

Southern System Planning Panel
 February 25 & 26, 2011
 Hilton Garden Inn
 1301 Avenue of Mid America
 Effingham, IL 62401

10:00 AM – 6:00 PM February 25, 2011
 8:00 AM – 11:30 February 26, 2011

Attending:

LCLS: Linda McDonnell, JoAnn Nabe, Diane Steele, Harriett Zipfel (Alt)
 LTLS: Allen Lanham (2/25 pm only and 2/26), Nina Pals, Rosanne Reidner
 RPLS: Val Green, Richard Helton, Mary Ann Pohl (Alt), Nina Wunderlich
 SHLS: Marian Albers, Karen Bounds, Arlene Dueker (Alt), Tom Turner

Absent:

LCLS: Ron Coleman
 LTLS: Scott Drone-Silver (Alt), Rochelle Funderburg, Anita Trame (Alt)
 RPLS: Amy Ihnen, Brenda Larison (Alt)
 SHLS: Andrea Witthoft, Susan Yallaly (Alt)

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, Christine Fine

ISL: Greg McCormick and Lawren Tucker

Audience: Amanda McKay (25th only), Bill Randall (26th only), Joan Rhoades, Donna Schaal, Margaret Turner (26th only), Diane Yeoman

Topic	Process
Start Ups: Welcome Purpose Desired outcome Agenda/Additions?	Bev started the meeting at 10:19 a.m. There were no comments on the outcomes or agenda additions.
Minutes of February 10, 2011 Meeting	(PP Doc. 2.25/26.11 A) Leslie asked if there were any changes to the minutes. Val—In the Strategic planning section—the committee completed the task of going through services to see how they fit to the strategic plan. Going to look at proposed services next. Val—In the Public comment section, after name of organization-- “8

	<p>weeks is not enough” should be 6. Karen—JoAnn’s name needs to be changed under resource sharing.</p> <p>Diane Steele moved and Karen Bounds seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was 14 ayes.</p>
<p>Ground Rules</p>	<p>Jan directed everyone to the last page of agenda to review the current ground rules. These need to be revisited now that we are more knowledgeable about each other. Val asked if these were supposed to be the same as assumptions. She couldn’t find the original document. Tom--process is starting to panic but has gotten to the point that it is getting too personal for a lot of us. We represent our people but it is time to get things done. Jan—Are you saying we should not take any of our actions as personal? Tom—Not exactly. Consider the big picture. Nina Pals—Keep it professional. Tom—Once all is said and done and the options are voiced and voted on, we have to go on, even if the vote didn’t go like you wanted. Val—Democratic—Don’t revisit decided issues. Tom—We know there are going to have to be some changes when we get done but think we’ve lost track. Harriet—Don’t get bogged down in the details. Tom/Val—Stay true to the democratic process. Everyone gets a vote and then it is decided until such time that it might need to be revisited. Jan—So this panel is final not local boards? Val—Panel is representing the boards. Tom—No pet projects. Can’t keep revisiting just because we didn’t get our way. Harriet—Don’t go back to local board and say this is what the panel wants but I want something else. Tom—Even though I don’t like the decisions, I am obligated to take it back to my local board and explain that this is what the panel wants. Jan—Need to make sure everyone knows what is expected of the boards. Marian—I read the comments and know that people are not happy but there are never any NO votes. Tom—Felt good after last meeting and then got documents in the last few days and wondered what happened. Jan—It’s only in the last week that we have started getting comments from members. We need to think about these people. Rosanne—Maintain professionalism. Karen—We have a goal to create 1 system out of 4. We won’t all agree but have to keep moving forward. New board has the right to change everything we are doing. Don’t loose sight of the goal. Mary Ann--Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good.</p>

	<p>Val—Stay true to the democratic process. Jan—Wants to be sure we agree with these. Nina W—Is it on there to not keep bringing things up? Jan--Listen as though you support it. Don't think you can have a ground rule to not keep bringing things up. If you vote no, you can't bring it back up but if you vote yes you can, according to Roberts rules. Jan—What does it mean to have sufficient conversation?—need to talk to directors. When committees come back from meetings with items, feel they are rushed. Arlene—We are trying to build the strongest foundation. Nina W--Don't know that ground rules for this group covers but we have to make sure that our libraries and boards understand the presented information. Diane—Need to start taking roll call votes. Val—Question where is SHLS report? There isn't any.</p> <p>Arlene Dueker motioned to add the suggested ground rules to the existing list, Nina Wunderlich seconded. Roll call vote was all ayes.</p>
<p>Report from System Board and Membership Comments LCLS LTLS RPLS SHLS</p>	<p>MEMBERSHIP COMMENTS Leslie reported comments from Cooperation Today. Not all committee meeting minutes are posted. There have been a lot of comments on naming the system, membership and delivery. Marian thanked Leslie for responding to all the delivery comments. Marian—she is getting verbal feedback also and having to clarifying.</p> <p>LCLS REPORT (PP Doc 2.25/26.11C) Linda—Our board discussed and considered the assigned documents. The intergovernmental agreement was approved. They are submitting James Fenton, Linda McDonnell, Diane Steele, and JoAnn Nabe to serve on the interim board. There have been many concerns from members on the criteria—read board statement. We hope that the criteria can be more inclusive. Strategic plan—add statement for delivery of electronic resources. Delivery—pleased about community delivery. Bylaws--The committees should not prepare but determine the cost of living, they approve and recommend to the board.</p> <p>Arlene—LCLS has taken concerns and made constructive suggestions. Jan—We have a strategic direction for e-resources and don't know why we would add it. Is it something that you can't live with? Linda—They discussed and felt it didn't fit and feel that it needs to be considered for the future. Jan—All boards have accepted the mission, visions and values so can this be changed? Just trying to use this as a good example. She</p>

	<p>understands the e-resource suggestion but do we want to add a goal to the 1st page.</p> <p>JoAnn—Thought that the only thing that had to be approved was intergovernmental agreement and comments for strategic plan. Ellen—Shawnee approved 3 documents.</p> <p>LTLS REPORT (PP Doc 2.25/26.11D)</p> <p>Rosanne--Have concerns on intergovernmental agreement. The document as it stands doesn't provide flexibility to move forward if timelines are not met. Nina P—The board did fully support but just concerned that something needs to be added. JoAnn—Did you approve it or not? Rosanne—No, but support it. Tom—So by not approving it, it's going to keep us from meeting deadlines. Val—Does it have to be listed or just understood. New system will handle the unfinished business. Karen—Anything left over will be taken care of by the new entity. We should have people in place by July 1. Karen/Val/Tom agree everything won't be done but it will be fine. Marian—Only way to get something done is to set a deadline. We will have a director and board in place. Rosanne—Just wants a clause added. Nina W—The state library gave us the July 1 date so we have to live with it. Arlene—Ann said we could go past but they are defending us. Karen—It will be done by July 1. JoAnn—There is no if. It will be done. Bev—Another document that committee will be working on is the application. Part of it is says how we are going to transfer the services. Rosanne—Board also had a problem with the Bylaws—number of meetings was put down to a minimum. Using the term "members" instead of "directors." Board is suggesting that Jan become the interim director because she is retiring and wouldn't have a stake in it. Membership Criteria is set too low. LTLS requires OCLC membership. School criteria is lower, also. There were no levels of membership mentioned. Strategic plan was good. Resource sharing—Would like it to include the 65% rule. Delivery—Doesn't seem like there was any type of change being made. Wants outsourcing looked at. Diane—thinks the new board will look into it. Val—What passed? Rosanne—Inter-governmental Agreement was not passed but endorsed.</p>
--	--

	<p>Jan—"Action item" is what was passed (what is indented) Val—Approved criteria? Jan—No. Val—But it is an action item. Jan—Just for comments and suggestions. Val—I still don't know which ones were approved. JoAnn—We are wasting time on discussing criteria since it is moot. Just go on to the next thing. Arlene—At the end of these 2 days, is this a directive that we have to agree with you (LTLS) on or we are stuck? Jan—They just want one little thing added. Don't want to stall the process. Harriett—If there were 4 systems and 3 approved and one didn't, is it approved? People think not. Jan—Thinks they could be convinced that the transition board doesn't need to go on past July 1. Harriett—We are getting bogged down by details that need to be left to the new board. Bev—LGM are going to be looking at the intergovernmental agreement and bylaws and discussing with Lawren so when we report back this afternoon, we will have a plan to move forward.</p> <p>RPLS REPORT (PP Doc 2.25/26.11E) Val--Approved new transition board, intergovernmental agreement, endorsed the bylaws, discussed membership criteria but no vote was taken. Strategic plan was approved. Delivery plan didn't seem like the final draft. Comments on delivery—Did a survey of members and received 100 responses. A lot of the changes proposed in delivery plan are already implemented by RP libraries. RP is closed on Mondays. Schools seemed to suffer the most—took longer to get materials. The issue can be addressed by preparing schools for the change and working out a plan. Comments about community delivery but mainly concerned the schools. Large volume was second place. Half said larger volume was fine, other half said they would have staff problems with more volume. They have the data from their survey.</p> <p>SHLS REPORT Karen—No paper report. Had a motion to accept the transition board and passed unanimously. Sentence change to intergovernmental agreement and approved unanimously. Looked at strategic plan and accepted it unanimously. Delivery always incites a lot of discussion. We can make changes to delivery but it will keep evolving. New board will have to deal with it, and we have accepted it. Membership had a lot of discussion on school criteria. We understand that everyone will be grandfathered in. The new board, with the help of state library will have the responsibility of setting membership criteria and we are not going</p>
--	--

	<p>to worry anymore about it.</p> <p>Jan—I understand not discussing it. But does it mean that each system would maintain their current criteria?</p> <p>Tom—Neal said that Anne said we should wait on criteria.</p> <p>Diane—Feb 17 Anne’s memo—“all existing membership should be grandfathered into the system”.</p> <p>Marian—Why not pass this document knowing it is going to be tweaked but we would all be the same until the change.</p> <p>Jan—Propose that we ask Greg to speak now and then take 10 minutes after lunch for system name discussion.</p>
Public comment	<p>Joan Rhodes--Glad she spent the night.</p> <p>Diane Yeoman—Everyone’s working very hard.</p>
Name of New Organization	<p>Moved to afternoon agenda.</p>
FY 2011 Funding FY 2012 Budget Projections	<p>Greg—Only make assumptions as of yesterday. FY11 can be summed up in two words—it’s complicated. Never been a time in state history where they have been running 3 fiscal years at once. This year and next year are years of restraint. Programs specific to State Library were flat funded. Did have new appropriation to public library construction but court has suspended it so all work is on hold. Library systems in FY11 15.3 million same as FY10. Of 15.3, still owe 10M for current fiscal year. In the next few months that all has to be processed. There is no lapse of payment in affect for this FY--Aug 31 is the current date. Owe this group 2.2 million for FY11. Even with historic tax increase, still 8 billion back log of bills. Still an issue of how soon payments can be made. Lively discussion on pension funding. Governor office put together a sheet of real reductions of 3.6 billion over 3 years. FY12 year of restraint. There will be many, many, many reviews of programs--an ongoing discussion that occurs in Springfield. Impact for FY12 for system area and per capita, budget presentation and house bill (2112) shows flat funding. Bit more difficult to read because things were lumped together. In a very preliminary stage of the process and before July 1, many decisions will be made. Plan on 3.4 million for 4 systems. Cash flow could be an issue in FY12 but hope that it is better addressed. There is another senate bill 1311 which addresses a change to the live and learn fund and will change how it is collected. Can’t go in the general revenue fund and in theory could help payments. Never lose site of LLSAPs, delivery, resource sharing, BPH and administrative costs. There will be a lot of tying up of personnel, real estates, etc. Discuss in the plan of service.</p> <p>Marian—2nd page grants 1515 to 87.? Greg—that was the lumping together of money. The reduction became the new base line.</p> <p>Greg—Libraries are getting per capita. If census is all filed and</p>

certified by grant time, the amounts may change. They always change. Had a high number of public libraries that didn't apply this year so everyone gets more. They get a pool of money to split between those who apply.

Jan—What is your estimation when we will see more money.

Greg—8 billion total...live and learn is what we are left to receive.

Jan—There will be a change in the census and will affect the southern systems more than north. And according to cash flow northern will have 5 million in the bank. All LLSAPs are on their own so what are they going to spend their money on? She has problems with this. Alice Calabrese thought that the formula needed to be changed. Jan has asked in the past that systems should never loose money if census changes. Don't know how you can in good conscience send money up there when they only do delivery. Look at the inequities between north and south. Hopes the conversations have happened at state library. A legislator is going to see the 5 million and wonder why they are giving them funds.

Greg—It has been discussed by state library advisory committee. End result has always been to leave the formula as is. Now we are at a time where that inequity is visible.

Jan—She is trying to educate the planning panel not lecturing. State library has changed, funded on per capita but have to operate by programs. Consulting--tell people to write to state library about it.

Marian—We are cutting delivery and now north has 5 million and we are cutting. Who do I need to talk to about this?

Greg—Where is the 5 mil coming from?

Bev—From their cash flow statement at last night's meeting.

Greg—This is why they are stating what they want systems to do.

Nina W—Does this include selling buildings? No.

Jan—They get 2 million for LLSAPs and don't have any. State library is punishing all of us because of 1 system.

Lawren—We have limited resources for support. Want to make sure that they will have enough for the basics. Can't divvy up any differently than what the law requires.

Greg—They would have to redraw lines to change. Not the process that anyone wanted to do last May. If other northern library boards didn't cover the one system in question, they could move that system but they are covering them.

Greg—Looking at it statewide, what was directed is what they know is affordable so that is where we start.

Jan—We need to think differently so maybe this is why the LT board did what they did. Thinks you have an opportunity now.

Marian—Thought they couldn't bank tax money.

Greg—Two types of grants but there has always been provisions that the board has authority to bank to plan for the future. Systems don't have other borrowing choices.

	<p>Jan—System XYZ she understands that we get the money after we show our plan of service. Would it have been in the authority of state library not to grant all the money to xyz because not giving all the service.</p> <p>Greg—It’s either all or nothing. We either agree with the plan or not.</p> <p>Jan- So if they need 1 million to do basic services and they get 3 million can’t you just give them 1 million?</p> <p>Greg—Law says have to give them 3 million.</p> <p>Break for lunch 12:35</p>
Lunch on Site	
Name of New Organization	<p>Meeting starts at 1:26 p.m.</p> <p>Ellen facilitated going through the list of names and eliminating what we do not want. Looked at pros and cons. Everyone was directed to take the list back to committees and come up with two choices to bring back to the panel.</p> <p>Heartland—overused Crossroads—overused Heart of Illinois White oak Four Rivers</p> <p>Jan—Lets do a quick brainstorm, non geographical, futuristic.</p> <p>Val—North system names choices are : Bridges, Cardinal, Pinnacle, 5 Star, Reach Across IL, Railsplitter, Zephyr</p> <p>Brainstorm in committee. We want a name today or tomorrow. Jan—Let me suggest library system doesn’t have to be at the end. System of ? Library.</p> <p>Bev—Supposed to be back here at 3:45 and now 1:45, so should we change the time? Be back here at 4:00.</p>
Public Comment	
Committee meetings	1:45-4:00
Name	<p>Val—New names: Illinois System of Information Service (ISIS) Illinois Library System of Information Services Noesis Library System (means knowledge) people will ask what it is. Trigger curiosity. Four C’s Library System—cooperation community collaboration communication Tom-Illinois Heartland Library System</p>

	Harriet—Illinois Library and Information Systems
	REPORTS FROM SUBCOMMITTEES
Planning	<p>Resource sharing and strategic planning committees are working together.</p> <p>Val—worked through part of the requirements, working to fit in resource and delivery into the strategic plan. Long list of resource sharing objectives and tasks. Then they will be able to put budget together.</p> <p>Jan—looked at it differently--what is it that we would like it to be. Talked about 24/7 support. What patrons expect.</p> <p>Alan—Some are talking about futuristic service and others about just getting vans down the road!</p>
Delivery	<p>Marian had been fielding a lot of questions on the numbers and the committee decided to go with Rolling Prairie’s numbers. She has had people who thought they had to have bags or tubs for every library in the 4 systems. The committee has changed the numbers and made better explanations. We looked at the plan of service and took the items we wanted to see implemented and tried to translate into the plan of service.</p> <p>Alan—need language jived between all documents.</p>
Legal, Governance & Membership	<p>Bev reported that the committee got through 5 things on their agenda and will call for voting tomorrow.</p> <p>Tom reported:</p> <p><u>Membership Criteria</u></p> <p>The committee discussed membership criteria with Greg and Lawren. We have two choices—grandfather everyone in and then adopt our draft recommendations or grandfather everyone in and adopt the Illinois code of minimal standards. Either way, the committee would like to send the draft to the northern libraries.</p> <p><u>Intergovernmental Agreement</u></p> <p>The document will be null and void after June 30 so the option to add flexibility is not applicable. Bev explained that when agencies are going to continue, flexibility is important but our agencies are not so flexibility is not appropriate in our document.</p> <p>Nina P still has the concern that if everything isn’t done, what happens.</p> <p>Jan—Isn’t it just because that is how this agreement is written? Our disillusion has special wording in it. They were told it was ok. LTLS’s is different and that is the difference here.</p> <p>Tom doesn’t remember that their resolution was different.</p> <p>Rosanne we would have to have a special meeting.</p> <p>Gregg—July 1 timeframe goes back months ago. Key is making the June 2 application deadline, working towards a July 1 date.</p> <p>Assumes they will only get 1 system application from us. After June 30, there will not be four separate systems. There is no extension.</p>

	<p>Lawren—You can amend your documentation to include only 3 systems. You can submit 5 plans of service but we might not approve them.</p> <p><u>BYLAWS</u></p> <p>Diane went over the changes made to the Bylaws. Will ask for approval tomorrow. Bev also went through Lawren’s changes. He was trying to protect us by putting in 9 instead of 10.</p> <p>Nina P—Did you discuss section 2 about the levels. Bev—look at page 3 and it refers to membership criteria so if put in specifics, would have to change in more spots. This document doesn’t have to go back to boards. Wants cross-outs to stay in.</p> <p><u>TRANSITION BOARD</u></p> <p>Rosanne explained that we have three Special potential board members and only need one. Lincoln Trail already has four members so it comes down to LCLC and RPLC. Committee suggests that we draw for the name. One system will only have 3 members on the board. Panel decided to draw.</p> <p><u>MERGER APPLICATION</u></p> <p>Nina W. reported that the list of liabilities and assets are the responsibility of fiscal agents and will be based on Feb 28th. Need them by March 21. Greg and Lawren approved this timeline. All assets as listed will be transferred to the new system as well as all liabilities. LLSAP funds will remain separate until the time LLSAPs are on the same platform. Another document is the plan for transition of services. Illinois state library will help on retention/disposal of official records. Unofficial records will be dealt with later.</p> <p>Jan—We assume we are writing personnel into the annual plan. Bev—Our document needs more dates and the numbers. Application for merger isn’t going to be a perfect document and not everyone will like it but it will have to be adopted at March board meetings.</p> <p>Jan—I think it is time that we make all our individual board meetings available on videoconference. Shawnee doesn’t meet at a videoconference location but could videotape.</p> <p>Val—Had asked for plans of service from each group and hasn’t received them. Jan has them.</p>
<p>Public Comment on Committee reports</p>	<p>Joan Rhodes—Thanked Tom for his comments on not rehashing. In committee was controversial. Does anyone know how to give injections? Greg can.</p> <p>Diane Yeoman—We appreciate that you are moving forward.</p> <p>5:10 adjourn.</p> <p>Donna—We can leave posters in here but take all personal stuff. We are to eat breakfast in this room tomorrow. Need to be out by 11:30 tomorrow.</p>

Committee meetings	
--------------------	--

February 26, 2011—Day Two Breakfast at Hotel Begin at 8:00 am with Committees	
Committee meetings	
BREAK	
Delivery	<p>Likes: Illinois Heartland Library System Handout has new content in italics. Want systems to implement these in March or April.</p> <p>The document has lower numbers of items required for delivery. Most communities could get very frequent deliveries. Committee feels that delivery drivers need to wear something that identifies them.</p> <p>It is a necessity to get logos on all vans to get some kind of familiarity.</p> <p>Ellen questioned that under stats, all delivery departments will keep statistics.</p> <p>Marian explained that the numbers used are estimates and need to keep stats to have better numbers for future planning. System staffs need to count how many tubs, bags and partials. Pat reported how Lincoln Trail drivers operate. Each route is assigned a DANA (handheld device) that collects data that they download at the end of each week. Drivers record mileage between each stop and the number of bags delivered. Routes are preset in the device. Marian wants to get something conducive to drivers...not too small.</p> <p>Alan suggested that there needs to be someone that looks over all delivery issues for whom ever is working on staffing.</p> <p>The committee wants this document approved by the planning panel and to system boards for endorsement and implementation of the content. The boards do not have to approve.</p>
Resource Sharing	<p>Nina P—Got an update from the LLSAP working group that they have received several quotes for software. They have also sent an email of interest in a grant opportunity to Anne.</p> <p>The committee met with the strategic planning committee and went over objectives. They also reviewed the resource sharing policy and there are changes state library would like. Ellen is making changes and will be up on Basecamp Monday for you to share with your membership. Looking for comments from members and boards. No board action is required. It will also</p>

	<p>be posted to Cooperation Today for member comments. Marian asked about Overdrive. Ellen explained that the language is very broad and they are talking about it in the strategic plan committee.</p> <p>Pat said that Overdrive is looking at every contract this year.</p>
<p>Strategic Planning Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Jan addressed Greg and Lawren. From our survey licensed resources are a high priority for members, but Jan doesn't see it in State Library priorities. Could we have a person that handles license resources in the new system? Lawren asked for a description of the job.</p> <p>Explained that we share electronic books etc. and it is very staff intensive to get better pricing. You have to see how many libraries are interested and then go back to negotiate pricing. Lewis and Clark has Gale for 60 libraries but would like to get it for more.</p> <p>Jan—We don't see that it falls into the priorities of state library.</p> <p>Alan—Carli group has someone to review legalities.</p> <p>Greg—Collective purchasing can be listed but it has to be part of resource sharing or delivery. They have discussed collective purchasing and what is being purchased. If tied to the LLSAP (resources) is ok.</p> <p>Lawren—This is not to say it couldn't be but, not now due to the financial situation.</p> <p>Karen—Move on.</p> <p>Val reported that they are adding literacy on the front page to the list of values. Ask that we take back to our boards.</p> <p>Monitor trends—Wanted e-resource added but committee decided not to change.</p> <p>Wants to have a conference call of two committees—resource and strategic to work on activities and tasks.</p> <p>They met with delivery and going to work together on more specifics regarding the budget to include in the plan of service.</p> <p>Next step is to get deeper into the plan of service and look at fee structures?</p>
<p>Legal, Governance & Membership</p>	<p>Tom reported for LGM.</p> <p>The simple membership criteria was added using the language in the law. You have the option of this one or the one presented earlier, knowing either one will be changed in the future. The committee would like approval to send the original document to the northern libraries.</p> <p>Jan asked if the committee has discussed not adding any new members.</p>

	<p>Bylaw changes are in red. Need to remove “Librarians” from the last sentence in that section. Also remove the last sentence on the first page.</p> <p>Intergovernmental Agreement (IA) —After discussion with Greg and Lawren, decided that the amendment clause should cover. If things are not done in time, the IA can be amended and 4 systems can submit a plan of service for 30 days. We are writing up the details and emailing to Lincoln Trail. We are asking them to have a special board meeting to approve this document.</p> <p>Jan—They also were concerned about a cancellation clause.</p> <p>Transition board—Mary Ann Pohl from RPLS was drawn as the special representative on the interim board. Committee recommends that meetings be held evenings and Saturdays. The first meeting should be face to face and others may be by electronic means.</p> <p>Alan asked if transition board members can run for the real board? Yes they can.</p> <p>Committee would like to recommend that we allow the fiscal people to gather information so we can seek bids for health insurance. Bids will be for all current staff for comparison. We want to be fair to staffs at all systems.</p> <p>Juliette—As we do that analysis, is it a possibility that we can offer two different plans? Yes.</p> <p>Marian—What about other insurance?</p> <p>Bev—Will look at those in the future but health insurance is the most critical now.</p> <p>Merger application: The committee would like to adopt this document as is, giving authority to directors to hash it out as needed. Has to be approved by the boards. If you want a more final document before approval, then we will have to have another panel meeting before the next board meetings.</p> <p>Jan asked that Bev send each committee parts that relate to them.</p> <p>Bev reported that the north is at the same point we are.</p>
Name of New Organization	<p>Heartland Library System Illinois Heartland Library System ILSI Muse LS</p> <p>Committee wants Illinois Heartland Library System Greg checked and the name has not been incorporated.</p>

Public Comment on Committee reports	Joan Rhoades—Hooray you have a name!
Delivery	<p>An email will be sent to panel members with exact board actions needed.</p> <p>Motion made requesting panel approve the Delivery Plan PP2.25/26.11 R to be sent to system boards for endorsement and implementation.</p> <p>Diane moved and Tom seconded the motion. Roll call vote: all ayes.</p>
Resource Sharing	<p>Motion for panel to forward the Resource Sharing Plan PP 2.25/26.11 O(a) to system boards and membership for review and comments.</p> <p>Marian motioned and Diane seconded the motion. All ayes. No roll call vote needed.</p>
Strategic Planning Strategic Plan	<p>Recommend that the three system boards (LTLS, RPLC, SHLS) that have already endorsed the Strategic Plan, endorse the addition of Literacy as a value and that LCLS board endorse the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Val motioned and Arlene seconded the motion. Roll call vote: all ayes.</p>
Legal, Governance & Membership	<p>Motion made that the Planning Panel recommend to the Transition Board that all current system members be grandfathered into the new system and adopt the simple criteria PP2.25/26.11 Q with the understanding that these are interim until new criteria is established.</p> <p>Diane motioned and Karen seconded the motion. Roll call—14 ayes, 1 no Nina Pals.</p> <p>Moved for Planning Panel to forward the Membership Criteria PP2.10.11 F to the Transition Board and the northern libraries for comments.</p> <p>Val motioned and Karen seconded the motion. All ayes. No roll call needed.</p> <p>Recommend to system boards there be a moratorium on new members.</p> <p>Allen motioned, Nina W seconded the motion. All ayes. No roll call needed.</p> <p>Moved to adopt Bylaws PP2.25/26/11 K & Ka and submit them to the Transition Board for ratification.</p> <p>Marian motioned and Rosanne seconded the motion. Roll call: all ayes.</p> <p>The planning panel encouraged Lincoln Trail board to adopt the</p>

	<p>intergovernmental agreement as soon as possible.</p> <p>Moved to ratify the Transition Board LGM 2.25./26.11 Ba with Betsy Mahoney’s name eliminated and Mary Ann Pohl as special library. If a member cannot serve, that system will submit a replacement.</p> <p>Tom motioned and Rosanne seconded the motion. Roll call: all ayes.</p> <p>Moved to meet March 11 via video conference at 3:30 in order to review the system application.</p> <p>Arlene motioned and Diane seconded the motion.</p> <p>All ayes. No roll call needed.</p> <p>Panel agrees to let fiscal officers collect health insurance information.</p> <p>Moved to accept Illinois Heartland Library System as the new system name.</p> <p>Marion motioned and Karen seconded the motion. All ayes. No roll call needed.</p>
Meeting Dates	<p>March 11 via video conference, 3:30 p.m. March 23 at Hilton in Effingham 10-4 April 8—need location, can’t at Hilton</p>
Meeting and Facilitation Review	<p><u>Plus</u> Space was good. Thank Donna Got docs for approval, worked through issues and have a name Gregg and Lawren very helpful Understand each others frustrations and still friends</p> <p><u>Delta</u> Yesterday too long. Need a time keeper Got off task</p> <p>Diane motioned to adjourn and Nina W. seconded the motion. Meeting adjourn at 11:52 a.m.</p>