

Draft
South Central Library System Board of Trustees Minutes
6/24/2021, 12:15 p.m.
4610 S. Biltmore Lane, Suite 101, Madison, WI 53718
Meeting held remotely via BlueJeans & in person

Action Items:

Approved the 2021 Mid-Year Budget & Notes
Approved the 2022 Cost Formula
Approved the 2022 Statutory Resource Services Agreement with Madison Public Library
Approved the 2022 Supplementary Services Agreement with Madison Public Library
Approved the 2022 Cataloging Services Agreement with Madison Public Library
Approved the Agreement to Participate in SCLS Technology Services

Present: F. Cherney, B. Clendenning, P. Cox, S. Elwell, N. Foth, J. Healy-Plotkin, J. Honl, N. Long, M. Nelson, R. Nelson, G. Poulson, T. Walske, K. Williams

Absent: N. Brien

Excused: M. Furgal

Guest: WVLS

Recorder: H. Moe

SCLS Staff Present: M. Van Pelt, M. Ibach, C. Baumann, K. Goeden, V. Teal Lovely

Call to Order: 12: 15 p.m. G. Poulson, Vice President

- a. Introduction of guests/visitors: Bruce Smith, Ben Miller - DPI
- b. Changes/additions to the agenda: None
- c. Requests to address the Board: None

Approval of previous meeting minutes: 5/27/2021

- a. Motion: N. Long moved approval. M. Nelson seconded.
- b. Changes or corrections: None
- c. Vote: Motion carried.

Bills for Payments: The payment amount is \$280,662.65

- a. Motion. J. Honl moved approval of the bills for payment. B. Clendenning seconded.
- b. Discussion: None
- c. Vote: Motion carried.

Financial Statements: K. Goeden provided an overview of the financial statements.

Presentation: 2021 Mid-Year Budget – M. Van Pelt & K. Goeden – changes made to the mid-year budget are highlighted in the mid-year budget notes.

Committee Reports:

- a. Advocacy - K. Williams noted B. Clendenning volunteered to join the Advocacy committee. The board was encouraged and empowered to advocate for their local library
- b. Budget/Finance/Personnel: 2021 Mid-Year Budget & 2022 Budget. Met June 8th.
- c. Personnel: Director 6 month check-in. J. Honl noted the committee met to discuss the progress of M. Van Pelt's 2021 goals. The committee feels that M. Van Pelt has done an

excellent job of continuing her pursuit of the goals and overall leadership. They give her an A+.

Action Items:

- a. Approval of 2021 Mid-Year Budget & Budget Notes
 - i. Motion: N. Foth moved approval of the 2021 Mid-Year Budget & Notes. J. Honl seconded.
 - ii. Discussion: None
 - iii. Vote: Motion carried.

- b. Approval of 2022 Cost Formula -no changes recommended
 - i. Motion: N. Long moved approval of the 2022 Cost Formula. P. Cox seconded.
 - ii. Discussion: None
 - iii. Vote: Motion carried.

- c. Approval of 2022 Statutory Resource Services Agreement with Madison Public Library (MPL) - no changes recommended

- d. Approval of 2022 Supplementary Services Agreement with Madison Public Library - no changes recommended

- e. Approval of 2022 Cataloging Services Agreement with Madison Public Library
 - i. Motion: M. Nelson moved approval of the 2022 Statutory Resource Services Agreement with MPL, the 2022 Supplementary Services Agreement with MPL, and the Cataloging Services Agreement with MPL. N. Foth seconded
 - ii. Discussion: None
 - iii. Vote: Motion carried.

- f. Approval of Agreement to Participate in SCLS Technology Services -no changes recommended
 - i. Motion: M. Nelson moved approval of the Agreement to Participate in SCLS Technology Services. P. Cox seconded.
 - ii. Discussion:
 - iii. Vote: Motion carried.

Discussion Items:

PLSR Delivery – Ben Miller and Bruce Smith, Library Services Team of DPI. You may view the PowerPoint in the documents online.

The board expressed their concerns about the impact the new PLSR Delivery model will have on SCLS. Many questions were directed to B. Miller and B. Smith who noted DPI wants to be a supportive place and encourage an open transparent conversation noting that every effort is being made to mitigate the impact and provide support with LSTA funding. DPI does not want the result of libraries being hurt, but the statewide perspective needs to be addressed.

Comments/Questions:

J. Healy Plotkin voiced her concern that SCLS will suffer the consequences of past actions with the UW contract and inquired what role DPI has in determining the new UW delivery contract with SCLS.

K. Williams noted the PLSR study was intended to help libraries, not hurt libraries, and she is concerned that the figures indicate this will hurt SCLS financially. SCLS took risks to start the contract with the UW.

S. Elwell inquired whether it has been considered to allow SCLS to have the opportunity to continue the role that we have played with the UW contract and not move to an advisory role.

B. Miller noted the advisory role would be contractual and there would be resources provided for that to happen. They want SCLS to be an integral part of it, not just advisory.

B. Smith noted SCLS should continue to stay in the coordinator role. The cost of the new UW contract needed to be transparent to provide a competitive open process and assist in determining implementation. Going forward it needs to be determined what will be the best way to provide service outside the system borders with transparent numbers. SCLS may not be an affordable option for the UW in the future.

M. Nelson noted the numbers look like there was a lot of profit for SCLS, but it does not take into account adjustments and research and development to accommodate cost and the human impact. The escalators that occurred in the UW contract should have been reviewed annually.

J. Healy-Plotkin expressed a concern about the role B. Smith has in this process since he was involved in the contract with the UW when he was employed as the SCLS Delivery Coordinator.

K. Williams inquired: What do you envision will improve?

B Miller replied: Transparency, equity, and more resources to more areas of the state with better efficiency.

B Smith noted there is duplication of service and a single hub model is not a good logistic. Need a statewide connected service and keep a collaborative model.

K. Goeden noted from a financial perspective, this is a hit for the system and we are being put in a position to provide more service for less money. The financial health of the system is based on delivery. The PLSR process came with the promise that no system would be harmed by implementing any decisions made by PLSR. There are also concerns regarding the new building project and the size that will be needed to accommodate delivery. Will the fleet be reduced and if so, SCLS needs to know that information beforehand. SCLS can't make a decision about how big to make the new building if we don't know what will happen.

M. Van Pelt noted in relation to the smaller UW service agreement that it is better to have half a loaf than no loaf at all.

Are the numbers comparable and reliable? C. Baumann and B. Smith noted that they are actual numbers. Who is the final decision maker of the model? DPI is making a recommendation that WPLC become the party responsible for statewide delivery oversight and that SCLS be the project coordinator.

SCLS Foundation Report: M. Van Pelt noted the board will meet in July. The Cedar Grove Public Library joined the foundation.

System Director's Report: You may view the System Director report online. The Rio Public Library went live on LINKcat.

Administrative Council (AC) Report: Met 6-17-2021. You may view the minutes online.

Other Business: None

Information Sharing: None

Adjournment: 2:13 p.m.

For more information about the Board of Trustees, contact Martha Van Pelt