>	<p>Bev Obert started the meeting with introductions and welcome to everyone, asked everyone to please sign in, hoped everyone got a tour of RPLS. Additions to agenda: future meeting dates Minutes of the Oct. 14 meeting had no corrections, Val moved to accept, second by Diane, approved. V. 6 Planning Process document is now out with additions to timeline. Discussion on member vote in February – if system boards approve resolution to dissolve, need to get information out to members. Should we remove member vote from the timeline? Is it a check on progress being made? LTLS</p>

	<p>put out the dissolution for comment and should have a good idea of the membership's perspective by the end of the month. It's not a vote but a ratification of what we're doing. Tom said LGM committee recommended that's what we do – ratification by members in the timeline instead of 'vote'. Timeline is to have resolution to ISL by 2/1 and it seems backward to have the member vote after that date. Also, members need to have some answers. Dissolution resolution has to be done by Feb. 1 – then give members the option to ratify what has already been passed by the systems. March 1 will be the new deadline for ratification by members. Tom made the motion, Karen 2nd, unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Report on Issues/ Concerns from Members</p>	<p>Jan facilitated discussion of C2Day comments from members about the timeline and finances. Some concern expressed by members asking what happens if they vote 'no'. General discussion followed about planning panel members going out to members to explain financial reality, offering to assist in delivering the message about scaling back on expenses. An explanation is needed by system to individual library boards about what is happening.</p> <p>LCLS: Because of economics, no funding, some of systems have reluctantly eliminated consulting, may have to look at resource-sharing & delivery for potential cuts as well.</p> <p>LTLS: Some comments on what it will cost, would like to keep consulting, intergovernmental agreement to hire consultants? Some are unaware of what is going on, as much as we try not all libraries paying attention to the process ShLS is publicizing something every week – so far no comments.</p> <p>RPLS: Commitment to visiting boards. In talking to libraries, question they have is 'will this thing work'?</p> <p>The sooner we all start thinking as 'one entity' then we will all be the same. When we do that, we can continue to provide good services, have a foundation for going forward.</p>
<p>Communication Discussion Review of SP&D session</p>	<p>Bev reviewed recent SP&D meeting, session about communications emphasizing that communication is crucial. Our communication is being done through C2D. Key issue is systems have to merge and focus on delivery and LLSAP. Stakeholders – library members, boards, users, SOS, ISL, elected officials, local officials, library associations, vendors, anyone who touches the system is a stakeholder – we have to know what they want. They have to know if it's going to work, what services they will have – they want straight information. Officials want to be elected, with happy library users, important to save dollars. Members want to know how it will affect them, have to make sure that we as individuals and panel can communicate clearly. If we do it right they won't notice a change. It's important to update groups as much as possible, assure/disseminate progress made so far, set up meetings with libraries to discuss process. May not hurt to involve media, let them know what is going on/why, what we're trying to do. Need to put out to wider media – but we don't a lot of detail to put out right now.</p>
<p>Report from Subcommittees</p>	
<p>Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Val presented info about the Strategic Planning survey, The committee spent a lot of time reviewing results, noticed that schools lowest in response, ShLS lowest response rate, public libraries highest response rate. Comments</p>

	<p>numbered in the hundreds, tried to pull best wording from the survey. Key terms for mission were: sharing of resources, enable libraries to provide better service, communication of library agencies. Committee developed a beginning draft mission: community of multitype libraries developing partnerships and sharing resources in pursuit of excellent service. Mission came about quickly, still working on vision/values for next meeting. Customer satisfaction was the highest value.</p> <p>Jan gave a powerpoint of many of the survey responses - % by system, % by type of library, pop surveyed, majority 3-7500. Delivery data is interesting – libraries under 500 population ok with 2 day, 4 day/wk is least popular. One of the things the committee wants to do is a press release, give number who responded, state that the systems merging are compatible. Jan thinks this is a really comprehensive response. Need to include more comments – if the powerpoint goes on C2D, people may not understand context. Usually when you put out results of surveys, it says ‘majority’, ‘minority’ – make it clear in the powerpoint if comments are ‘majority, few, etc.’.</p> <p>If there is a weakness in the survey, it’s how we received data about a vision statement. We have to go back to the survey more than once to help us figure out the vision. In structuring the vision of what we’re going to do, don’t want to leave out other services we should offer. Would like feedback from other groups – visions for future years may allow us to build on the two priorities – want to include what’s important.</p>
<p>Legal, Governance & Membership</p>	<p>Bev indicated the committee is presenting discussion, not recommendations. There will be a ‘Board Representation’ document put up, for voting at next meeting. This is Option 4, with 15 members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Public Library Trustees from each system board 2 Public Librarians 3 School Librarians 1 Special Librarian 1 Academic Librarian <p>Best option for serving the new area with 260 schools, 231 publics, 65 specials, 38 academic. Committee will propose process for appointing the first year board and for staggered terms thereafter. Document will be on Basecamp.</p> <p>Headquarters discussion: Committee thinks the best geographically logical location is Effingham if central office is needed. Final decision will be made by the new board and is depending on selling of buildings. Recommending that we stay in current building until sold, look at possibility of leasing space, etc.</p> <p>The committee also revisited the due diligence issue – finance managers have put info on CD but it will be uploaded on C2D with a new tab added to site, in pdf format. Documents should be sent to: Doris McKay.</p> <p>The committee will refer other ‘contract’ issues to committees for discussion: OCLC & E-resources – to Resource-Sharing and recommend that the RS committee keep those in place</p>

	<p>Plinkit – to Strategic Planning, recommend to keep in place as long as possible IMRF – don't have the problems we thought, will have some rules we will have to look at but will likely recommend not dropping IMRF. Discussed membership but no decisions. Looking at tiered situation for membership (staffing issues, inequity with size, finances, have to look at some tiering of membership) Timeline for possible new Board – will have better idea in December but may want them appointed earlier. Question about how will we get new board members – committee is looking at a possible structure. Committee also developing draft documents – search committee, bylaws, etc. for new board.</p>
Resource Sharing	<p>JoAnn indicated committee reviewed previously approved LLSAP capital reserve accounts document. RS committee is asking LLSAP working group to clarify some of the language, will have that for the next meeting. The committee reviewed survey data, were pleased resource-sharing was so high as a value. The RS committee discussed the possibility of two-tiered resource-sharing plan as well. The next task is to look at Resource Sharing policies of all four systems, hope to have a draft document ready for review for the next meeting. In answer to question at the end about what tiered membership means, Ellen said in relation to membership with resource-sharing access– that there might be a two-tiered resource-sharing standard. Two-tiered membership might include who would be required to do reciprocal access (special library collections), etc. In regards to actual membership, some of the small libraries don't have resources to hire/meet standards, need to look at membership standards, two-tiered approach.</p>
Delivery	<p>Allen said committee reviewed past work, steps forward , continue to have some discrepancies of data across systems. Instead of 5 day, looking at 4 day as highest frequency. Any library receiving 500+ items weekly would get at least 4 day/week. 300-500 3 day weekly, 50-299 2 day, mail for those under 50. The committee continues to look at community dropoff, which favors highest volume in community. Preference to deliver to site with most volumes but libraries could decide. If dropoff is insufficient, multiple dropoffs would be considered. The committee is also developing materials for an RFP for a commercial vendor – cost quote – quality and quantity. They have another meeting planned with the working group to determine possible routes, no overlap on borders. Also looking at cross-over routes of vans, might be consequence if libraries close and don't tell us. Dick talked about the US Mail option box which at a media rate is mailed at a half-price rate. The committee is discussing implementing change to 4,3,2, day and mail delivery in January, to see how things work out. Who pays return mail cost is not yet decided. Also if funds are flat-lined, perhaps everyone will have to pay something for delivery. Know that big libraries may require 5 day/wk, will look at this in the next meeting. Academic libraries have been mailing to patrons – each system also may mail now. Is there concern that this might slow the return of material? Libraries might hold on to material, instead of spending money on boxes. As far as an idea of number of routes, vans, drivers, the committee needs more</p>

	<p>data, library by library what volume has been. Last time mentioned 3 hubs, word is there may not be any new money, don't have money to move building hubs until they all get sold. Allen: all committees need to meet together, with the building/hub issue.</p>
<p>Public Comment on Committee reports</p>	<p>– Comfort level at how everyone is working together. How counting 500 coming or going only? Both ways -How are you defining community dropoff? What are you using for volume – last year's? How often assessing – using 2010 figures, will reassess yearly? Community hubs could be school or public – or several places within the community. One with the highest volume. Community dropoff – multiple towns? Still looking at all options while trying to cut costs. -Issue raised at ILSDO – archives of all data that needs to be retained as systems consider merge. Financial – no money for headquarters? What happens to past systems archival material?</p>
<p>Timeline of Key Milestones</p>	<p>Delivery will give 'progress' report in December, due diligence documents discussed. Feb. 1 - dissolution to ISL March 1 – ratification April 4 – ISL application, intergovernmental agreement June 1 – area&per cap grant application due Add date of new board? Feb/Mar at latest</p>
<p>Agenda items for next meeting</p>	<p>Dates for next meeting Dec. 2 at LTLS Discussion about January-doing a vtel for planning panel, separate vtels or phone calls at other times May have to look at a 2-day meeting to finish up everything. Aren't going to get done otherwise. ½ day com/pp, ½ day comm./pp – January meeting? Planning a face to face with vtel on hold? Would like to meet in person, working with maps, etc. Directors will send out poll for dates.</p> <p>December meeting agenda items: New Board decision – solidification – discuss tasks of new board? What Resource Sharing will look like in the new system? Draft of strategic plan – mission, vision, values Finance piece – need to know what money we will have & plan – who will handle it. RS/delivery groups will need to decide – before finances can be determined, also tied to hiring exec. dir If we wait too long for Exec. Dir hire, have to handle employees, benefits, etc. Discussion of buildings? What happens if buildings are sold, if we become a new entity, who gets liabilities and assets – new entity.. Will current system/directors stay in effect until July 1? Yes, even with new board/hire Strategic Planning committee may merge into developing annual plan, as result of what they are doing New board has intergovernmental agreement with four existing boards – plan</p>

	of service runs through June 30? Have to take a look at how this will all be handled. Need information on intergovernmental agreements that should be in place
Meeting and Facilitation Review	Plus: Accomplished lot in subcommittee 2 hour subcommittee helps Report backs are useful Document list was helpful (what was needed) Appreciate ISL reps coming to meeting Lunch was good Delta: More time for subcommittees