



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

September 22, 2009

This Governance Conference II Report was prepared by:



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

www.RussellConsultingInc.com

1134 Winston Drive • Madison, WI 53711-3161

Table of Contents

<i>Background and Process</i> -----	1
<i>Background and Philosophy</i> -----	2
<i>Governing Bodies Charges/Descriptions</i> -----	7
<i>Clustering and Representativeness</i> -----	14
<i>The Proposed Process for Member Charges</i> -----	24
<i>The Shared Automated Resources Agreement</i> -----	29
<i>Appendices</i> -----	35

Background and Process

On September 18, 2009, the South Central Library System (SCLS) hosted a Governance Conference as a follow-along event to the May 15th Technology Governance Conference where member libraries recommended a new governance model for the SCLS.

Between May 15 and September 18, the SCLS Technology Governance Task Force and staff from the SCLS worked to develop a structure and process for moving SCLS toward the hybrid governance model recommended at the May 15th conference. Prior to the September 18th conference, member libraries received background information on the emerging structure for the proposed governance model.

The September 18th Governance Conference II was designed to present a final set of recommended structures and processes for implementing the new governance structure. In preparation for the conference, participating member libraries were asked to review a **Conference Handbook** (included as *Appendix A*) that summarized the proposed governance model's approach to the following:

- Background and Philosophy of the New Governance Structure
- Charges and Descriptions of the Governance Bodies
- Clustering and Communication within and Between the Clusters
- Annual Election Process and Meeting Calendar [Note: *Due to conference time constraints, this facet of the proposed governance structure was not discussed by the conference table groups*]
- Determining Cost Distributions (Member Charges)
- Proposed Shared Automated Resources Agreement

Who Participated

Thirty-seven representatives signed up to participate in the conference, with 39 people actually attending on the 18th. Participants were assigned to one of six table groups that were to focus on exploring specific aspects of the proposed new governance structure for SCLS. Each table group was structured such that there was a good representation in the group in terms of library size with an eye toward bringing together libraries that were likely to be grouped in a shared cluster – as proposed by the new governance structure. *Appendix B* lists all of the participants at the conference.

Each table group was led by a facilitator, trained by Russell Consulting, Inc. (RCI), to lead the group through the structured activities and questions. The table facilitators were largely 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 findings and recommendations for the group.

The entire process was facilitated by Linda and Jeff Russell of RCI. The agenda for the conference is included within the Conference Handbook (*Appendix A*).

Background and Philosophy of New Structure

The six table workgroups identified what they liked about the proposed SLCS governance structure and then explored and identified questions that they had about the proposed structure.

Overall, what do you like about the proposed governance structure?

Group 1

- Clear that SCLS has ownership of all the problems. Actual governance resides in SCLS. Committees are just advisory.
- Clear ability to operate on a day-to-day basis. SCLS has more authority to operate.
- Simplifies the structure. If had to explain it before, couldn't do it without going back to documents, charts, etc.
- Representative governance has some additional efficiency.
- Integration of technology expertise and response. Each can inform the other more readily, advance tech in libraries more easily.
- Simpler. Easier to explain to other people.
- With clusters, nobody can say "I didn't have a say."

Group 2

- Reduction in number of committees.
- Eliminated some inactive groups.
- Will allow for greater input from member libraries.
- LINK was too big to allow input.
- There will be more authentic conversations and less intimidation.
- The cross-county aspect of the clusters may be a good thing in that it may eliminate "this county said this" that occurs at PLAC.
- Technology is under one roof--eliminates LINK machine vs. non-LINK machine issue. Also, non-LINK and LINK participation will be more cohesive.
- Geographic nature of clusters may allow for greater ease of meeting.

Group 3

- Like the representation concept. It's not going to make the decision making any slower and may allow for more nimble decision making. Better allowances for enforcement.
- Less committees. No more many-headed monster.

Group 4

- Fewer meetings.
- Better combo of SCLS resources and staff.
- Clearer/more coherent. There is a structure and it is understandable.
- More efficient, fewer huge meetings with untenable discussions.
- Relationship between libraries and SCLS.
- 2-year review process so things stay fluid and can be changed.
- Identifies and gives credence to the three important services that the libraries have all agreed to collaborate upon. Gets words and a box on an org chart which makes us understand what we're all about.
- Representative governance.
- Clearer lines of sight for responsibility and chain of command. Better organizational transparency.

Group 5

- Thinks it's exciting - likes clustering.
- Likes having LINK under SCLS - divisions are confusing - LINK computers, SCLS computers, why there is word processing on some and not others, do I call Dan or help desk, etc.? Making it simpler will be wonderful. Never understood why LINK and SCLS are separate.
- Will have a system that reflects modern, current library practices - libraries won't be stuck in a system that's out-of-date.
- Likes more representative structure - better than having 40+ people sitting around making decisions. Has safeguards for holding cluster representative accountable.

Group 6

- Enforcement of policies.
- Stability of clusters unless there is significant population change.

What questions do you have about the governance structure?

Group 1

- Why is this day titled "SCLS technology governance conference II"? We're looking at OVERALL governance.
- In 2 years, who adjusts the clusters? (assuming it's SCLS who looks at the populations)
- If the goal of the clusters is to have roughly equal populations represented, why are Madison's clusters for larger populations? (MPL and DCL)
- Are clusters supposed to meet? Canvass for decision-making? What is the recommended/suggested vehicles of communication for the clusters?

- HOW will SCLS enforce policies?
- What if you have this annual meeting where you're going to ratify things or the recommendations made are defeated, WHAT THEN? What if the annual meeting doesn't resolve issues/decide things?
- Why is MALC represented on the technology committee? ("Sometimes they say something that's useful.")
- How soon will a fair and equitable cost structure be devised? (perhaps this is for a different section)
- The agreements that libraries will sign outline agreements of system membership, but don't really outline what the members will get from the system? Why aren't system services provided more fully articulated in the agreements?

Group 2

- How will individual clusters communicate?
- How will it work when a committee makes an appropriate recommendation and tells the Administrative Council and it is a controversial decision?
- Is the budget process really different than what they are doing now and how is it different?
- In addition to LINK, what other types of member fees will there be?
- What are the mechanisms to ensure cost effectiveness?
- Madison will want another seat since the new plan represents a reduction in representation for them.
- How do we plan for the effect that Koha will have on technology governance?

Group 3

- Concerned about the scope of the power of the AC. Will anyone be willing to serve? (Really big job/long meetings?)
- Will there be term limits on the representatives? To make sure the same library isn't always the representative.
- In one place it looks as though the person is the rep and in another it's the library. If you elect a library, do you just get rid of that person or do you get another library if you have to oust the person or if they leave?
- Enforcement: What kinds of enforcement? Fines? Sanctions? What are they envisioning? And for what type of infractions?
- Computer tech services? Will they become a cost service? What about using LINKcat for a non-LINK library? Will there be a cost for that now? What about the costs for a current LINK library?

Group 4

- Can a single library send a representative to several committees at once? Can one library be on multiple committees at once? This should be spelled out.

- What expectations exist for the representatives to get feedback so people know when to respond, how to respond, what to respond to, etc. so that the cluster has time to respond to issues and give the feedback.
- In clusters where there are only a few libraries and they serve disparate populations, how do you ensure adequate/fair representation?
- Will there be warnings before enforcement occurs?
- Concern about the possibility of libraries being kicked out of an agreement.
- Changes in computer support. What is happening with that?
- Can smaller libraries be adequately represented in committees when they don't have the staff to send to committee meetings, whereas bigger libraries have enough staff to send some to committee meetings so they might be represented more?
- Madison only has two votes on the AC but they want more because any way that they calculate service populations, fees, etc. they have more of a vote now and will find it hard to justify to their board that they are losing votes.
- The number of libraries per cluster is a concern.
- Concern about dissolving the agreement between libraries. How will the agreement with SCLS be better? Can there still be an agreement between libraries? Lose the collaborative/consortial nature of the relationship?
- Concern about placing so much trust in SCLS. Not that they don't trust SCLS, but it's kind of scary.
- What happens to the December potluck?!

Group 5

- Would like to know what's coming - there are still unknowns re cost/ILS.
- How will the evaluation happen (after two years)? Will there be 2-3 months set aside after two years or will it be ongoing over the next two years?
- Is there a backup plan? What if this doesn't work - what will we do then? How quickly could we adapt if there was a major problem with the new structure?

Group 6

- Will the enforcement role and policies be more spelled out, or... will they be broad or specific, will there be room for interpretation?
- Would like more discussion on the make up of clusters. How important is it to cluster by population?
- Do I really have to learn new acronyms? What about natural language? (with regard to descriptions of committees, relationships, etc.)
- Can the timeline for educating Boards and getting them "on board" be adjusted?
- Does the library-to-SCLS ILS agreement somehow lose the cooperative spirit between the library members of the consortium?

- With the representatives bringing input to the committees as smaller bodies, how will member libraries be kept informed of what individual ideas are coming up, being approved, being tabled, etc.?
- Could more clusters even out distribution with regard to high population areas like Dane County and Madison and Stevens Point?

Integrated List of Participants' Governance Structure Questions

After members of the small groups had had a chance to identify their questions and concerns about the governance structure, the Russells compiled one, integrated list of the questions and concerns that the small groups shared with the larger group. The following are the questions and concerns that were included on that list:

1. What if there's no resolution of an issue at the end-of-the-year annual meeting?
2. How will clusters communicate amongst themselves?
3. Given the power and responsibility of the Administrative Council, will people want to serve on it?
4. Clusters - how will fair representation be ensured in areas where there are few libraries in clusters serving desperate populations?
5. How will the evaluation process play out? Do we wait two years before evaluating it?
6. How will enforcement be enforced? How will the policies work?
7. Clusters - population equity - especially Madison and Dane County.
8. Budget process - is it different and how?
9. Cost structure - a big unknown - but it's OK to punt!
10. Can smaller libraries be representative on committees when they have fewer staff to spare?
11. Costs?
12. Concerns regarding new agreement between SCLS and individual libraries - implications?
13. Cluster communication - to and from Administrative Council - how will this occur?
14. What effect will KOHA have on structure?
15. Agreement doesn't spell out SCLS responsibility - want a more two-way street.
16. Timeline for education of library boards - getting their buy-in.
17. Why is MALC represented on the Administrative Council?
18. Madison is concerned with its representation on the Administrative Council - doesn't reflect its appropriate share.
19. Term limits? People may serve too long.
20. What mechanisms are there to ensure cost effectiveness?
21. Warnings or fines for non-compliance? Will libraries be kicked out? Doesn't this punish the community?

Governing Bodies Charges/Descriptions

The six table workgroups reviewed the charges and descriptions for the various governing bodies in the new governance structure and identified (a) what they liked about the descriptions/charges, (b) what isn't clear and what issues/questions they had about these bodies' charges/descriptions, (c) their ideas for *addressing* their own issues and questions, and (d) the group's overall "comfort" level with the charges/descriptions using a 10-point scale.

Overall, what do you like about the descriptions/charges of the governing bodies of the new structure?

Group 1

- Clear delineation of responsibilities.
- Smaller bodies.
- Videoconferencing will be possible (sounds like it).
- Number of representatives on the committees is good ("a lot").

Group 2

- If someone really wants to have their voice heard, they will through this process.
- There are multiple opportunities for involvement.
- The committees will have more respect because their decisions can be challenged and this may eliminate some of the special interest stuff that happens.
- The recall mechanism is a good thing.
- The fact that the terms are staggered.
- The committees recommended are relevant and appropriate.
- The clusters provide a sense of ownership and commitment.

Group 3

- Same things as the above question mostly. Like representative/committee. Think it's pretty well put together and simpler to understand.

Group 4

- General concept.
- Low number of committees.
- 13 members = 13 colonies. Very patriotic! Prime number! Masonic number!
- SCLS will be there as facilitators but not voting members.

Group 5

- Seems as though there will be less meetings overall.
- Three at-large members.

Group 6

- Smaller and more streamlined, it's going to be easier to explain to people.
- Like the way it has been laid out, seems to be all-inclusive.

What isn't clear about the governing bodies' charges/descriptions? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens with unresolved ties in voting? (when electing cluster representatives) -- there's a run-off election. What if there's another tie? "I don't know." • How does the AC decide what's a "major" issue and what's a "minor" issue? Or WHO decides major/minor? • Why can't "at-large" representatives be recalled? • How the committees and clusters will communicate? (between each other and within themselves) • why is MALC represented on the AC? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If they're non-voting, it's probably not an issue.

Group 2

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>The Technology Committee is more of a challenge because there are so many questions and unknowns (impact of Koha). Technology goes in more directions, it changes rapidly and not everyone wants the same thing. The ILS Committee is much more clear.</p> <p>We don't know what we don't know. This is a leap of faith.</p>	<p>It may help clear up the LINK/non-LINK service problem.</p> <p>Let's not adopt a chicken little attitude. This is not about us, this is about the future of our libraries. This structure may last for years and other systems in the state are watching how this will play out.</p>

Group 3

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>What happens if the AC rep isn't representing you and is only representing their own interests?</p> <p>Do individual libraries have the resources to contribute/be on all the committees? Are the sub-committees too big? Do all of the clusters need to be represented on all of the subcommittees? What about those libraries that don't participate now? Is there a way to make them "step up"?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's a recall option. • Maybe more at-large members to open it up a bit. Term limits may help that as well.

Group 4

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>Process for unresolved issues from Annual Meeting.</p> <p>Clarify responsibility in terms of getting feedback from cluster constituents.</p> <p>Voting at all-director meeting (p.7)</p>	

Group 5

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is role of MALC within SCLS? If it doesn't carry enough weight to be a committee on the same level as the other committees, then why does it exist at all? Why isn't MALC discussed as part this governance process? 2. No formal method or frequency of communication among cluster members and cluster representative. 3. Term limits/representation/recalling representatives? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Representation of MALC visually should be made smaller in the diagram of structure. Right now it looks like MALC has a lot of influence and the actual role of MALC could be difficult to explain to library boards because of the visual depiction. Could also add some clarification re: the statutory directive SCLS has to include multitype libraries in decision-making. 2. There should be some direction for cluster representatives about a minimal level of communication, e.g. they should be emailing agendas to members to see if libraries have feedback, etc. 3. If the representative leaves library, then another person from library could take his/her place.

Group 6

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>The election process for nominees, do clusters vote only on their nominee?</p> <p>What is the philosophy behind having an at-large member and how do they represent everyone? Do we really need at-large members? Is the voting structure for at-large weighted improperly if clusters have differing numbers of libraries (e.g. can large clusters unfairly push their home candidates)?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>If two great people from one cluster wanted to serve, the cluster could elect one and (if desired) the entire membership could elect the other too.</p> <p>Can the at-large members be elected by (or assigned to represent) a library size group -- small, medium, large? That might balance geographic representation with size representation.</p>

What questions do you have about the governing bodies' charges/descriptions? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Why do we bother to have a DC? ("it's a service")</p>	

Group 2

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>As a new director, LINK is a good way to meet people. Will the annual meeting be enough to allow people to get to know each other?</p> <p>Why are the "at large seats" there? Also, why can't these be recalled?</p> <p>Why is MALC part of the committees?</p> <p>If there is a recall, is it necessary to have a term limit?</p>	<p>Continue director's breakfast.</p> <p>Think positively about change.</p>

Group 3

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>How are ad-hoc committees selected? Do they need a rep from all clusters? Can people volunteer to be on the committee?</p>	

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Will the all-director's meeting voting process work to decide what needs to be decided?</p> <p>Will the directors be provided with the detailed budget before it comes up for a vote? (Want the full budget/cost/plan before the AC meeting)</p>	

Group 4

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>How does recall work in clusters with 2 members? 51%?</p> <p>Why can't the "at large" representatives be recalled? (Who would want to be a cluster rep when you could be at-large with no recalling?) Who would recall you?</p> <p>What happens if the fees aren't approved at the Annual Meeting?</p> <p>What does "oversees" mean in terms of committee?</p> <p>Whose responsibility is it to get feedback for the committee from the constituents?</p> <p>Not happy that the AC gets to decide on vote weights for all-directors meeting. Would be more comfortable if this was laid out here. Somewhat more comfortable with this after Stef explained the new formula and how votes will be weighted by what you're paying.</p>	<p>Clusters should have a minimum of 3 members. Does there have to be 10 clusters?</p> <p>Recalling at-large reps -- make it so they can be recalled and spell out how that works, and clarify their duties.</p> <p>Have a special meeting OR do enough work in advance so that fees will pass. Have a solution that doesn't go straight to SCLS Board if all-directors can't decide -- it will be more important to get the consensus.</p> <p>Spell out the details of what "oversee" means in the context of the committee.</p> <p>Make a plan for communication within the cluster. Like a job description.</p>

Group 5

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Why can't at-large representatives be recalled?</p>	<p>Should be some way to remove a person from office if there is a serious problem.</p>

Group 6

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Will there be maintenance of service levels (specifically regarding Delivery, but also generally), will the representatives be able to balance the needs and wishes of members that can and can't pay more?</p> <p>If a representative cannot attend a meeting can they send a proxy from their cluster to ensure representation?</p>	<p>Individual members with specific concerns have the opportunity to speak at meetings of committees where such topics are on the agenda.</p>

Using the 10-point scale, identify the group's overall comfort level with the governing bodies' charges/descriptions. For individual scores of a "5" or lower, explain what might increase their comfort level.

Group 1

Comfort Scores: 7, 9, 9, 7, 8, 9

Average: 8.17

General Comments: "The problems from the various options discussed at the last meeting have been addressed."

"Should be thinking of all of this as 'Are the policies we're developing best for serving people?' rather than 'representative government is representing LIBRARIES'" - "but libraries receive different funding!"

"I am comfortable with the structure because I think we'll make it work no matter what happens."

Group 2

Comfort Scores: 8.5, 7, 9, 6, 7, 8.5, 8

Average: 7.71

Group 3

Comfort Scores: 7, 8, 9, 7, 8, 5

Average: 7.33

General Comments: Was concerned that all high scores would give the impression that "we are done" when there's still a number of questions/concerns that need to be addressed.

Group 4

Comfort Scores: 8, 4, 8, 6, 8, 8, 10, 7

Average: 7.38

General Comments: Would like to see the governing bodies more developed to increase comfort level. See things more spelled out.

Group 5

Comfort Scores: 6, 8, 7, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7

Average: 6.63

Group 6

Comfort Scores: 8, 7, 5, 6, 7, 6, 6

Average: 6.43

Average for All Groups Combined

Overall Comfort Level Average: 7.28

Clustering and At Large Representatives

The six table workgroups reviewed the descriptions of the clusters and the role of the “at large” representatives as proposed in the new governance structure and identified (a) what they liked about the clusters, (b) what isn’t clear and what issues/questions they had about the clusters, (c) their ideas for *addressing* their own issues and questions, and (d) the group’s overall “comfort” level with the clustering model using a 10-point scale.

Overall, what do you like about the clustering process of the new structure?

Group 1

- It attempts to have representative government (has a good “goal”).
- An opportunity to network with a smaller group of libraries of different sizes (better than at LINK meetings). Isn't necessarily true with all of the clusters.
- More efficient working group size. More opportunity for feedback than you might have sitting around a table at a LINK meeting.
- Very effective to integrate small libraries in with large so you don't have that small/large discussion. Opportunity for accommodating "shared" needs, decisions that are respectful of all sizes.

Group 2

- The same system is used for all the committees which keeps it simple.
- It makes for a more manageable committee size.
- It puts the ownership on the cluster groups to function and take more responsibility.
- The libraries within the cluster ensure that people will get to know each other and their concerns.
- It will be re-evaluated and adjusted according to population.
- The diversity (LINK/non-LINK, small/large).

Group 3

- More of a holistic SCLS vision: less of one county vs another county.
- No more soap box meeting, more bigger picture focus.
- Facilitate idea sharing across counties.

Group 4

- Smaller group meetings.
- Valiant attempt to figure out how to do this. Understandable and logical approach.
- Two year "redistricting" process looking at population.

Group 5

- No response listed.

Group 6

- It gets reviewed every two years.

What isn't clear about the clustering process? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would clusters resolve differences amongst themselves? • How will the clusters communicate within themselves? • With the way the clusters are set up, how will Madison have an idea of what small libraries need? (they won't hear it until it hits the AC) 	

Group 2

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
What do they mean when they are referring to work groups?	Ad hoc committees. When it is done with its charge, it goes away.

Group 3

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
Who do at-large reps represent?	Tie to specific libraries - apply recall procedure.

Group 4

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>Small library representation.</p> <p>Why is MALC by itself and not part of the AC and how does voting work for MALC?</p> <p>How are meetings among cluster members held, face to face or in other ways?</p> <p>Job descriptions for cluster representatives and members-at-large.</p> <p>Recall procedure for members-at-large.</p>	

Group 5

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>How is SCLS intending to create two-way communication between cluster and representative?</p> <p>Clusters will be reviewed every two years - but if proximity is required there really wouldn't be any changes unless there is a population explosion in a particular area.</p>	

Group 6

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>How will new libraries be incorporated into clusters, or how will clusters absorb new libraries like Fitchburg in the first two years?</p>	

What questions do you have about the clustering process? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There's a disconnect - if within a cluster a majority of libraries want something but it doesn't necessarily represent a POPULATION that wants something, that may not be very equitable. Votes/pull 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't know what the recommendation would be.

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>within the cluster are not based on population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested timeline, plans for clusters? (p14, #8 - cluster will decide how they will communicate, meet). Should there be a recommendation? Standardization? Seems as though there could be quite a disparity between clusters. Will clusters report publicly or to other clusters? Will there be cross-cluster communication? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May resolve itself. Some people felt it might be good to have "recommendations for minimums" or "suggested ways to communicate" or something similar. Not necessarily REQUIREMENTS. Would like to see info about a cluster's communications between their cluster members out there for others to see.

Group 2

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What technology will support cluster communication? What is the purpose of the at large seat? Why doesn't Madison use branch representation model? Why was this divided up by population rather than circulation? Madison would ask that the clusters be more equalized--will Madison and Dane County get an at-large seat? Who will be willing to serve on the AC and put themselves on the line? This will be a lot of work. How will you sell participation to your library? Is the timeline too aggressive? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Technology staff can help. At large: Scenario A. MPL could have one, Dane County could have one, and a library with a small population. Scenario B. Dane County already has a large representation, perhaps at-large could be for other counties. Madison branch representation: that would probably be Madison's decision. Division: circulation may not represent population. Budgeting may include circulation. Should a busier library have more representation? It may be better politically--serving population may fly better than circulation. Importance of circulation may be reduced in the future. There should be information that can be provided to a board that justifies participation. Some of the libraries in each cluster are bigger and may be able to step up and serve.

Group 3

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Are the clusters balanced among the different sized libraries?</p> <p>What happens if your cluster isn't representative of your library? Can you change if your population doesn't? Why was clustering on library size rejected?</p> <p>Why do three clusters represent so much more population?</p> <p>Are there going to be guidelines for cluster procedures?</p>	<p>Treating the "at-large" reps as Senators--make it 9 clusters with "at-large" divided up with between small/med/large (maybe with another "at-large") and let the at-large have 2 votes. Have them act as kind of a check/balance so no one cluster runs the show.</p> <p>See above answer--basically consolidate some of the smaller clusters--doesn't increase the number of people on the committee</p> <p>Job description for elected cluster rep on committees. Make the "at-large" people more defined--give people an idea who they should contact and would then give the "at-large" a constituency so they could be recalled.</p>

Group 4

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>How does small library representation work?</p> <p>Will the clusters be truly representational of the minority member libraries (i.e. libraries that lie outside of a county -- if an entire county is together in one cluster and there are a few libraries from other counties, since there are different county funding structures)</p> <p>Is geography truly important in the clustering? How can it not be?</p> <p>Madison and Dane Co. need proportional representation, how do we get this?</p> <p>What's the mechanism for communication between clusters? Can two clusters get together and meet?</p> <p>When reevaluating clusters after two years who votes on the reevaluation -- AC or all-directors?</p>	<p>Tough question, no answer for ensuring small library representation.</p> <p>If not geography, maybe service populations? Should the little libraries be in one cluster together? No agreement on this either. If you feel as though you're not represented, you can run for representative in your own cluster. Have to be understanding of inherent differences between libraries. Some small libraries want to be able to rely on a bigger library to represent them since they don't have the time. MUST have good communication. Do more online or in advance with lots of documentation so that travel/geography wouldn't be such an issue.</p> <p>In the current cluster setup Barb proposes 3 votes for Madison and 2 for DCL.</p> <p>AC could draft a working group to look at clusters for the 2-year reevaluation, with one person per cluster involved in the WG.</p> <p>What if there were 4 at-large-members - one representing Dane Co and each of the others representing 2 counties?</p>

Group 5

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some clusters have a lot of member libraries - are they going to get bogged down in details because there are so many members? 2. Many librarians get together on a county level - will the cluster discussions duplicate what they discuss in the county meetings? 3. Is proximity necessary for clustering? Does requiring proximity create more problems than it solves? 4. Some clusters have very few members, e.g. Amherst and Portage County - will it be difficult for Amherst to participate? Amherst is in Portage County, but they are not part of the Portage County library system, so maybe that is why they are part of that cluster? 5. What if a library wants to leave a cluster and join another cluster instead? 6. Is it fair that Madison has only two votes - not representative of population. 7. Madison has different demographics for each branch. 8. How can at-large representatives truly be neutral? Who are they going to be accountable to? The at-large reps could have a hard time separating from the needs of his/her library. 9. What if a particular library had a director that was "extreme" and that director was excluded from the cluster rep and became an at-large rep instead? That person could then promote "extreme" agenda. 10. At-large rep could end up being influenced by "lobbyists" - other libraries might put a lot of pressure on the rep. Concern about at-large rep and whether the at-large rep will truly represent his/her constituency. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depends on communication among cluster libraries - if communication is "in person" then proximity is important, but for online communication proximity isn't important. Some people think it would be interesting to part of a cluster with libraries from a different geographic area. Group members do think it's important to meet face to face at least some of the time. 6. Madison could get more vote(s) based on population. 7. Cluster representatives could be assigned based on branch demographics. Maybe branch representatives could be part of cluster with other libraries. This could promote communication among Madison and smaller libraries and reduce animosity between Madison and small libraries. 10. At Milwaukee County the at-large reps were responsible to the group as a whole - the entire group was the constituency. Constituency needs to be spelled out.

Group 6

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will clusters communicate among themselves, do they need to have a consistent organizational structure, standards for operation? 2. Does splitting clusters over county lines (esp. with Dane Co. members being in 4 different clusters) really weight things fairly? 3. What about Madison being in 2 clusters, is it fair that by population they essentially lose a vote compared to other clusters? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Madison has internal hierarchy and processes already, so all of the other clusters sort of have to establish their own internal structure for communication and decision making. 2. More discussion may be needed about the make up of the clusters. 3. Smaller libraries like that their weight within a cluster feels larger.

Using the 10-point scale, identify the group's overall comfort level with the clustering process. For individual scores of a "5" or lower, explain what might increase their comfort level.

The comfort level with the clustering process question ended up being asked twice within the small groups – first, as part of the initial small group discussion of the cluster approach and then again after the large group had discussed the clustering approach and voted on possible options for it. In order to show the comparison between how people assessed their comfort level before and after the large group discussion and voting process, we've included the two sets of numbers, by table group, at the end of this clustering section.

Large group discussion of and voting on clustering approach options

Due to the amount of discussion of this issue, the facilitators extended the discussion of the clustering approach. During the small groups' reporting out to the large group, the clustering issues that were raised (as recorded by the Russells) included:

- Equalizing cluster size. Should the clusters be equal?
- Representation by branches for Madison?
- At-large representation - by library size? (with weighted votes for small library—2 votes) By geography? Bands?
- It would be good to have job descriptions for representatives; standards/expectations
- How bring in new libraries? How assign to a cluster?
- Give Madison 4 votes, Dane County 2 votes?
- Get rid of "at-large" reps?
- How will "minority" perspectives be heard in county clusters?

It became clear that there needed to be a clear resolution of several key issues that had surfaced during the small and large group discussions. These issues included:

- Should the clusters be “balanced” or equalized so the population of each cluster is similar to every other cluster?
- Should there be “at-large” representatives and, if so, how should they be defined? Who should they represent – truly “at-large,” by library size, or by geography?

As a result, the consultants, conferring with the SCLS director and assistant director, posed a series of questions (listed below) for the large group to consider and vote upon. The voting by the group occurred after the director and deputy explained the various options to the large group. People voted with a show of hands for each of the options presented to them. In question #2, “people” and “votes” after a, b, and c refer to the estimated number of people and votes on the Administrative Council related to that specific choice. The options receiving the most “votes” from the large group are highlighted below in **bold type** and underscoring. These decisions by the large group enabled the group to move forward with a specific plan for structuring the clusters and defining the representative nature of the “at large” representatives.

1. Balance cluster populations? YES/NO?
2. If YES . . . [choose one from the following options]
 - a. Get rid of “at large” seats and reapportion votes - 9 people, 13 votes
 - b. **Create more votes and keep “at large” - 12 people, 16 votes (?) (actual number of votes still to be determined)**
 - c. Consolidate other clusters to represent larger pops. and keep “at large” - 13 votes, 10 people
3. If NO . . . clusters stay as. At-large representatives need to be further defined.
4. If keep “at-large representatives,” how determine: [choose one from the following options]
 - a. At-large is “at-large” - representing all libraries
 - b. **Divide “at-large” by geography (counties or bands)**
 - c. Size of library: small, medium, and large

The director and deputy of SCLS noted to the group that the issue of cluster size and the nature of the “at large” representatives would be reviewed as necessary following the formation of the new governance structure. Adjustments to both clusters and the role of the “at large” representatives would be made if warranted based on what works and what isn’t working with these dimensions of the new governance structure.

Based upon the voting results, the facilitators directed the small groups to discuss and document a new “comfort level” score for the newly defined clusters and at-large definitions. The results that follow for each of the six groups present first the groups’ initial comfort ratings and then follows with the *new* comfort rating.

Using the 10-point scale, identify the group's overall comfort level with the clustering process. For individual scores of a "5" or lower, explain what might increase their comfort level.

Group 1

First Comfort Scores: 8, 7, 7, 6, 8, 7

Average: 7.17

Comments: One person, voting a "6" suggested that: "so much hinges on that 'representative' government. Assume people will be responsible, but have some concerns."

General Comment: "Something that's interesting about this system is that we're doing cross-county things where it's really counties that join systems. Counties are represented on the SCLS board."

Second Comfort Scores: 9, 10, 10, 8, 9, 10

Average: 9.33

Group 2

First Comfort Scores: 8.5, 9.5, 7, 7, 8.5, 8

Average: 8.08

Second Comfort Scores: 8, 6, 9, 9, 8, 8.5

Average: 8.08

Group 3

First Comfort Scores: 7, 5, 7, 7, 8, 6

Average: 6.67

General Comments: If we made the changes suggested here, most people's scores will go up. The 5 would actually go down if we put in these changes--it's complicated now and the changes would make it worse. The way LINK is right now is more straight-forward.

Second Comfort Scores: 7, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6

Average: 6.17

General Comments: After the balanced clusters, the comfort level went up to 6 for the one who had the 5, but it went down for most of the rest of the group. One remained the same. Many of the people at the table had supported the "at-large" by size instead of geography and there was still some interest in getting rid of the "at-large" all together.

Group 4

First Comfort Scores: 5, 6, 8, 8, 7.5, 8, 10, 5

Average: 7.19

General Comments:

- Clusters need to be refined. Really interested in seeing clustering by library size or seeing clustering across counties being reviewed.
- Proportional representation for MAD/DCL.

Second Comfort Scores: 7, 6, 8, 7, 8, 8, 10, 6

Average: 7.50

Group 5

First Comfort Scores: 8, 6, 8, 8, 7, 8, 8, 8,

Average: 7.63

Second Comfort Scores: 8, 6, 6, 7, 8, 8, 8, 8

Average: 7.38

Group 6

First Comfort Scores: 5, 8, 5, 5, 5, 8, 8

Average: 6.29

Second Comfort Scores: 8, 6, 5, 5, 2, 7, 8

Average: 5.86

General Comments: If there were clearer standards of operation for cluster communication and decision making. After large group discussion: the recurring review process needs to review cluster allocations and vote weighting as well. Also: concern about largest libraries ending up with too much weight (much as they do now).

Average for All Groups Combined

First Overall Comfort Level Average: 7.17

Second Overall Comfort Level Average: 7.39

The Proposed Process for Member Charges

The six table workgroups reviewed the proposed process for member charges in the new governance structure and identified (a) what they liked about the proposed process, (b) what isn't clear and what issues/questions they had about the member charges process, (c) their ideas for *addressing* their own issues and questions, and (d) the group's overall "comfort" level with the proposed process for member charges using a 10-point scale.

Overall, what do you like about the proposed process for member charges in the new structure?

Group 1

- Looks like they're going to try for a fair and equitable formula.
- Like that we have a timeline.

Group 2

- Good transitional period/process for the new AC and gives communities time to prepare for cost changes.
- Detailed with target dates.
- It's aggressive but doable. Some like the timeline because it forces progress.

Group 3

- It's good that we're reviewing it. It's time to review it.

Group 4

- Having the option to reevaluate the fee structure.
- 75% approval.
- Having a year to get used to this and opportunity to change.

Group 5

- Ample opportunity for input.
- Good timeline for reporting back to library boards.
- Seems like a good plan - enough voices are heard, and there are enough points along the way with deadlines that it will keep the process on track.

Group 6

- The cost structure does change. There are several cycles of feedback.

What isn't clear about the proposed process for member charges? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't know that it clearly separates the ILS and the technology costs. • Process is clear. The end results aren't. Everyone is a little less comfortable because there are unknowns and it deals with money. • Think October is too late to approve a budget. Is it possible to make that earlier? • Short timeline between determining fee structure and opting out of ILS. (This is actually a bigger window than there has been previously). Why such a short amount of time? 	

Group 2

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
Who decides how votes will be weighted and who approves it? How does the SCLS board approve things?	The AC makes a recommendation to SCLS. The SCLS board has their own governance procedure. Libraries can approach their board representative if there is a concern.

Group 3

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
Everything. It'd be good to know how the task force is going to seek input from the libraries on weighting the vote.	The old fee structure would probably stay in place but no one's sure. Ultimately you need the same money coming in to continue services, it's the way you'll get it that may change.

Group 4

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
I won't know if I like it until I see the actual costs! Ha,ha. But the policy is ok. Is the re-evaluation after a year guaranteed?	Have to go through the process in order to evaluate it. Guarantee that there will be a re-evaluation after a year, in writing as part of the policy. After the first year the re-evaluation should not just be done by the AC, it should be done by all directors, full group.

Group 5

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
No response	

Group 6

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
Lots, until the task force comes back with more information.	

What questions do you have about the proposed process for member charges? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
None	

Group 2

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
What is considered a "member fee" as compared to a service fee? Is there a difference between a member fee and the fees they pay now for databases, etc.?	

Group 3

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>What if the new fee structure isn't approved? What happens?</p> <p>Will there be a tiered service package? ILS/Databases/etc are sort of tiered already but would there still be something like that so people can decide what they need/can afford?</p> <p>What would new library fees be?</p>	<p>The task force puts together tiered options and/or opt in/opt out services.</p>

Group 4

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
None	

Group 5

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a chance that the fees will dramatically spike? If fees go up too far then libraries will be forced to cut somewhere else. 2. If a particular library can't afford the cost, how will that be handled? What would SCLS do with that library for that year? Will there be a provision for extreme circumstances, e.g. LaValle and Rock Springs have been closed for more than a year. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cap increase by a certain percentage because no library can afford a large spike in costs. 2. Incorporate a "hardship clause."

Group 6

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Is the 75%/75% requirement realistic (can that much consensus be attained)? What if that requirement is not met?</p> <p>Are we confident that the current fee structure will work until we can implement a new formula?</p>	

The group's overall comfort level with the proposed process for member charges? For individual scores of a "5" or lower, explain what might increase comfort level.

Group 1

Comfort Scores: 7, 8, 7, 6, 7.5, 7

Average: 7.04

Comments: One of the "7s" noted: "Process isn't bad... it's just that uncertainty. The second year we'll probably be more comfortable with it."

Group 2

Comfort Scores: 9, 9, 7.5, 8, 9, 7

Average: 8.25

Group 3

Comfort Scores: 6, 7, 6.5, 6, 6, 6

Average: 6.25

General Comments:

- Tell me whatever they come up with won't cost my library more.
- If this had been ironed out ahead of time--there was a feeling that this should have been done earlier.

Group 4

Comfort Scores: 8, 7, 8, 8, 8, 8, 10, 7

Average: 8.00

Group 5

Comfort Scores: 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 8, 8, 8

Average: 8.63

Group 6

Comfort Scores: 8, 8, 7, 8, 8, 7, 9

Average: 7.86

All Group Scores Combined

Overall Comfort Level Average: 7.67

The Shared Automated Resources Agreement

The six table workgroups reviewed the proposed shared automated resources agreement and identified (a) what they liked about the agreement, (d) what isn't clear and what issues/questions they had about the agreement, (c) their ideas for *addressing* their own issues and questions, and (d) the group's overall "comfort" level with the proposed agreement using a 10-point scale.

Overall, what do you like about the proposed shared automated resources agreement?

Group 1

- I like that there IS a contract. Can't operate without a contract, especially if the system can unplug somebody for not following the rules.
- Know what you're getting yourself into, at least for now.
- Is fair. Cost formula is being maintained for now. If it changes for the future, it will change because there is a need.
- Since it's not a change, it's hard to be too upset with it.

Group 2

- It's familiar.
- We know our costs for 2010.
- It's good that they are looking at changing the current formula.
- It's renewed automatically so if a new proposal isn't ready in time, we are OK.
- LINK and LINKcat are a terrific success as a service.
- The agreement is between the library and SCLS--line of authority is more clear.

Group 3

- It's pretty clear.
- It outlines SCLS's responsibilities.
- There's a paragraph on enforcement.

Group 4

- Pretty much the same contract we have, same formula until we change it.
- Makes budget more transparent. LINK budget = ILS budget.
- Statute 893.80 is included in the agreement.

Group 5

- Formula is quantifiable.
- It's a placeholder until costs are evaluated.

Group 6

- Knowing that it's clear for the next year and also that it will change; having time enough to educate Boards about what's to come.

What isn't clear about the proposed agreement? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear how it will change (or if it will change). • What will the components of the budget be in the future (after we get to Koha)? • If budget nosedives in the future, what will you have to give up? Uncertainty isn't tied to this agreement, though. • What other factors could be used to determine how the libraries are charged? • Do the percentages allotted to each of the costs really reflect what it costs to maintain/provide those services? (ex. does the circ portion really reflect how much it costs to provide this piece?) 	

Group 2

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
None	

Group 3

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
What exactly does #14 mean? If SCLS isn't responsible for fixing it, who is?	Wording should change to clearly indicate that SCLS will do "due diligence" in case of a vendor failure.

Group 4

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
Compliance and enforcement process. Is LINK = ILS in this agreement?	Spell out what the steps are. Cutting off access to the ILS punishes the community and may be too harsh.

Group 5

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Who do library staff complain to if there is a library that is breaking the rules? SCLS "guided by" language is unclear -- do you mean "guided by" or "directed by"? Not always clear who SCLS is - is it the board or the staff? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on severity - small things (barcode placement) go to SCLS staff - SCLS staff could keep a log if there are repeated violations. Large things (giving out library cards without checking IDs) might have to go to ILS committee. Language should be more clear.

Group 6

What Isn't Clear?	Recommended Response
<p>How will enforcement be enforced? How will the policies work?</p> <p>Concerns regarding new agreement between SCLS and individual libraries - implications?</p> <p>Warnings or fines for non-compliance? Will libraries be kicked out? Doesn't this punish the community?</p> <p>Delivery and Tech committees are not mentioned in the ILS agreement but services provided in those areas impact the ILS (leads to questions about what the agreement does or does not cover, how many different SCLS service agreements a library might have to sign off on, etc.)</p>	

What questions do you have about the proposed agreement? The group's recommended response to each.

Group 1

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
None	

Group 2

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is a remote site? • Under the new system, will Dan's time be even more in demand because he will now be serving LINK libraries? • There is not enough time to get board approval for the new budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A library that is not located in an administrative building. • There will be more cross-over between the existing tech staff.

Group 3

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>What would happen if a library left the ILS and they were the cluster rep?</p> <p>The "adjustment" in #1 --should it still say the \$100,000 since that was evidently years ago?</p> <p>There isn't enough time between the budget done date and the pull out of the ILS date.</p> <p>Is there a commitment that the council will present a revised agreement by a certain date or this agreement will automatically renew?</p>	<p>They should resign.</p> <p>Should it say the previous year's number instead?</p> <p>The day of the budget should be June 1 and the day of pulling out of the ILS should be Aug. 1.</p>

Group 4

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>Do non-LINK libraries have to sign the agreement too?</p> <p>Where it says SCLS "as guided by the AC," can it say "with the consent of the AC?"</p> <p>Can we add language to continue the</p>	<p>An additional agreement for non-LINK</p> <p>Something that protects legal interests of the libraries i.e. guided by AC vs. consent of AC</p>

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
<p>agreement between libraries so that there is still some obligation to be good neighbors?</p> <p>Under #9 "charged for which data?"</p> <p>Under #11 "one year indefinitely" improve this language. Clarify charging mechanism for purging data.</p> <p>End #11 w/ "at the end of the year paid for"</p>	

Group 5

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
How do we make sure that SCLS holds up its end of the bargain? Who does SCLS answer to?	SCLS board is oversight for SCLS staff.

Group 6

Questions We Have . . .	Recommended Response
In extreme cases (member expulsion from the ILS), is there any method of appeal given that it's already a decision by SCLS? Are there warnings, negotiations, etc. or just fines and expulsion?	

The group's overall comfort level with the proposed agreement? For individual scores of a "5" or lower, explain what might increase comfort level.

Group 1

Comfort Scores: 10, 10, 10, 10, 10

Average: 10

Comments: One person commented – "Comfortable until I see what changes in the future." Another person indicated that their library was a non-ILS member.

Group 2

Comfort Scores: 9, 7.5, 8, 9, 8

Average: 8.3

Group 3

Comfort Scores: 6, 9, 8, 8, 7

Average: 7.5

Group 4

Comfort Scores: 7, 5, 8, 7, 7, 6, 10, 5.5

Average: 6.94

Increase Comfort: Change the language about "guided by" to something that gives libraries more legal recourse.

Group 5

Comfort Scores: 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9

Average: 9.0

Group 6

Comfort Scores: 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 8

Average: 6.33

All Group Scores Combined

Overall Comfort Level Average: 8.01

Appendices

Appendix A – The Governance Conference Handbook

Appendix B – Conference Attendees