

Winnefox Library System Strategic Planning Committee Minutes  
Tuesday 23 October 2007

The Winnefox strategic planning committee met at 3:00 on Tuesday 23 October 2007 at the Berlin Public Library. Committee members present were: Mark Arend, Karen Boehning, Marie Boleman, Christine Carroll, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Ken Hall, Mary Olson, Stephen Proce, Sara Wilson, Sandy Zuehlke & Paul Wade

Tasha Saecker was absent.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pro-Tem Jeff Gilderson-Duwe at 3:07. Stephen moved and Sandy seconded that the minutes of the September meeting be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Jeff handed out a draft of goals & objectives he was working on. The committee began with discussion of the goals & objective Stephen emailed out. Jeff said he thought the shared directorship was no longer an issue. Sara & Sandy agreed. Stephen said he believes there's an inherent conflict of interest. Paul asked Stephen if he thought there would be a change if there was another board vote; he believes the board has made their decision & it will stand. Mary agreed. She does not believe there would be any benefit to rehashing the issue.

Mary said that our goals shouldn't be too operational. This is not our role. She doesn't see that we're getting off square one.

Chris said we haven't been laying down goals. We've been laying down how to solve problems. How to get there should be discussed elsewhere (All-WALS, LAC meetings, etc.). Goals should be measurable.

Jeff said that's what he tried to put in his proposal. Some goals have been rewritten to be very general. But the objectives are measurable or can have target completion dates.

Stephen noted that some of Jeff's specific points are similar to his points. Chris asked if some of this isn't the board's job: cost effectiveness, etc. Stephen said that in an ideal world yes, that's how it should work. Jeff believes that if accountability standards are set the accountability will be to the members as well as the board. His goal is to make Winnefox a more open & accountable organization. Mary mentioned periodic assessment. Jeff said we're looking at task tracking and job queuing solutions. He would like to present an annual report to each member stating the benefits and services each has received from the system in the previous year.

Stephen asked Mary about difference between real goals. A goal is a statement of where you want to be. Planning sometimes takes on organizational activities. Chris said she thought governance would be a goal. Jeff incorporated Stephen's Electronic Resources goals into his and tried to include the spirit of his concerns.

Stephen said goals should be specific, measurable, & dated. Jeff said that goals can be more general & aspirational; objectives are more specific.

Ken arrived at 3:30

Stephen said that staff time accountability needs to be addressed. Deb Johnson mentioned it in her comments but it's not in her report. Jeff said we're trying to work towards more accountability but disagrees with the need for time tracking. He realizes there are still concerns about shared staff and understands the need to look at it. Chris said that a time study is valid if there are concerns that an employee or department is not functioning. Then it's the manager's task to address the issue. She doesn't think it's necessary to time track everyone. Mary said if there's a problem then the administration needs to address it. Chris said if there are problems with a staff member maybe a third party needs to track their time. But she doesn't think there's a need to inflict it on all staff. Stephen said he's thinking in terms of what he's paying for. He starts from a skeptical position. Since we have the shared director we need to take extra steps to make sure there's an extra layer of accountability and services are distributed appropriately. OPL is billing without an accounting for the billing.

Sandy asked about board meetings. Aren't they open and couldn't someone have brought these issues up? She's skeptical about time tracking. Jeff said he included something on graphics in one objective. We are looking at online tracking for graphics & maybe cataloging. Ken said we're on the right track. He's in favor of some sort of work order system and believes WALS needs it too. Karen said we're looking at call tracking software. She's not sure it will track time or only jobs & requesting library. Stephen said that sounded fine. Jeff said that many tasks benefit more than one member. How do we allocate benefit among libraries? Stephen said we could have a general category or categories. Jeff said he's trying to lay out goals and is writing objectives with target dates. But he doesn't want to pre judge solutions. Ken likes implementing a job tracking system for Winnefox staff. But he never wanted penny by penny tracking that his library has put in X amount of dollars and got X amount out in services. Jeff agreed we don't want to be like Brown County. He commented that the benefit a library receives from system services needs to be looked at over multiple years. One library may get more service one year—for example a major website redesign—and less service another.

Paul asked if we should put in target dates as we discuss each goal. The consensus was to wait until we had all goals & objectives written and to set dates once the whole picture was clearer.

Ken said he thought that there should be an added objective in the electronic resources goal that the Reference & Adult Services committee should have input into selection. He believes there is a role for them in coordination of database subscriptions among libraries.

Marie asked if there was some way to encourage directors to speak up for what they need. They can't wait for the system to always step up. Directors need to take some responsibility to speak up. Jeff said our goals should address what the system can do. Do we need to write objective encouraging directors to do something? He asked if she would draft something. Staff will look for opportunities for "teachable moments". But we can't be seen as overly invasive or stepping on territories. Sara commented that some of this might show up in annual service reports sent to libraries. Sandy said that maybe it's a case of more communication needed about some services. She suggested mentioning services in *Trustee Tales*.

Ken suggested we encourage member libraries to be proactive in learning about & asking for services.

Mark commented that Trustee Tales is a general publication that goes to several systems. We can't mention specific services that one system offers and others may not.

Jeff said we can't instill proactivity but that we'll do what we can to encourage it.

Jeff asked Stephen about his cost-efficient ILS point. Stephen said that in tight budget times we need to have different services ranked for importance so we know what we can drop if it becomes necessary. Jeff said we should be analyzing and deciding what's mission-critical and what isn't. Marie & Ken both agree.

Ken suggested an exercise for the annual meeting. We could hand out play money representing the Winnefox budget and divide up to members. Show them the array of services and ask how much to pay for each.

There was some general discussion on the state budget.

Stephen said we should look at whole pot of money. It's all related. If there's a crisis situation we would be better able to take action that's reasonable and thought out.

Jeff asked Stephen if we've fairly considered his objectives. He said yes except for the first one.

Jeff commented it was getting late and did the committee want to continue going over his draft now or look at them and send comments in. He said he tried to take things from January meeting & from Deb Johnson's report and make them concrete.

The consensus was to continue.

Jeff began reviewing his goals & objectives.

Stephen mentioned something he saw at WLA that used a wiki for training and information sharing. Karen said we're looking at the extranet organization and can include this in that. Some things are appropriate for a wiki format while others (policy documents for example) are not.

Chris left at 4:30

There was a suggestion we adjourn and that people send comments on the draft goals & objectives to Jeff for revision. He will make changes and send out a revised document.

Paul moved and Ken seconded we adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:40.

Next meeting: Tuesday 27 November

Respectfully submitted, Mark Arend