

Planning Panel Draft Minutes for 2.10.2011

Southern System Planning
 Thursday, February 10, 2011
 Knights of Columbus Hall
 1501 West Fayette Avenue
 Effingham, IL 62401-1972
 (217) 342-6565

Attending:

LCLS: JoAnn Nabe, Linda McDonnell, Dianne Steele, Elaine Steingrubey (Alt)
 LTLS: Allen Lanham, Nina Pals
 RPLS: Val Green, Amy Ihnen, Mary Ann Pohl (Alt), Nina Wunderlich
 SHLS: Marian Albers, Karen Bounds, Arlene Dueker (Alt), Tom Turner

Absent:

LCLS: Ron Coleman,
 LTLS: Rochelle Funderburg, Scott Drone-Silver (Alt), Rosanne Reidner, Anieta Trame (Alt)
 RPLS: Richard Helton
 SHLS: Andrea Witthoft, Susan Yallaly (Alt)

Others Present:

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

ISL: Greg McCormick and Lawren Tucker

Audience: Maria Dent, Sandra Hayes, Janet Hicks, Kay Marshall, Gisa Powers, Lacy Wright, Diane Yeoman

Topic	Process
Start Ups: Welcome Purpose Desired outcome Agenda/Additions?	Bev Obert welcomed the Planning Panel at 12:50 and apologized for late start time (orig. 12:30). There were no additions to the agenda.
Minutes of December 2, 2010 Meeting	Linda McDonnell noted that Susan's correct name was 'Mendelsohn', not 'Middleton' and that 'meeting as much as possible' should be changed to 'meet as much as possible'. JoAnn Nabe moved and Tom Turner seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was 13 Ayes, 1 abstention.
Panel members comments from members	Report from Panel & Cooperation Today Comments (PP Doc. 2.10.11 B) SHLS—Marian Albers noted that there had been several questions regarding membership criteria. She had explained to those concerned that criteria are needed for the new system to operate. RPLS—Val Green reported that school libraries not part of the LLSAP are asking what is the benefit for them in the new system if we don't offer consulting and CE. Schools are not allowing staff to

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
	<p>go to CE and can't meet the education criteria. They don't want to lose membership so we need to be clear on what benefits will be.</p> <p>LTLS – none</p> <p>LCLS – Diane Steele noted the LCLS members' concern of small libraries being reduced to a lesser membership level or eliminated from membership completely. There is a fear factor regarding the new standards, particularly regarding the education requirements.</p> <p>Val Green mentioned that budget restrictions and not offering training will make it more difficult for people to obtain training.</p> <p>Ellen Popit indicated we haven't gotten a lot of comments on Cooperation2day and criteria is going to impact membership so we need to encourage members to read the documentation.</p>		
Status of Due Diligence	<p>Leslie facilitated the discussion.</p> <p>Juliette Douglas indicated the four southern system business managers have been working to collect all of the required information. There is now a section in Basecamp for due diligence which is 80% complete, with everything in pdf format. All of the documents are organized by a numbering system. The rest of the documents will be up by the end of next week. They will also email to anyone who wants.</p> <p>Leslie asked if anyone had looked at it. Val indicated it was a lot to digest; others said it was well organized.</p> <p>Juliette reiterated that the documents are labeled with descriptions and either all systems information are in one document or system's name is at the end of the file. The numbering starts with DD and then numbers indicate the type of document (1 organization, 2 employees, 3 financial, etc.).</p>		
Transition Board Make-Up (PP Doc 2.10.11 C)	<p>Discussion item at this point in the meeting – action items for the proposals will be after public comment.</p> <p>Tom presented the Transition Board document from LGM. Board makeup is based on number of libraries in combined systems (1131 total: 39 academic, 231 public, 260 school, 65 special) while also meeting legal requirement for 51% public library trustees. The transition board will be composed of existing system board members and terms will end 6/30. Each system should submit nominations to LGM by 2/24 meeting when Planning Panel will approve members.</p> <p>Marian asked how soon transition board will be in place. Tom said Transition board would be in effect March 1 and will operate in conjunction with Planning Panel during the transition period.</p> <p>JoAnn asked what will the two do? The Planning Panel will develop documents, the Transition Board will spend, hire director, conduct the board election, etc. The Transition Board will operate under the same agreement procedures as Planning Panel</p> <p>Juliette asked if LGM has discussed the audit required by individual systems in August. That discussion has not yet happened.</p>		
Intergovernmental	Tom indicated this is similar to a document developed by the northern		

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
<p style="text-align: center;">Agreement v.2.1 (PP Doc 2.10.11 D)</p>	<p>system process. It's been reviewed by Phil Lenzini, lawyer, and is ready for system boards' approval. Once approved, it will go to ISL. ISL has already seen a preliminary copy.</p> <p>Elaine asked Lawren if the ISL thought the document was ok. He said yes, if it is similar to the northern systems' intergovernmental agreement.</p> <p>Action on this document will be taken during committee reports section of the agenda.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">By-Laws of New Organization v 4.1 (PP Doc 2.10.11 E)</p>	<p>Tom Turner reported on changes made in the Bylaws document, by LGM, during the morning meeting. There are additional revisions suggested by Phil Lenzini and an addendum on electronic meetings in compliance with the Open Meetings act to be added. The newest version was posted on Basecamp prior to the meeting and will be re-posted on Cooperation Today (tomorrow), with these additional revisions:</p> <p>Page 1, Article 3 – modified to say “and other counties that may be associated with the System in the future”</p> <p>Page 7, Section 7 – the listed “Order of Business” section will be replaced with “Standard Order of Business will comply with the Open Meetings Act”</p> <p>Page 6—Change “Standing Committees (other than Nominating Committee)” to “Standing Committees (other than Nominating Committee for the Board of Directors)” for clarification</p> <p>Page 8, Article VII - add "or equivalent professional credentials" to the qualifications.</p> <p>Val indicated a small issue, that Article 6 is not centered like the rest. Allen asked what does equivalent professional credentials mean for the Executive Director qualifications? He thinks it leaves the door wide open. Bev indicated it is a consideration for international applicants. Lawren, when asked, indicated “professional” may not agree with the legal language. The description of the Executive Director qualifications, p. 5 of Intergovernmental Agreement, agrees with the legal requirements and needs to match the language in the Bylaws. This wording will be changed. The “Meetings via Electronic Means” addendum will be added to the Bylaws, with the numbering organization of ‘J’.</p> <p>Action on this document will be taken during the committee reports section of the Agenda.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">System Membership Criteria v5 (PP Doc 2.10.11 F)</p>	<p>Tom Turner reported on changes to the Membership Criteria document made in the morning LGM meeting. This is a challenging document, there have been many concerns expressed about the criteria. The goal is to meet standards set by the state while also trying to accommodate members who have issues meeting the new criteria. The committee discussed the following changes:</p> <p>Appendix C, p. 9: Staffing, third paragraph, change to “...hire, they can remain at full status two years upon proof that they advertised. A third year...”</p> <p>Action on this document will be taken during the committee reports section of the Agenda.</p>		

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
-------	---------	-----	------

<p>Strategic Plan (PP Doc 2.10.11 G)</p>	<p>Val Greene reported for the committee, highlighted changes committee had made to the Strategic Plan based on comments from the survey.</p> <p>Strategic Direction II – change Goal 2 to read “Seek funding opportunities to expand local, regional and statewide service.” Add Goal 3 – Leverage system resources to support services.</p> <p>Strategic Direction IV – Change Goal 3 to read “Identify services that would be more cost effective to provide as a group or negotiate with vendors to offer those services.”</p> <p>Strategic Direction VI – Change Goal 3 to read “Provide opportunities to network and share services and strategies which enhances education and the promotion of libraries.”</p> <p>Next task is to go back to the list of suggested services, from surveys, and see what can be included in this document.</p> <p>The committee will also work on putting together some elements of the Plan of Services. They need to discuss this with the fiscal officers to match the budget proposal with the plan of service.</p> <p>Juliette indicated due diligence documents includes current years budgets and lists all current staff and salary ranges. However, current plan of service of each system is not part of due diligence.</p> <p>Val indicated the committee will need current plan of service from each system. Nina indicated some wording inconsistencies in the document.</p> <p>Action on this document will be taken during the committee reports section of the Agenda.</p>
<p>Resource Sharing Plan v 4 (PP Doc 2.10.11 H)</p>	<p>Karen Bounds presented the changes to the Resource Sharing document.</p> <p>Page 4, 3.a)1) add “A member library is expected to provide 60% or more of local circulation to their card members.” Also, remove last sentence in that paragraph</p> <p>Page 4, 3.a)2) add “No library is expected to lend more than 15% of total circulation to cardholders of another single library.” Also, remove last sentence in that paragraph.</p> <p>Bev had some questions about consistency in those statements. Marian asked f you are one of those libraries that are loaning more than 15%, do you have the right to refuse? How are you going to enforce? Do you call the library? JoAnn Name indicated it is up to the local board. The wording needs to be clearer.</p> <p>Ellen indicated that the document includes statements that indicate what libraries are expected to do. We know it is difficult to enforce. If it happens, it is up to a local library to address it.</p> <p>Allen asked about card-issuing vs. home library wording – needs to be consistent. The committee will revise during the break.</p> <p>Action on this document will be taken during the committee reports section of the Agenda.</p>

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
-------	---------	-----	------

<p>Name of New Organization</p>	<p>Ellen asked everyone to review the names we've already received, from the surveys. Eliminated from the list were any names with 'southern,' 'downstate,' 'central,' 'lincoln,' and words from current systems. The procedure for soliciting more names was discussed. Val said we need to include 'library system' for legal reasons. Tom said the LGM committee wanted to suggest "four rivers library system". LGM would like name suggestions by February 24th from system membership and boards. Local system boards and the Planning Panel are going to choose the name and asked the system directors to submit 5-7 names at the February meeting.</p> <p>Allen suggested that if we have a hand show vote now we may eliminate some from the list. The names were voted on, with the following names being approved for additional consideration by a majority count.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between the Rivers Library System BRLS • Big Bluestem Library System • Crossroads • Heart of Illinois Library System • Land between the Rivers (Ohio & Mississippi) • Pioneer Trails System • White Oak Library System (state tree) • Four Rivers Library System
---------------------------------	--

<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>Lacy Wright asked that the Planning Panel consider changing the reciprocal borrowing billing period (Resource Access Policy) from 6 weeks to 8 weeks. Eight weeks is not enough time to try and collect from the patron. Ellen asked if better to use the phrase 'timely fashion' but Lacy indicated 8 weeks would be more definite.</p> <p>Gisa Powers stated that she likes the four rivers library system name. Kay Marshal thought that 'between four rivers' might describe the area. Sandi Hayes asked if membership criteria includes 'grandfathering' of current directors. What happens if directors can't meet criteria in 5 years? Tom Turner pointed out that all system members will be grandfathered into the new system and Appendix C indicates new criteria should be met only when there is a change of director.</p> <p>Break at 2:17.</p>
-----------------------	--

Report from Subcommittees

<p>Legal, Governance & Membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transition Board Make - Up 	<p>A motion was made by Marion, second by Val, to approve the Transition Board Makeup document. During discussion, Allen stated he wanted to be recorded that he thinks the 1 board position for academics will marginalize academic libraries. In the entire</p>
--	---

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intergovernmental Agreement v2.1 ○ By-Laws of the New Organization 4.1 ○ Membership Criteria v 5 	<p>state, there will only be 2 academics on any system board. Tom indicated that some board members can be dual representatives from multiple libraries.</p> <p>There was discussion about whether the new board can change the bylaws to allow different representation. This group is trying to get a transition board in place – a new board can make changes. Elaine and Diane stated that once a new entity is in place and has a board seated, it is their responsibilities to determine what the vision is for the new organization; this is not cast in stone. The motion to adopt the document passed unanimously (Ayes – ALL)</p> <p>A motion was made by Allen, second by Tom, to refer the Intergovernmental Agreement to the system boards for comment and approval. There was no additional discussion. The motion passed unanimously (Ayes – ALL).</p> <p>A motion was made by Tom, second by Val, to refer the newly-revised ByLaws to the system boards for comment and approval. Tom then amended the motion to include the Resolution on Electronic Meetings document as an addendum, Val agreed to this amendment. In additional discussion, Marian asked if the change regarding the wording on counties was to allow for other systems or libraries joining. It was indicated this wording would make this a possibility. The motion passed unanimously (Ayes – ALL).</p> <p>A motion was made by Tom, second by Nina, to refer the newly-revised Membership Criteria to the system boards for comment and approval. This needs to be done for the March Planning Panel meeting. The motion passed unanimously (Ayes – ALL)</p> <p>Tom indicated that the LGM committee plans to work on the following at their next meeting: ISL Plan of Service Application, hiring a new director, organizational chart, job descriptions, and personnel policy.</p>		
<p>Delivery</p>	<p>Leslie indicated the Delivery Committee had met with its working group in January and the goal for the Delivery Committee is to determine the best process going forward.</p> <p>Elaine discussed these components being worked on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to 7/1/2011, would like to initiate a delivery schedule based on volume. Largest libraries, with largest volumes, will still get 5 day a week delivery. For the remainder: Receives 500+ items or more per week = 4 day, 300-499 = 3 day, 50 -299 = 2 day, less than 50 on demand/mail/. This is the base starting point. 2. In order to plan for revisions, need counts by delivery drivers of items in/out of each library on routes. Will have to be changed as data changes, Right now based on FY 2010 numbers. 3. CAT (Community Access Terminal) will be where several libraries in a 		

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
	<p>community can form a CAT and increase their frequency of delivery by increasing the volume delivered to a single site. A letter will be sent to the libraries offering this opportunity – not predetermined by the system. Libraries would be responsible for formation and must remain a CAT for a year.</p> <p>4. DOG (Delivery on the GO). Libraries will be asked to presort and bundle for others who come later on delivery routes. This could be implemented soon.</p> <p>5. The delivery point needs to be as close to the door as possible. That will minimize driver time spend at each stop. It will be a requirement for keys and access codes be given to system. If not this, have an alternate drop spot or drop box. School deliveries, unless controlled by volume, will all be delivered to school office to save time. Drivers will identify libraries that can improve their delivery access. Letters will go to the library from the current executive director</p> <p>Jan asked if the Delivery Committee report will be posted to basecamp and if it could be voted on for implementation. Also, has the committee looked at outsourcing.</p> <p>A motion was made by Elaine, second by Diane to take delivery recommendations to local boards for comment and approval. The motion passed unanimously (Ayes – ALL)</p> <p>The committee will continue its work by making a budget recommendation soon. It was noted that the current buildings are paid for and that as the LLSAPS merge delivery patterns will change.</p>		
Resource Sharing Resource Sharing Plan v 4	<p>Resource Sharing committee reviewed their revisions to the Resource Sharing Plan, which included the following changes:</p> <p>Page 3, 2b and page 4, 3e change time from 6 to 8 weeks.</p> <p>Page 4 3e move subsections 1 and 2 to 2b on page 3.</p> <p>Consistently use card issuing/home library.</p> <p>Page 4 3a and b change “restrict access” to “restrict reciprocal borrowing”.</p> <p>The motion was made by Diane, second by Nina, to take the Resource Sharing Plan, with revisions, to local boards for comment and approval, with a March deadline. The motion passed unanimously (Ayes – ALL)</p> <p>Karen indicated further work for the committee includes asking LLSAP group for budget information as well as a possible state grant to help LLSAPs migrate to a new platform.</p> <p>The committee asked that LGM work on a grievance policy for libraries and personnel to bring grievances to the new entity.</p>		
Strategic Planning Strategic Plan	<p>The motion was made by Valerie, second by Linda to take the Strategic Plan, with revisions, to local boards for comment and approval by February meeting. The motion passed unanimously (Ayes –</p>		

Agenda February 10, 2011

Topic	Process	Who	Time
	<p style="text-align: center;">ALL)</p> <p>Val indicated the committee is going to look at combined budgets, services to see where money comes from, and surveys to see if we will meet membership wishes. Jan asked that ISL prepare the plan of service documentation as soon as possible so we can work on preparation.</p>		
Public Comment on Committee reports	<p>Allen asked who is discussing to be sure we are in compliance regarding personnel. Are there any dates for possible layoffs, etc. Jan indicated the four directors have some basic beginning assumptions but are not ready to discuss yet. The directors want to be as fair as they can and want to offer Cobra. Closing systems may take longer than June 30. Looking at personnel policies. System directors are trying to lead this. Appreciate everyone who has stayed with the systems. Goal is to not disrupt people as much as possible while looking at budgets in a different way.</p> <p>Juliette said there is no time period that employees have to get notified. Kay Marshall loves the delivery plan, please include limitations on weight in delivery containers Doris did put up agenda on coop2day with links to all documents.</p>		
Agenda items for next meeting	<p>Jan explained there will be a two-day meeting on 2/24 and 2/25. It will be a working meeting, with times for committee breakouts, large panel meetings, evenings perhaps. After discussion, the group indicated this format:</p> <p>2/24 – start at 10-12 with committees, lunch, panel 1-2, committees 2-4, panel 4-6, free evening.</p> <p>2/25 – start at 9-11 with panel. Holiday Inn asks us to be done by 11:30. Hotel rooms will be in Country Inn & Suites.</p> <p>Val asked in the interest of the public let the time of the public action be specified so we are in compliance with the open meetings act.</p>		
Meeting and Facilitation Review	<p>Plus++++</p> <p>Allen said documentation was very good Jan said northern systems not having this rich discussion it's important that our panel is multi-type Tom said we don't always get along but there is still comradery—we all want the same thing. Diane indicated this is the place to voice opinions. Done early Good public input Lunch great</p> <p>Deltas----</p> <p>Remember markers and paper</p> <p>Upon motion by Elaine, second by Diane, the meeting was adjourned at 4:08.</p>		

Agenda February 10, 2011

	Agenda February 10, 2011		
Topic	Process	Who	Time