



---

# A Summary Report of Key Findings and Recommendations from the Technology Governance Conference

May 15, 2009

This Technology Governance Conference Report was prepared by:



Linda and Jeffrey Russell, Co-Directors  
*tel* (608) 274-4482 • *fax* (608) 274-1927  
*email*: [RCI@RussellConsultingInc.com](mailto:RCI@RussellConsultingInc.com)

[www.RussellConsultingInc.com](http://www.RussellConsultingInc.com)

1134 Winston Drive • Madison, WI 53711-3161

# Table of Contents

---

<i>Background and Process</i> -----	1
<i>Final Summary Findings and Conclusions</i> -----	2
<i>SCLS Governance Principles and Scenario Results</i> -----	7
<i>Model Scenario Pass/Fail Results</i> -----	8
<i>Summary Assessment Documents</i> -----	10
<i>Parking Lot Issues</i> -----	19
<i>Appendices</i> -----	20



## Background and Process

---

On May 15, 2009, the South Central Library System (SCLS) hosted a Technology Governance Conference to involve member libraries in assessing the utility and effectiveness of five potential governance models. These models (*Appendix A*) were:

- Model 1 – The Status Quo Model
- Model 2 – Revise LINK
- Model 3 – Cooperative Technology Decision Making
- Model 4 – ILS Managed as a System Service
- Model 5 – Independent LINK Consortium

### Who Participated

Fifty-three representatives signed up to participate in the conference, with 51 actually attending on the 15<sup>th</sup>. Participants were assigned to one of seven table groups that were to focus on exploring specific aspects of three of the five models. Each table group was structured such that there was good representation in the group regarding library size, experience with LINK, and other related factors. *Appendix B* lists all of the participants and the work groups that they were assigned to throughout the day.

Each table group was led by a facilitator, trained by Russell Consulting, Inc. (RCI), to lead the group through the structured activities, assessments, forms, and questions. The facilitators were members of the SCLS Technology Governance Task Force – the group overseeing the development of an effective technology governance structure for SCLS.

Each table group was also assigned an SCLS staff member to be the official scribe and recorder of key assessments, findings, and recommendations for the group.

The entire process was facilitated by Linda and Jeff Russell of RCI. The agenda for the conference is attached as *Appendix C*.

### The Assessment and Conference Process

Within the facilitated process, each group was assigned three of the five models to review. Each group was asked to assess how effectively their assigned model was at meeting a set of ten core **principles for technology governance** (*Appendix D*). Each group was also asked to indicate if their assigned models passed or failed six **key scenarios** or tests (*Appendix E*) that any governance model would be expected to satisfy.

After each group completed the principles matrix and the pass/fail scenarios tests for each model, they were then asked to complete an overall final assessment of each model.

Following the model assessment activity, RCI led the groups in reporting out their findings. After the model assessment findings were shared with the large group, the small groups reconvened again to offer their final assessment and recommendations.

# Final Summary Findings and Conclusions

---

The final findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the seven table workgroups are included here.

The facilitators asked the seven groups to reflect upon the discussions of the five models that were explored throughout the day and to answer the following questions:

- What conclusions can your group draw from the model assessment process?*
- Is it possible to eliminate one or more models from future consideration?*
- Do one or two models emerge as “front runners” for a governance process for technology decision making?*
- What issues or questions need to be addressed or resolved in order to enable convergence on a specific governance model?*

## Group 1

### *What conclusions can you draw?*

- 4, 3 and 2 are still viable. 2 is less work but there would still be a decision on what to change.

### *Can you eliminate any models from future consideration?*

- Number 5—don't want to put work to start over from scratch into it.
- Number 1 because it's not really working. We wouldn't be here if there weren't problems.

### *Do one or two models emerge as “front runners” for a governance process for technology decision making?*

- 2, 3 or 4. 2.5 maybe?

### *What issues or questions need to be resolved in order to enable convergence on a specific governance model?*

- Could the ILS be 2 and the internet access be 4? Basically split LINK and make LINK just the ILS again and move the rest of tech to SCLS.
- Could we have model 2 with more penalties for holding up process, more enforcement of policies? (5)
- People go to DC meeting but hold back. More gets done in committees (3)
- How to make sure everyone's voice is heard.
- Can we split basic vs. advanced services? What happens if a basic service becomes an advanced like some of the databases did? Get tiers kind of like the cable company?

## Group 2

### *Conclusions and Recommendations*

- Think we should scratch #1 and #5
- Would like to keep 2, 3, and 4. Incorporate some of the suggested changes. Then evaluate again.
- Think we really do need a group to make system-wide technology decisions.
- Issue of representation came up in every group's discussion of the various models. Representation is in models 2, 3, and 4. This is something that needs to be addressed.
- Might be good to have the best parts of 3 and 4.
- Participation by payment for project, combining SCLS + LINK staff... both are very positive.
- Representation might work better if the libraries knew that someone was representing them specifically. 7 is too low. 52 is too high. The ground in between is really large.
- Seems like model 2 isn't enough – we've already done a few things in this direction. Doesn't seem enough.
- #2 is not on the top of the list, but we wouldn't rule it out. If we could really address the problems, it might be okay.
- If we end up with 3 or 4, we eliminate LINK. That's a pretty big change so there would be a bit of a learning curve which might impact our progress ("whole hog"). #2 would be less of a change but might still bring some progress ("half hog").

### *What would need to be addressed/answered to make a decision?*

- Representation issues
- Structure/by-laws for 3 and 4
- Communication between committees/groups in 3
- Do we really want to keep LINK and SCLS separate?

## Group 3

Models 1 and 5 eliminated. People are ready for a change. Some members of the group were surprised with the overall negativity towards the current model.

Model 2 doesn't involve much change, but wasn't eliminated from consideration. Same group making final decisions for the ILS.

Combination of Models 3 and 4 preferred. Instead of every director representing the governing body, it is a smaller group. There is a concern how this governing body will be formed, its size, and if it will represent every library's needs. In Model 4, library technology would still be part of a larger system.

No matter what model is chosen, we need to still realize there will be problems along the way.

## Group 4

*What conclusion can your group draw from the model assessment process?*

- A change is necessary. None of the models will, in and of itself, fix the problems. Model selection should maintain or increase resource sharing.

*Is it possible to eliminate one or more models from future consideration?*

- Eliminate models one and five.

*Do one or two models emerge as “front runners” for a governance process for technology decision making?*

- Between model one and two, two is a slight improvement over one. Keep model two as one possible model. We really want a 2.5 or 3.5 because neither model 2 or 3 go far enough and 4 goes too far in splitting up.

*What issues or questions need to be addressed or resolved in order to enable convergence on a specific governance model?*

- Roller coaster on cost can implode when one library pulls out and rest of libraries have to increase pay to compensate. Is there some way to mitigate the impact on support and cost for projects that have limited participation?
- Core level of service provides a consistent amount to budget for each year, allowing libraries to choose services and projects over the core level when they can actually pay for it.

## Group 5

We would eliminate Models 1 and 5 and possibly 2.

Model Three

- More formal representation from people on the front line.

Model Four

- All the technology services are under one roof.
- Need a more formal agreement and formal bylaws.
- If four were more like three, we would like it better.

Take the pluses of Model 3 and pluses of Model 4 and it would be perfect—a 3 1/2 or 6.



## Group 6

### *Conclusions about the model assessment process*

- Could start with model 2 and end up with something like 3 or 4. We want model “3.5” halfway between 3 and 4. Pieces that we like from all of them. No single model meets all the needs.
- 4 is too dictatorial. No bylaws, formal agreement, or budget input. Troubling!

### *Is it possible to eliminate models from future consideration?*

- We’re dropping 1 and 5 from consideration.

### *Front-runner models*

- We are most familiar with 3 and 4 and scored them the best.

### *Issues/Questions to address/resolve to enable convergence on a governance model*

- Taxpayer money can’t be handed over to SCLS Board.
- Model 4 why would/should the SCLS director have a vote?
- Model 3 blend SCLS Tech and LINK Exec Committees so you have a larger group, and keep the other committees.
- Budget transparency in any model. Clearer process and more detailed information about how funds are used.

## Group 7

### *What conclusions can be drawn?*

- There are problems with the current model.
- Surprise that model one did not get slaughtered.
- Status quo is not as low as we thought, but retooling slightly does not seem as appealing as something new like model 3 or 4.

### *Is it possible to eliminate one or more models from future consideration?*

- Yes, number 5 (clearly), and also model 1 just because there is consensus that things could be improved.

### *Do one or two models emerge as front runners?*

- Model 4 (for this table), but it needs some revisions. Model 3 also has potential.

### *What issues or questions need to be addressed to enable convergence?*

- More specifics about how things would play out (but not so many specifics that it overwhelms or predefines).
- Smaller decision making bodies would need mechanisms to ensure that their members are indeed representative.

- Does opt-in/opt-out allow for some libraries to choose to sponsor Koha development and some not, while still being ILS users? Or is a “project” all-in-or-nothing.
- Can any of the viable models be hybridized to create an even better model?
- If we leave model one, what happens if some members leave the consortium in that process?

***General Notes (hand written):***

- Not one shining example in the models
- This process was necessary
- Status quo wasn't appealing but Model 2 wasn't sufficient - need new model
- Eliminate Models 1 and 5
- Models 3 and 4 would be our front runners
- Representation would need to be well defined and made effective
- Models need more flesh, information - will they address the problems in the current structure
- Koha impact on status quo - what if some libraries want to pay for some
- If model is changed, what happens if some libraries want to leave

# SCLS Governance Principles and Scenario Results

## SCLS Technology Governance Model Assessment Matrix

Governance Principles	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5*
Principle 1	42.5	15.7	23.5	26.50	5.8
Principle 2	31.75	16.3	20	29.50	7.2
Principle 3	33.2	16.3	27.5	30.50	8.7
Principle 4	33.6	18.7	21	25.00	8.8
Principle 5	39.5	17.5	28.5	33.00	1.7
Principle 6	35.5	18.2	21	24.50	6.2
Principle 7	40.75	19.8	22	18.50	7.3
Principle 8	27.2	17.8	30	30.00	0.3
Principle 9	44.3	20.3	27.5	27.00	8
Principle 10	34.7	18	33	32.50	7.7

<b>Total Points for Principles:</b>	<b>363**</b>	<b>178.6</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>61.7</b>
<b>Number of Groups Who Reviewed this Model:</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Average Score for Each Model (total divided by number of groups)</b>	<b>51.86</b>	<b>59.53</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>69.25</b>	<b>30.85</b>

\*Note: only two groups reported scores for Model 5

\*\*All seven table groups reviewed Model 1

# Model Scenario Pass/Fail Results

Scenario	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Table
Scenario A	Fail	Pass w/res	Pass/Fail			Table 1
Scenario B	Fail	Pass	Pass			Table 1
Scenario C	Pass	Pass	Pass			Table 1
Scenario D	Fail	Pass	Pass			Table 1
Scenario E	Fail	Pass	Pass/Fail			Table 1
Scenario F	Pass	Pass	Pass			Table 1
Scenario A	Fail		Pass*	Pass*		Table 2
Scenario B	Fail		Pass	Pass		Table 2
Scenario C	Fail		Fail*	Pass*		Table 2
Scenario D	Pass		Pass	Pass		Table 2
Scenario E	Fail		Fail	Fail		Table 2
Scenario F	Pass		Pass	Pass		Table 2
Scenario A	Mostly Fail			Pass	Pass	Table 3
Scenario B	Pass			Pass	Fail	Table 3
Scenario C	Pass as model, but fails in application			Pass	Pass	Table 3
Scenario D	Pass			Pass	Pass	Table 3
Scenario E	Majority Pass			Pass	Pass	Table 3
Scenario F	Pass			Pass	Pass	Table 3
Scenario A	Pass	Pass			Pass	Table 4
Scenario B	Fail	Fail			Fail	Table 4
Scenario C	Fail	Pass			Fail	Table 4
Scenario D	Pass	Pass			Pass	Table 4
Scenario E	Pass/Fail	Pass			Pass	Table 4
Scenario F	Pass	Pass			Pass	Table 4

\* = not all in agreement  
(1 or 2 disagreed)

Scenario	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Table
Scenario A	Fail+	Fail+	Pass			Table 5
Scenario B	Fail	Fail	Fail+			Table 5
Scenario C	?	?	Pass-			Table 5
Scenario D	Pass	Pass	Pass			Table 5
Scenario E	Pass	Pass	Pass			Table 5
Scenario F	Pass	Pass	Pass			Table 5
Scenario A	Fail		Pass	Pass		Table 6
Scenario B	Fail		Pass	Pass		Table 6
Scenario C	Fail		Pass	Pass		Table 6
Scenario D	Pass		Pass	Pass		Table 6
Scenario E	Fail		Pass	Pass		Table 6
Scenario F	Fail		?	Pass		Table 6
Scenario A	Fail			Pass	Pass	Table 7
Scenario B	Fail			Pass	Fail	Table 7
Scenario C	Fail			Pass	Fail	Table 7
Scenario D	Fail			Pass	Pass	Table 7
Scenario E	Fail			Pass?	Pass	Table 7
Scenario F	Pass			Pass	Pass	Table 7

# Summary Assessment Documents

Each of the seven groups submitted a document that summarized their perspectives on the specific models that their group explored. Each group assessed Model 1 while three or four groups assessed Models 2 through 5.

The questions explored in each summary assessment were:

1. What did you like about the model?
2. What *didn't* you like about the model?
3. What questions do you have about the model?
4. How might the model be improved?

## Model 1

All table groups assessed Model 1 and offered their comments.

### What We Like About this Model

Group 1	A familiar model, we know what we have and a “seat at the table” is important.
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It’s already there, it’s already “known”</li> <li>• On the whole it works well</li> <li>• Voices from each library can be heard (every library has an opportunity for representation)</li> <li>• It’s a good model to start from</li> </ul>
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone has a vote, place at the table</li> <li>• Good support, knowledgeable</li> <li>• Menu of choices for databases</li> </ul>
Group 4	Resource sharing, databases, it functions, reliability, staff,
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All can be heard.</li> <li>• Fluid committee structure.</li> <li>• Provides for rotation of officers.</li> <li>• Weak executive.</li> <li>• Total meeting time is only 10 hours per year. There is an opportunity for people to be involved at the sub-committee level including non-directors.</li> </ul>
Group 6	No change = no pain from the change itself. Familiar. You can gripe without having to do anything about it. Diffuse responsibility, infinite whining.
Group 7	Familiarity (comfort with the known). Opportunity to participate if you choose. In a way it works as designed.

## What We DON'T Like About this Model

<b>Group 1</b>	Rules difficult to enforce and lines of authority unclear; small vs. large library perception; can't agree so go nowhere/do nothing.
<b>Group 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the increasing importance of technology, libraries need more help. Currently there isn't a good process in place to plan for the future</li> <li>• It's cumbersome</li> <li>• Weighted voting doesn't give all libraries a true voice</li> <li>• There is a "rigidness" for what is allowed or not allowed.</li> <li>• There is no "policing" of libraries who are not following the rules</li> <li>• There's a lot there and we don't understand everything that's there.</li> </ul>
<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small libraries feel they have a place at the table, but vote has little impact</li> <li>• Needs more equity in voting, formula for voting needs to be re-examined</li> <li>• It's questionable how committees were formulated</li> <li>• Large group creates inefficiency in decision-making</li> <li>• Model not flexible to individual library decisions</li> <li>• Problems with clear lines of authority</li> </ul>
<b>Group 4</b>	Lack of agility, unwieldiness, doesn't include non-LINK libraries, technology services are handled in two pieces, lack of clear authority, difficulty in making large group decisions, assumes all libraries have same goals, needs and resources,
<b>Group 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tedious decision-making process.</li> <li>• Weak executive (absence of leadership).</li> <li>• The largeness of board slows the process down. Voting mechanism can be cumbersome.</li> <li>• There is a level of transparency for budget that is not there (those on committee are most familiar).</li> <li>• Libraries are not held accountable regarding policies.</li> <li>• Committees are overly staff dependent.</li> <li>• Decisions are made based on technology issues vs. librarianship issues which generates workarounds.</li> <li>• Automation staff accountability is not built into the LINK structure.</li> </ul>
<b>Group 6</b>	Cumbersome, ineffective, outdated. Why we are here today. Unequal votes.
<b>Group 7</b>	Confusion about who does what & governance. Inflexibility. Design not working for today's needs. Too many big meetings discussing small issues (rehashing committee work). No group charged with overall technology.

## Questions We Have About this Model

<b>Group 1</b>	Will Koha make a big difference? Why wasn't LINK working?
<b>Group 2</b>	None

<b>Group 3</b>	How committee membership is decided
<b>Group 4</b>	None
<b>Group 5</b>	None
<b>Group 6</b>	Confusion about what is included in the model, SCLS vs. LINK relationship.
<b>Group 7</b>	What technology is available to non-LINK libraries through this model?

### Improving this Model

<b>Group 1</b>	If it was more flexible—move to model 2
<b>Group 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More of a focus on technology is needed - maybe a committee to do planning. This has been sort of hit and miss. We need to do some goal-setting.</li> <li>• Could be improved if it had some additional flexibility as far as decision-making, allocation of resources.</li> <li>• If it was “one library-one vote” or if it was more of a “opt in for certain projects” sort of a situation. After more discussion, this boils down to a wish for “more flexibility for some libraries to not participate in some technology, or for some libraries to participate differently in some technology”.</li> </ul>
<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change voting formula</li> <li>• Working groups making timely decisions on change</li> <li>• Narrow number of people in governing body</li> <li>• Empower committees to make decisions, but certain issues such as budget would come to the entire group</li> </ul>
<b>Group 4</b>	Fix the DON'T LIKE, allow libraries to keep their new materials.
<b>Group 5</b>	Anything that changes it completely—one of the other models.
<b>Group 6</b>	Past the point of improving within the model itself.
<b>Group 7</b>	We could change it. If charges to committees, etc. could be modified. If it were dissolved and reformulated.



## Model 2

Three table groups assessed Model 2 and offered their comments.

### What We Like About this Model

Group 1	Positive aspects of model 1 with increased ability to change. We're still in control and have a seat at the table.
Group 4	Works with known values, it's easier, simpler than re-creating the wheel (model 5), more efficient than model 1 if committees are changed, fiscally consistent with existing model,
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If operational committees had more authoritative power we would like that. Decision-making would be more streamlined, flexible and responsive to changes in external and internal environments.</li> <li>• Restructuring a change in how LINK shares are charged could lead to restructuring of how LINK staff is used. There is an opportunity to investigate the funding formula to more fairly distribute sharing costs. (Circulation and # of terminals may be less important as we move into the future). SCLS provides Dan for free, LINK costs more and there is only one Dan.</li> <li>• Current structure is more than a decade old. So tinkering with the current model could lead to improvement. The existing structure has served us fairly well.</li> </ul>

### What We DON'T Like About this Model

Group 1	Unknown ease of implementation. SCLS still doesn't have responsibility with this model.
Group 4	Representation and agility issues - not far enough into the tweakability, too close to model 1, doesn't represent non-LINK libraries
Group 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's too similar to what we have now.</li> <li>• Technology is still "king" vs. librarianship.</li> <li>• Would like a clearer picture of how LINK costs are broken down.</li> <li>• A lot of people have been in the system for a decade and aren't aware of how it could be different.</li> <li>• Many of these changes could be accommodated in the current structure.</li> <li>• Executive council does not meet frequently enough in this model.</li> <li>• Committees may have too much power. It takes power out of the hands of the most representative body (the current LINK director's council).</li> <li>• Committees are not representative. It would be more difficult for smaller libraries to participate. (Could technology help this?)</li> <li>• Not a holistic approach.</li> </ul>

### Questions We Have About this Model

Group 1	How easy will it be to change? What and how much are we changing?
Group 4	None

<b>Group 5</b>	There is nothing clearly distinctive about this that makes it an obvious choice. There are too many unknowns such as how much authority will the committees have, at what point are issues escalated to the director's council, etc.?
----------------	---

### Improving this Model

<b>Group 1</b>	None
<b>Group 4</b>	Go further in revising the representation and voting, can this be more agile, still does not represent non-LINK libraries
<b>Group 5</b>	Would like to see a funding model that provides an incentive that keeps your computers in LINK rather than going elsewhere for service.

### Model 3

Four table groups assessed Model 3 and offered their comments.

#### What We Like About this Model

<b>Group 1</b>	Lines of authority well defined.
<b>Group 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like the idea that LINK is representative (smaller decision-making body, more streamlined)</li> <li>• There's lots of opportunity for input through the advisory committees, even if you're not on the final decision-making body</li> <li>• Seems more organized</li> </ul>
<b>Group 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient; decisions made more quickly.</li> <li>• There are clear lines of authority; action would probably be taken. There would be more accountability for libraries and technology staff.</li> <li>• People on the executive committee would have a clientele to discuss the issues with. People could contact the committee members to provide feedback and vice versa.</li> <li>• Having a more formal technology committee for SCLS.</li> </ul>
<b>Group 6</b>	Clear line of authority, allows more flexibility for decision making in a more timely manner. Voting rights are more equally distributed by size of library so there will be a more even playing field for smaller libraries.

#### What We DON'T Like About this Model

<b>Group 1</b>	Lack of votes for each library. Feeling that people may not be heard since they don't have a seat at the table.
<b>Group 2</b>	None
<b>Group 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive councils are not necessarily representative.</li> <li>• Sometimes a decision may be made without enough deliberation.</li> <li>• What we like about it is subject to change; there is too much uncertainty.</li> </ul>

Group 6	The governance sounds good but the specifics of how it is done is unclear.
---------	--

### Questions We Have About this Model

Group 1	How does a committee then convince everyone else?
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't know how well the representation portion would function</li> <li>• Don't know if communication between the groups would work well or be difficult</li> <li>• If the representation detailed in the description would be the best way (suggested only LINK and SCLS members be standing members)</li> </ul>
Group 5	Depending on the structure—bylaws, size of the executive committee--this could be a better model.
Group 6	<p>We are assuming that all sizes of library will be represented in the LINK Exec. Comm. (i.e. small, medium, large).</p> <p>Should we be assuming the best possible functioning of the committee, it could go either way for being transparent, etc. depending on whether people do their jobs on the committees.</p> <p>Does this model go far enough? Would we like to see something more progressive?</p>

### Improving this Model

Group 1	Possibly a few more people on the representative board to make sure libraries have their voices heard.
Group 2	Representation portion of tech committee might be different
Group 5	Larger executive committee would be essential. The proposed committee does not provide for a diverse enough representation.
Group 6	If we knew more about it.

## Model 4

Four table groups assessed Model 4 and offered their comments.

### What We Like About this Model

Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexible</li> <li>• One member one vote for the committee (though still weighted)</li> <li>• Simple, streamlined, seems efficient</li> <li>• Like the idea of SCLS enforcing policies</li> <li>• Combines the expertise of both SCLS and LINK under one umbrella</li> <li>• Participation by payment for project gives libraries more autonomy and allows libraries to spend money where they need it most</li> </ul>
---------	--

<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear lines of authority</li> <li>• Smaller groups making decisions</li> <li>• Can opt in and out of technology choices, pay for what you use</li> </ul>
<b>Group 6</b>	<p>1 representative 1 vote.</p> <p>No split between SCLS and LINK so more efficient.</p>
<b>Group 7</b>	<p>Small decision-making body (one rep, one vote), while directors can still get involved.</p> <p>Balance of size representation. One structure for defining what technology services are (clarity). Greater technology flexibility.</p>

### What We DON'T Like About this Model

<b>Group 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly too flexible (could get “scattershot”)</li> <li>• With no by-laws, seems like there’s not as much structure to it</li> <li>• Very small group making decisions, less input from the individual libraries</li> <li>• No formal agreement between the system and the libraries</li> <li>• Tech board make-up</li> </ul>
<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget planning difficult if changes are made often</li> <li>• Not enough director input/vote</li> </ul>
<b>Group 6</b>	<p>Can’t plan project-by-project. (May not be realistic/viable way to budget.) Feels hard to predict costs/control risks.</p> <p>Want more input on what the budget is, so they can’t just call once a year and say this is what your cost will be, without you getting any say in it. Hard to go back to the board and justify what things cost in this model.</p> <p>Don’t like SCLS Board involvement in the budget.</p> <p>Less democratic.</p>
<b>Group 7</b>	<p>Concerns about representatives being in tune with an individual library’s needs. So different that it’s hard to evaluate its effectiveness.</p>

### Questions We Have About this Model

<b>Group 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why did they choose 3%? What does that translate into in dollars?</li> <li>• By-laws?</li> </ul>
<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would communication happen?</li> <li>• How are the elected members chosen? Who elects them and from where?</li> <li>• Why is MPL Director a standing member?</li> <li>• How would the technology budget fit into the SCLS budget?</li> </ul>
<b>Group 6</b>	<p>Could there be a baseline cost for participation? So you have a baseline budget?</p> <p>Is there a minimum number of services you have to participate in?</p>
<b>Group 7</b>	<p>Would representatives be charged with gathering input from their constituent libraries?</p> <p>Could there be a structure ensuring representation? Would individual libraries be incentivized to do more on their own (and would that be good or bad re: overall</p>

	efficiency?). Questions about whether one rep one vote could break down (e.g. if Madison is voted down, would they go do their own thing?). How do non-technology decisions get made?
<b>Improving this Model</b>	
<b>Group 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add some sort of “backbone” of agreement/by-laws/standards</li> <li>• Committee should maybe be a little larger? (not a lot of people representing everyone)</li> <li>• Equal representation on committees? (SCLS and LINK are only standing members)</li> </ul>
<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't be a called technology board</li> <li>• Larger representation</li> <li>• Directors have more voting representation, especially on the budget</li> <li>• Director of SCLS would act as ex-officio of governing</li> <li>• Adding more structure such as bylaws</li> </ul>
<b>Group 6</b>	<p>Defined minimum set of core baseline services that everyone is expected to pay for and participate in.</p> <p>Want the illusion of control☺</p>
<b>Group 7</b>	We need to know more about the structure to evaluate this.

## Model 5

Three table groups assessed Model 5 and offered their comments.

<b>What We Like About this Model</b>	
<b>Group 3</b>	Similar to outsourcing which may be more efficient and responsive
<b>Group 4</b>	Design flexibility, clear delineation between SCLS tech staff and LINK staff, good staff utilization, clear lines of authority, innovation comes from competition, option to maintain or increase the quality of resource sharing,
<b>Group 7</b>	Need more information about structure and operation.
<b>What We DON'T Like About this Model</b>	
<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many decisions would need to be made initially to get this model rolling</li> <li>• Similar to Model 1, but more expensive and more time-consuming</li> <li>• More business-related expenses</li> <li>• Too many unknowns</li> </ul>
<b>Group 4</b>	Possible budget increase, fiscal management, more of a business model than it is now, limited library pool could increase fees, management functions could be dicey, could increase isolation of non-LINK libraries from LINK libraries, difficulty in contracting for library business IT needs, confusion of role of SCLS in this model, amount of time and effort and commitment to (re)create this system.

<b>Group 7</b>	Need more information about structure and operation. Non-LINK libraries would probably hate it (not represented). Admin overhead sounds terrible (probable increase in cost of doing business). Unfamiliarity, ambiguity. Reinventing the wheel. Some top heavy meetings. Seems divisive.
----------------	---

### Questions We Have About this Model

<b>Group 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who would organize and establish this model? Where would you start?</li> <li>• Who is responsible for seeing this through?</li> <li>• Could we separate the ILS from the rest of the technology provided to SCLS libraries?</li> </ul>
<b>Group 4</b>	What is the role of SCLS in this model in terms of technology? What does this mean for the individual responsibilities of each library director: does this increase the work and responsibilities or decrease? When you build your representation, you have to just trust that those who represent you will vote the way you want them to vote, make decisions based on your needs. SCLS is bound by their mission and state requirements, what would LINK be bound by if not connected to SCLS anymore; you would have to build it in to any agreement. What happens to the money that LINK has had managed by SCLS - would SCLS keep it and the new LINK start from scratch? This model does not immediately offer a fix for the existing representational problems. Do we have time to be the business manager(s) for LINK?
<b>Group 7</b>	How would this improve governance? Whose idea was this?

### Improving this Model

<b>Group 3</b>	More details
<b>Group 4</b>	Fix the Don't Like issues and answer our questions above.
<b>Group 7</b>	We don't use it. If we had to toss one out it would be this one.

# Parking Lot Issues

---

RCI asked each of the tables to track key issues and questions that would eventually need to be addressed in the model development process – but which might distract the group from the discussions during the conference.

## Group 1

None

## Group 2

- When we go to Koha, will LINK machines be able to have Office? What will this mean for the services provided by the various groups?

## Group 3

- LINK PC's have limits on software applications
- Hopes and fears governed how we answered the ratings of the guiding principles
- Formula for votes should be examined!

## Group 4

- What's cool about Koha is that the staff in a library can access the software and play with it

## Group 5

- All models can be modified to meet all guiding principles
- Pass/fail not appropriate for the scenarios
- Scenario C is a technical matter, not a governance matter
- Lean infrastructure can be assumed for all models - may be the eleventh principle

## Group 6

- None

## Group 7

- None

# Appendices

---

Appendix A – The Technology Governance Models

Appendix B – Participants at the Governance Conference

Appendix C – The Conference Agenda

Appendix D – The Guiding Principles for Technology Governance

Appendix E – The Governance Model Scenarios



### SCLS Technology Governance Discussion Model Summary

<b>Model 1 – Status Quo</b>	<b>Model 2 – Revise LINK</b>	<b>Model 3 – Cooperative Technology Decision Making</b>	<b>Model 4 – ILS Managed as a System Service</b>	<b>Model 5 – Independent LINK Consortium</b>
<p>The LINK Consortium continues to operate as it currently does with the LINK Director's Council (directors of all shared ILS member libraries) making all decisions for the ILS. The agreement, by-laws, cost-sharing formula and committee structure stay just as they are. There is no group that is charged to make system-wide (SCLS) technology decisions.</p>	<p>LINK governance remains essentially unchanged, with the LINK Director's Council (directors of all shared ILS member libraries) making all final decisions for the ILS. The LINK member agreement, by-laws, cost-sharing formula, committee structure, etc. would be revised and updated as spelled out in the current agreement. There is no group that is charged to make system-wide (SCLS) technology decisions.</p>	<p>A representative group would be created to advise SCLS staff and a LINK decision-making body on technology services. LINK governance would be changed so that a smaller, representative group would make some of the decisions currently made by the LINK Director's Council (directors of all shared ILS member libraries). All LINK directors would meet periodically for planning and to give feedback.</p>	<p>All technology services would be managed by SCLS. A representative technology body would devise cost-sharing formulas, approve the budget, plan and priorities and advise on other technology decisions and services. All library directors would meet several times a year for planning and to give feedback.</p>	<p>The LINK consortium becomes a completely separate entity with no involvement with SCLS. Link's new structure and governance methods would have to be determined by members.</p>



<b>Model Name:</b>	<b>Model 1 – Status Quo</b>
<b>Model Structure</b>	
What bodies will be needed to make decisions?	The LINK Director’s Council would continue to make all operational, policy, and fiscal decisions according to the procedures contained in the bylaws and membership agreement. As per the Agreement, all decisions of the LINK Director’s Council can be appealed to the South Central Library Board, whose decision is final. Recommendations to the Council are made by standing and ad hoc committees appointed according to the By-Laws.
How are body members chosen?	The director of each member library or his/her designee serves on the LINK Director’s Council. Committee members are appointed by the LINK Director’s Council Chair or Vice Chair according to the By-Laws.
How many members will be on each body?	As per the current by-laws.
Are LINK and non-LINK representation included?	Only LINK will be represented in this model.
How often does the body meet?	As per the current by-laws; LINK Director’s Council meets bi-monthly; committee meeting schedule varies.
Other information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not provide an integrated technology service model for SCLS.</li> <li>• Does not change the cost sharing formula.</li> </ul>
<b>Decision Making</b>	
What types of decisions will each body make (policy? Procedure? Budget?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains the current committee/LINK Director’s Council structure for all decisions. In general, committees make recommendations to the LINK Director’s Council which makes policy/procedure/budget decisions, unless the LINK Director’s Council specifically authorizes a committee to act.</li> </ul>
How will the body make decisions?	As per the current by-laws.
How are votes apportioned, if applicable?	As per the current by-laws.
Who recommends a technology budget?	The Budget and Personnel Committee recommends an annual budget for all LINK services (note: this is not all SCLS technology service) which encompasses any LINK technology projects identified and approved by the Long Range Planning Committee.
Who approves the budget?	The LINK Director’s Council

<p>How is input gathered from individuals beyond the body?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through standing organizational and operational committees, as well as ad hoc committees formed by the LINK Director's Council.</li> <li>• Through surveys and contact with other interested/knowledgeable people.</li> <li>• Through Automation Staff.</li> </ul>
<p>Other information</p>	
<p><b>Other</b></p>	
<p>Do libraries sign a formal agreement? If not, how do they commit to participate?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Are there formal by-laws?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Who is responsible for enforcing policies?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LINK Director's Council per the Membership Agreement.</li> </ul>

<b>Model Name:</b>	<b>Model 2 – Revise LINK</b>
<b>Model Structure</b>	
What bodies will be needed to make decisions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational committees would be established and charged with operational, procedural and policy-level decision making in specific functional areas.</li> <li>• Organizational committees would be established and charged with making recommendations regarding planning, budgeting, and resource allocation to the LINK Director’s Council.</li> <li>• LINK Director’s Council makes planning, budgetary and resource allocation decisions and would be the final arbiter of any appeals of decisions made by the operational committees.</li> </ul>
How are body members chosen?	Appointing authority for committee members would be specified in the revised by-laws; committees would be representational according to library size.
How many members will be on each body?	<p>Committees: As per the revised by-laws, but sufficient to adequately represent the sizes of libraries.</p> <p>LINK Director’s Council: Equal to the number of LINK libraries (each director or their representative is a member).</p>
Are LINK and non-LINK representation included?	Only LINK will be represented in this model.
How often does the body meet?	LINK Director’s Council would meet as needed, but no less frequently than annually. By-laws would specify who could call meetings and what notice would be required.
Other information	<p>Possible Modifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clearly define current LINK services</li> <li>• Revise language outdated for technical reasons and items based on assumptions that are no longer valid.</li> <li>• Revise the funding formula to more fairly allocate and apportion costs.</li> <li>• Revise methodology for assessing initiation costs for new members.</li> <li>• Revamp committee structure and revise committee charges.</li> </ul>

<b>Decision Making</b>	
What types of decisions will each body make (Policy? Procedure? Budget?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option amends and streamlines the current decision making structure, but does not replace it.</li> <li>• LINK Director’s Council will make planning, budgetary, and resource allocation decisions and will serve as needed as the final arbiter of all committee decisions. While members may request reconsideration under the provisions of the By-Laws, all decisions of the LINK Director’s Council would be final.</li> <li>• Committees will make decisions regarding policy, procedure, and operations. These decisions may be appealed to the LINK Director’s Council according to the procedure outlined in the revised by-laws.</li> </ul>
How will the body make decisions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LINK Director’s Council: As per the current Agreement</li> <li>• Committees: By majority vote of members present.</li> </ul>
How are votes apportioned, if applicable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LINK Director’s Council: 1,000 votes shall be apportioned to members according to the relative size of their annual financial contribution to LINK.</li> <li>• Committees: Each member would have one vote.</li> </ul>
Who recommends a technology budget?	The Budget and Personnel Committee would develop a budget recommendation to support LINK services, including any technology enhancements or developments.
Who approves the budget?	The LINK Director’s Council.
How is input gathered from individuals beyond the body?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through standing organizational and operational committees, as well as ad hoc committees formed by the LINK Director’s Council.</li> <li>• Through surveys and contact with other interested/knowledgeable people.</li> <li>• Through Automation Staff.</li> </ul>
Other information	
<b>Other</b>	
Do libraries sign a formal agreement? If not, how do they commit to participate?	Yes. A new membership agreement would need to be developed and signed by those interested in membership in LINK, according to the terms of the current agreement. The agreement would provide for notice from those libraries discontinuing their membership.
Are there formal by-laws?	Yes. These would be revised according to the procedure established in the current by-laws
Who is responsible for enforcing policies?	The LINK Director’s Council would decide how and who would enforce LINK policies.

<b>Model Name:</b>	<b>Model 3 – Cooperative Technology Decision Making</b>
<b>Model Structure</b>	
What bodies will be needed to make decisions?	SCLS Technology Advisory Committee, LINK Executive Committee, LINK Directors , Working groups
How are body members chosen?	<p><b>SCLS Tech Committee:</b> elected according to size of library (includes non-LINK);</p> <p><b>LINK Exec Committee:</b> SCLS Director, MPL Director, and LINK Project Manager (this position is non-voting) are standing positions, 3 more members based on size of library, 2 at-large members (these 5 positions are elected);</p> <p><b>LINK Directors:</b> all LINK libraries represented</p> <p><b>Working groups:</b> To be determined, depending on task</p>
How many members will be on each body?	SCLS Tech Committee: 7-9; LINK Exec Committee: 8 (7 voting); LINK Directors: all LINK libraries represented; working groups: to be determined, depending on task.
Are LINK and non-LINK representation included?	Yes, on the SCLS Technology Advisory Committee & some working groups.
How often does the body meet?	SCLS Tech Committee and LINK Exec Committee meet monthly; LINK Directors meet 3 to 4 times per year
Other information	SCLS Tech Committee and LINK Exec Committee should have some members in common; all meetings are open to library staff
<b>Decision Making</b>	
What types of decisions will each body make (policy? Procedure? Budget?)	SCLS Tech Committee is primarily advisory; makes recommendations to the LINK Exec Committee for LINK related issues and to SCLS staff for other technology issues. LINK working groups will make recommendations to LINK Exec Committee on procedural issues. LINK Directors meet for planning, feedback, and information sharing.
How will the body make decisions?	SCLS Tech Committee and LINK Exec Committee make decision by majority vote.
How are votes apportioned, if applicable?	For both the SCLS Tech Committee and LINK Exec , each representative has one vote.
Who recommends a technology budget?	SCLS Tech Committee recommends a technology budget. The LINK portion of the budget goes to the LINK Exec Committee. LINK Exec Committee will recommend budget in April allowing 2 months for feedback from LINK member libraries.

Who approves the budget?	LINK Exec Committee for LINK portion, unless the increase is equal to or greater than 3%. If the percentage is greater, LINK Directors vote on budget; SCLS Tech Committee for other SCLS technology projects, with input from libraries participating in services.
How is input gathered from individuals beyond the body?	Working groups, subcommittees, surveys, review by all LINK libraries of budget items.
Other information	
<b>Other</b>	
Do libraries sign a formal agreement? If not, how do they commit to participate?	Yes, for LINK
Are there formal by-laws?	Yes, for LINK
Who is responsible for enforcing policies?	LINK Exec Committee

<b>Model Name:</b>	<b>Model 4 – ILS managed as a System Service</b>
<b>Model Structure</b>	
What bodies will be needed to make decisions?	Technology Board
How are body members chosen?	Standing members: SCLS Director, MPL Director, LINK Project Manager (non-voting position); Elected members: 3 based on size of library and 2 at-large
How many members will be on each body?	8 (7 voting)
Are LINK and non-LINK representation included?	Yes
How often does the body meet?	Monthly
Other information	Directors meet several times a year for planning, feedback and information-sharing
<b>Decision Making</b>	
What types of decisions will each body make (policy? Procedure? Budget?)	Technology Board devises cost-sharing formulas, approves budget, plan, and priorities for technology. Also makes recommendations on other issues to SCLS staff.
How will the body make decisions?	Majority vote
How are votes apportioned, if applicable?	One representative = one vote
Who recommends a technology budget?	Technology Board, with direction from SCLS staff and possibly a subcommittee or working group.
Who approves the budget?	Technology Board and the SCLS Board of Trustees. If the increase in any service budget is greater than 3%, all libraries participating in the service vote on the budget.
How is input gathered from individuals beyond the body?	Working groups, subcommittees, surveys
Other information	
<b>Other</b>	
Do libraries sign a formal agreement? If not, how do they commit to participate?	No. The commitment to participate is on a project-by-project basis. Participation is by payment for the project.
Are there formal by-laws?	No
Who is responsible for enforcing policies?	SCLS staff



<b>Model Name:</b>	<b>Model 5 – Independent LINK Consortium</b>
<b>Model Structure</b>	
What bodies will be needed to make decisions?	<p>This option does not lock LINK into any structure. Almost any proposed structure can be implemented. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Directors</li> <li>• Peer-to-Peer <b>or</b> representative governing body</li> <li>• Budget</li> <li>• Technology Committee</li> <li>• HR, Legal, Facilities, Fiscal agent</li> </ul>
How are body members chosen?	As per the revised by-laws.
How many members will be on each body?	As per the revised by-laws.
Are LINK and non-LINK representation included?	Only LINK will be represented in this model.
How often does the body meet?	As per the revised by-laws.
Other information	The consortium is responsible for all management functions, including payroll, accounting, renting facilities, salaries and benefits, developing personnel policies, and supervision (or hiring a supervisor). It is quite usual for a governing body to oversee operations, with final authority resting with annual meetings of the entire membership.
<b>Decision Making</b>	
What types of decisions will each body make (policy? Procedure? Budget?)	<p>This option does not lock LINK into any structure. Almost any proposed structure can be implemented. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Directors – Budget, Bills, Policies, Staff</li> <li>• Peer-to-Peer <b>or</b> representative governing body – Ultimate body to decide policies, procedures, budget, technology for the consortium</li> <li>• Budget Committee – Develops and recommends a budget</li> <li>• Technology Committee – Reviews new technology requests, assesses feasibility (staff, time, cost, priority). Makes recommendation to either/or the Budget Committee or the governing body</li> <li>• HR, Legal, Facilities, Fiscal agent – self explanatory</li> </ul>
How will the body make decisions?	As per the revised by-laws.
How are votes apportioned, if applicable?	As per the revised by-laws.
Who recommends a technology budget?	As per the revised by-laws.

Who approves the budget?	Usually proposed by a governing body and approved by the general membership, though this is not the only option.
How is input gathered from individuals beyond the body?	<p>There are many possibilities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have technology requests on an annual cycle, just like the budget. Have a deadline where all technology requests have to be submitted by some certain date if it is to be considered for implementation for the following year.</li> <li>• Library staffs and Automation staff can make technology requests/proposals to the Technology Committee (probably starting by completing a web form that gathers general project information: cost, scope, expertise required and who will benefit).</li> <li>• The Technology Committee can make recommendations to the governing body.</li> <li>• All libraries will have the opportunity to evaluate and provide input into this process with some agreed upon regularity.</li> <li>• The general membership or governing body will recommend which projects to pursue.</li> <li>• Evaluations/input will be published to all members.</li> </ul>
Other information	
<b>Other</b>	
Do libraries sign a formal agreement? If not, how do they commit to participate?	Membership is a commitment, usually made by a governing body (such as a public library board) or a “if you pay, you’re in” agreement or can come to some other agreement.
Are there formal by-laws?	The Governing Body can decide to have formal by-laws or can come to some other agreement.
Who is responsible for enforcing policies?	<p>The Governing Body would decide which body would enforce policies. Possibilities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Governing Body</li> <li>• A committee assigned the “enforcer” role</li> <li>• LINK staff</li> </ul>
Other information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option would allow LINK to expand beyond public libraries and beyond the SCLS boundaries.</li> <li>• SCLS services are completely separated from consortium services.</li> </ul>

# Appendix B – Conference Participants

---

## Group #1

Denise Anton Wright, Facilitator  
Carol Froistad – Madison  
Susan Santner – Oregon  
Carolyn Shaffer – Black Earth  
Joan Behm – Cambridge  
Jon Pribbenow – Rio  
Norma Jean LeMoine – Rock Springs

## Group #2

Dan Jacobson, Facilitator  
Trisha Priewe – Lodi  
Shelley Selle – McFarland  
Gisela Newbegin – DeForest  
Diana Skalitsky – Marshall  
Sue Steiner - Reedsburg

## Group #3

Pamela Westby, Facilitator  
Tracy Herold – Sun Prairie  
Tana Elias – Madison  
Lysianne Unruh – Mt. Horeb  
Kaia Fry – Deerfield  
Sharon Briggs – Monticello  
Mary Friesen – Wyocena  
Ron McCabe – Wisconsin Rapids

## Group #4

Pat Dolan, Facilitator  
Debra Johnson – Fitchburg  
Pam Bosben – Cross Plains  
Leah Fritsche – Deerfield  
Hilary Bauman – Albany  
Sue Ann Mobley – Reedsburg  
Peggy Kindschi – Columbus

## Group #5

Andy Barnett, Facilitator  
Brian Simons – Verona  
Demita Gerber – Monona  
Marilyn Granrud – Stoughton  
Kris Daughtery – Poynette  
Michele Joseph – Bellville  
Richard MacDonald – Baraboo

## Group #6

Susan Lee, Facilitator  
Bob Stack – Portage County  
Susan Kosharek – Oregon  
Jan Berg – DeForest  
Jean Christensen – Bellville  
Carolyn Seaver – Monticello  
Kristine Millard – Lodi  
Dan Calef – Adams

## Group #7

Lauren Blough, Facilitator  
Barb Dimick – Madison  
Jennifer Endres – Prairie du Sac  
Audrey Johnson – Mazomanie  
Cathy Borck – Wisconsin Dells  
Maureen Palmer – Plain  
Jamie Vache – Stoughton  
Elizabeth Bauer - Middleton

# ◆ SCLS Technology Governance Conference ◆

May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009

Olbrich Botanical Gardens

## Agenda

- 9:30 a.m. **Welcome and Charge** – Phyllis Davis
- 9:40 **Overview of the Process** – Linda and Jeff Russell, Russell Consulting, Inc.
- 9:50 **Overview of Technology Governance Models** – Stefanie Morrill
- 10:00 **Overview of the Guiding Principles for Technology Governance** – Denise Anton Wright, Technology Governance Task Force Member
- 10:10 **Governance Scenarios: “Stress Tests” of the Models** – Linda and Jeff
- 10:15 **Overview of Small Group Process and Roles** – Linda and Jeff
- Key Roles
  - Technology Governance Model Matrix and Overall Model Assessment Form
- 10:25 **BREAK**
- 10:40 **Small Group Technology Governance Model Assessments**
- Discuss the Three Assigned Models
  - Complete the Governance Model Matrix for Each Model
  - Complete the Summary Assessment Worksheet for Each Model
  - Prepare to Report out Small Group’s Assessment Results
- 12:00 p.m. **Lunch**
- 12:45 **Small Group Technology Governance Model Assessments, contd.**
- 1:30 **Small Groups Report Out Results and Large Group Discussion**
- Each Group Reports out their Model Matrix and Assessment Results
  - Large Group Review and Discussion of Models Based Upon Assessment Results
- 2:00 **BREAK**
- 2:15 **Small Groups Report Out Results and Large Group Discussion, contd.**
- 2:45 **Small Group Session: Exploring Model Preferences**
- 3:05 **Large Group Discussion: Exploring Governance Model Preferences**
- 3:25 **Next Steps, Conclusion and Thanks** – Phyllis
- 3:30 **CLOSE**

# Ten Guiding Principles for Selecting a Model for Technology Governance

---

An *ideal* model or approach for technology decision making for SCLS . . .

1. Is sensitive to the needs of all sizes of libraries and is representative in that all library voices have the opportunity to be heard within the decision making process.
2. Allows flexibility in technology adoption at individual libraries.
3. Allows technology staff to be allocated in a way to provide the best possible service, with flexibility allowed.
4. Allows for the greatest degree of structural agility, including the flexibility to change committees as needed.
5. Allows for non-ILS services related to technology to be available to all SCLS members.
6. Provides for transparent processes and products for project planning, goal setting and priorities on a short-term and long-term basis.
7. Provides for input on budget and explicitly states the process for creating and approving budgets.
8. Includes a place/group to make system-wide SCLS technology service decisions for members.
9. Ensures the efficient and effective sharing of resources by participating member libraries—enabling them to better serve their patrons.
10. Establishes clear lines of authority for making decisions, taking action, and holding people accountable.

## Scenarios for Technology Governance Models

---

Scenario	Brief Description of this Scenario
Scenario A	Some libraries would like to add a piece of software to their patron computers and there is a charge for the licenses.
Scenario B	SCLS would like to change how PC support is provided, combining LINK and non-LINK support, with a goal of making service more efficient.
Scenario C	Library B, who is <u>not</u> a member of the LINK consortium, would like e-mail service through SCLS.
Scenario D	The role of ILS support staff has changed due to Koha implementation and duties need to be reassigned/realigned.
Scenario E	Library X is concerned that new items should stay in-library before being circulated to the whole of the consortium.
Scenario F	A new library would like to join the ILS and needs to know what the start-up and ongoing costs are to be a member.