



**SHOREWOOD LIBRARY BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**  
April 10, 2013

Members Present: Catherine Hansen, Jean Gurney, Patrick Linnane, India McCanse,  
Mariann Maris, Stephanie Snyder  
Others Present: Sue Kelley, Elizabeth Carey - Library Director, Joe Rice – Assistant  
Director, Angela Andre – Administrative Assistant

The meeting of the Shorewood Library Board of Trustees was called to order by President Hansen at 4:00 p.m. in the Friends' Room of the Shorewood Library.

Statement of Public Notice: Ms. Andre stated that the meeting had been posted and noticed according to law. President Hansen asked that the agenda be reordered so that Ms. Kelley may be introduced and speak first. There were no objections.

Sue Kelley

Taking action on a motion from the March meeting, President Hansen contacted Sue Kelley, a local consultant, about possibly employing her services. Ms. Kelley introduced herself as twenty-three year resident of Shorewood who has been working as an independent consultant for twenty years. She works with older adults in the community through the Shorewood Connects program and has done work for other Village entities as well. Ms. Kelley stated that people call her when they 'need a plan'.

Based on the conversation she had with President Hansen and her review of the Trustees' conversation as recorded in the March minutes, Ms. Kelley summarized her understanding of the Board's request. She distributed a document which outlined reasons why the Board may want to gather consumer input, questions they might ask, and methods to use. Addressing the trustees' question of when a mission statement should be developed, Ms. Kelley advised that because the library is part of an ever-changing environment, the process should start with community feedback.

She talked about the role of gathering feedback in a strategic planning process and why an entity may or may not want to go through the process. She then highlighted the importance of identifying primary stakeholders.

Ms. Gurney arrived at the meeting.

According to Ms. Hansen, Ms. Kelley's overview seemed to be in line with what the trustees had discussed at their last meeting.

Ms. McCanse also agreed with Ms. Kelley's suggestions and added that queries should be open to non-library-users as well. She wondered if the stakeholders should be offered some examples of innovations or services that are being introduced at other libraries. Her thinking was that posing such 'trigger questions' might prompt suggestions for new services that community members would like to see at the Shorewood Library. Ms. Kelley concurred, stating that in focus groups or other settings it may be a good idea to use trigger questions and inform stakeholders of relevant studies. Ms. Hansen noted a Pew Research study and agreed that the Board and staff would need to come up with a means for non-users to have a say. Ms.

Snyder wanted to make sure that any survey would not be too long. She noted that people tend to tune out when the survey they are taking is lengthy and therefore answers become skewed. Ms. Kelley asserts that there will not be many questions and noted that a survey would not be the only format used.

Ms. McCause thinks it will be helpful to ask the public what a library is to them and what it represents in the community - some kind of query that will get them thinking outside of the box. Noting that all tax payers are stakeholders, Mr. Linnane suggested asking how much the library is valued.

Ms. Kelley added that another part of the process is internal analysis through staff input. Assistant Director, Joe Rice, agreed that the process could provide some focus and development of a plan that may serve to outline the mission statement. Ms. McCause agreed that there is great benefit in simply asking the questions. Ms. Kelley concurred that the process itself is worth something – it offers valuable information to the trustees and staff, serves as an outreach to the community, and acknowledges the community stakeholders in the library.

Ms. Hansen asked what the next step should be once the Board members discuss possibly hiring Ms. Kelley. Ms. Kelley suggested that the trustees may want to form a subcommittee to address this first phase of decisions which include determining purpose, solidifying what they want to accomplish, and deciding on what the final product will be. Based on those decisions, the next step would be to identify tasks that need to be done and determine costs. Mr. Linnane offered that in order to determine who the stakeholders are, they may need to get prices on two or three different levels of engaging Ms. Kelley's services and then decide from there based on the available resources for funding. Ms. Gurney asked how much time Ms. Kelley had planned to invest in her presentation of a proposal to which Ms. Kelley answered that she had allowed for one or two meetings.

Ms. McCause put forward a motion to appoint a sub-committee of the Library Board whose members would meet with Sue to make recommendations on the scope of the project. They will bring those decisions back to the full Board for discussion. Mr. Linnane seconded the motion.

Ms. Maris arrived at the meeting.

After a vote on the motion resulting in two abstaining and four in favor, the motion passed. The trustees will move forward by appointing a subcommittee whose members will meet before the May full Board meeting. Ms. Kelley will also attend the meeting in May. Ms. McCause volunteered to be on the committee, as did Mr. Linnane and Ms. Maris. Director Carey was also asked to participate. They will coordinate schedules and meet with Ms. Kelley.

Consent Agenda: A motion to approve the entire consent agenda was made by Mr. Linnane, seconded by Ms. McCause, and passed unanimously after a vote. President Hansen thanked director Carey for including a report of staff continuing education experiences as well as a budget report.

### Broadband

A motion was made by Ms. Gurney and seconded by Ms. Maris to allow staff to proceed according to Director Carey's recommendation and increase bandwidth for a for \$3,400 one-time fee to be paid from Fund Balance. The motion passed after a unanimous vote.

### Fine and Fee Payment Plan

Ms. Hansen stated that it is her understanding that two patrons have recently requested forgiveness for the substantial amount of fines they had accrued for late, overdue, or missing items. Director Carey elaborated that one of the individuals left items behind when travelling and has incurred replacement charges, the other individual is being charged for one lost item (\$21.99) in addition to \$43.95 in fines for overdue items (these items were eventually returned).

Ms. Carey has surveyed other libraries to find out how they have handled similar situations. She found that some have established payment plans for the patrons although the patrons often do not follow through and make payments. Some libraries allowed patrons to continue to use their card during this period. Assistant Director Rice was asked about his experience and he stated that when he was a Library Director, he did not allow patrons in similar circumstances to use their cards until the fine was paid off, but he did offer them the option of setting up a payment plan. He also noted that the patrons did not follow through on payments.

Ms. McCanse highlighted the fact that when patrons get a library card, they are not only receiving a free taxpayer funded service, but they sign a contract confirming that they are responsible for returning the items that they check out in a timely manner. Mr. Rice added that the library also offers a grace period for return of items, various forms of reminders, and there are also several different payment options available. Ms. McCanse asked how frequently they received similar requests for fine forgiveness and Ms. Carey answered that this is the only time she has received a request for waive of fines. She added that these particular cases involve financial hardship.

Director Carey recommends that staff offer the patrons a payment plan structure but also keep their cards blocked from use until the fines are fully paid. Ms. Maris inquired as to how much staff involvement would be required with that plan and Mr. Rice answered that additional work would be minimal.

The trustees voted to approve action based on Director Carey's recommendation. This passed unanimously.

### Employee Compensation Plan

To give some background, Director Carey explained that this system of automatic pay rate increases has been in place since before she was hired. In this process, the eligible employee is given an increase in their hourly pay rate after their six month probationary period and then every year on the anniversary of that probation end date, they are granted another hourly pay rate raise. In examining the amounts of increases given in the past, Director Carey could not determine how these amounts were calculated – they appeared random. She also noted that there is not an established pay range for these employees. Up to now, at the time of hire, eligible employees were informed of and expected the step-increase structure. Also, on the first of January each year, employees are granted an across the board percentage increase which would put each person at a percentage above whatever step they were currently on.

Ms. Gurney asked if the steps were arbitrary amounts and if they were charted. Mr. Linnane thought that the steps were already established – a base increase plus the across the board yearly increase. Ms. McCanse asked if the pay raise was based on current market wages and Ms. Carey answered that staff has not recently evaluated the market rates to which Ms. McCanse stated that it would benefit staff to do so. Mr. Linnane asked if the job descriptions for the employees involved in this discussion are comparable from library to library to which Ms. Carey answered in the affirmative. Ms. Hansen stated that the Board would like to see a pay range comparison with other libraries to evaluate whether they need to establish new ranges for Shorewood Library staff.

Ms. Gurney put forward a motion that those eligible employees who were hired before January 1, 2013 with the understanding that the step system is in place, maintain the current compensation system until the end of the year 2013. Ms. Maris seconded this motion.

The trustees discussed.

Mr. Linnane observed that there are two practices running parallel in the current system and he expressed that he was not comfortable with that process. He asked when the step system would actually end if they went along with the above motion. Director Carey answered that it would end in five years. Ms. McCanse noted that according to her calculations, past increases have been almost 1% (.98% to be exact). Mr. Linnane said his main concern is there they establish a fair single system. Ms. McCanse reiterated that without a current market evaluation, they cannot discuss specific amounts. She recommends carrying out such an evaluation and then going forward with a performance based system of increases with performance measured by the Director.

Ms. Maris contended that people were hired with the assumption of the step increase system and maintaining that process is a matter of ethics and promises made. In her assessment, the main concern is attracting and keeping good people and determining what would be the best way to do that – whether it is the step system or not. Mr. Linnane is not convinced that a promise was made. He noted the changes that are occurring in labor agreements from year to year. Some agreements were in place but he wonders if this particular increase system was part of the negotiated contract. Director Carey added that even with the union contract in place, everything was negotiable and anything could have changed from one year to another. She answered in the affirmative when Ms. Hansen asked if the step system was part of the union contract.

Ms. Maris attested that pay based on performance can be a divisive issue and she questioned who would determine the evaluation. She believes that Shorewood Library staff meets the needs of the community in the spirit of good will and she is of the opinion that this is what makes the library tick. Ms. Maris would like to see if and how other libraries have used pay for performance and still kept good will in tact. Mr. Linnane thought it would be interesting to examine the dynamics and risks of both step and performance based systems. Ms. McCanse stated that performance-based pay increases empowers the staff and added that the Board could trust the Director to make decisions with standards in place for clear performance evaluations. Ms. Maris' again expressed concern that such a system would divide the staff. Director Carey noted that she has read studies of the pros and cons of each system. Mr. Linnane stated that the Board should commit to a decision going into the 2014 budget.

The trustees voted on the motion *that those eligible employees who were hired before January 1, 2013 with the understanding that the step system is in place, maintain the current compensation system until the end of the year 2013* and it passed unanimously.

This issue will be on the agenda for discussion in May. In the meantime, a pay range comparison with other libraries as discussed will be supplied to the trustees in advance of the next meeting. Director Carey will keep the comparisons as local as possible.

#### Director's Goals 2013

A charted outline of Director Carey's goals was distributed at the March meeting. It was revised and sent to Ms. Gurney. Director Carey and Ms. Gurney will meet to discuss it before the next meeting.

#### Regular Library Board Meeting Day/Time

With the news that Ms. Snyder will be stepping down from the Board, and since the original meeting time was changed from 4:30 to 4:00 to accommodate her schedule, Ms. Hansen asked that the trustees reexamine the time and day of meetings so that it works best for everyone. Ms. McCanse asked that the meeting time be 5:00 starting in June. The trustees agreed that the May 8 meeting would start at 4:00 and then, starting in June, their meetings will begin at 5:00p.m.

#### Officers Discussion/Annual Meeting

As Ms. Hansen reminded the trustees, June is the month in which the Board holds its annual meeting and elects officers – the President and the Secretary. She announced that her term for serving on the Board expires in June and asked for volunteers for a nominating committee. It was so far determined that Ms. McCanse and Ms. Hansen will be part of that committee. Ms. Hansen will reach out to Mr. Lexmond and Ms. Snyder to be a part of the committee as well.

#### Friends of the Shorewood Library Liaison Report

Director Carey reported that the Friends are supportive of the Early Literacy Center Project. She also mentioned the great success of the Jerry Aps (local author) visit which was held by the Friends in conjunction with the Shorewood Historical Society. Lastly, Sue Ewens has decided to step down as President of the Friends but will remain on the Board. Priscilla Tolan will take on the role of President.

#### Trustee Essential Handbook – Chapter 10 – *Developing Essential Policies*

On the topic of Policy development, President Hansen explained that in the past, Beth would bring any policies that needed updating to the Board's attention and the trustees would discuss and vote to establish new or changed policies.

When Ms. McCanse asked that the policy manual be made available to the trustees, Director Carey mentioned that the Board had previously discussed using a Google doc site for such postings. Instead of a Google site, Ms. Hansen would like the policies accessible through the Library's website. Director Carey agreed to do so but will post policies only, not procedures, for security reasons. Ms. Hansen directed the Trustees to bring any policy that they do not agree with to the full Board for discussion.

#### Website Design

In a memo to the trustees, Director Carey reported on the progress being made in the revamping of the Library's website. Although staff continues to research options, the first estimate for hiring a web developer is between \$10,000 and \$15,000.

Mr. Linnane mentioned that the Village is also planning a website redesign and wondered if there may be some economy of scale when looking at web developers. Director Carey has some knowledge of the plans for the Village web site and feels that the Library wants to go in a different direction with their design. Ms. McCause attests that the library needs a robust site. Ms. Carey and the library staff have come up with a list of technological requirements. For example, in-house administrative control will be essential as well as coordination with other software feeds.

Ms. Hansen asserted that the \$10,000 to \$15,000 price range seems exorbitantly high from her perspective and from her discussions with other individuals within SOIS (the UWM School of Information Studies), they agree. Her reasoning is that they would not be hiring the web developers for anything as complex as catalog redesign or creation of databases but rather they would be asked to provide links and work on the appearance of the site. Ms. McCause argued that the point of the upgrade is to make the website more than it is right now, more interactive. Ms. Hansen requested that staff talk to other developers and request more bids on the project and while Ms. Carey stated that she is in the process of doing so, she also does not want to create a full RFP. Mr. Linnane noted that the exact specifications are still unknown and Director Carey agreed that as part of her research, she is looking to the developers to offer suggestions and contribute ideas. Therefore, as Mr. Linnane concluded, Shorewood Library could do a request for qualifications instead of an RFP.

Director Carey explained that staff does not want to base the project off of the existing site but rather create completely new functions. This means not simply providing links but integrating software and streams – pulling everything together for a website that will be well designed and work seamlessly. Exploring other options in web development has always been part of the plan. Ms. McCause added that as far as web site development goes, Board members and staff may not even know what is needed or possible yet. Ms. Carey commented that one of the web development companies that she has talked to has worked with a lot of non-profit organizations and gives them a significant discount. Mr. Linnane agreed that it is still a good idea to talk with other site developers and continue to explore options. He asked what the timeline or calendar goal is for this project and Director Carey stated that she would like to have the new website up by this September.

#### Other Informational Items

- Next Wednesday, during National Library Week, Shorewood Library staff will compete against the Whitefish Bay Library staff in pub trivia at the Shorewood Pub. It starts at 7:00p.m.

#### Action Items for Future Consideration

- Employee Compensation (Step System)
- Discussion with Sue Kelley and results of subcommittee meeting

Adjournment: Ms. McCause motioned; Mr. Linnane seconded, and the Board unanimously agreed to adjourn at 6:00 p.m.

Recorded by Angela Andre, Administrative Assistant and submitted by Beth Carey, Director of Library Services.

