

**South Central Regional Library Council  
Board Meeting  
March 21, 2014  
Southern Tier Library System**

**Present:**

Linda Beins  
Susan Bretscher  
Pamela Brown  
Lis Chabot  
Kate Dimitrova  
Richard Entlich  
Deb Gagnon  
Brian Hildreth  
Aprille Nace  
Charles O'Bryan  
Mark Smith  
Nicole Waskie-Laura  
Sarah Weisman

**Excused:**

Jill Dixon  
Susan LeBlanc

**Staff Present:**

Mary-Carol Lindbloom  
Danna Harris  
Kathleen Jackson

**Doc.#2014 - 12**

**Presiding.** Beins called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**Agenda.** Weisman moved to approve. Second by Dimitrova. Approved.

**Doc.#2014 - 13**

**Minutes of January 31, 2014 meeting.** Gagnon moved to approve. Second by Nace. Approved  
**President's Report.** No report.

**Board Committee Appointments.** Discussion tabled; Gagnon and Lindbloom will update list and distribute to the Board.

**Doc.#2014 – 14, 15**

**Treasurer's Report. Bill Sheet #7 - AskUs 24/7:** O'Bryan had a question regarding this item; Harris indicated that the program is a cost share between RBDB and the participating libraries. Lindbloom will distribute AskUs statistics. Entlich questioned the amount spent for automobile maintenance, whether a replacement is needed, and suggested budgeting more for this line as the car ages. O'Bryan asked about the IT line; Harris explained that it includes hardware, software and tech support, which is now broken out for tax reporting. Entlich asked about the printing line—nothing has been spent, including the *Annual Report*. Lindbloom indicated that it was posted to the Annual Meeting, which we sometimes do, and that printing for Academic Librarians 2014/Empire Collaborations was budgeted within that line. Adjustments for 2014-2015 will be made accordingly (i.e., no AL 2014 or *Plan of Service* to print). Smith moved to approve. Second by Hildreth. Approved. **Bill Sheet #8** – Harris clarified charges from FLTG as follows: \$108 is telephone, \$327.39 included \$199 for February Internet Service, plus a pro-rated charge for service in January. Lindbloom indicated that funding has not been received yet for the NN/LM MAR grant; the TPS grant has been delayed due to Hogan's resignation. She has received approval to hire a project director; SCRLC has until December 31 to complete the activities. Entlich moved to approve. Second by Gagnon. Approved.

**By-Laws & State Regulations Committee.** No report.

**Nominating & Board Development Committee.** Gagnon, Beins, Lindbloom, Hildreth and Smith provided training for new members, Jill Dixon and Nicole Waskie-Laura. Board Retreat: 6/6 in Binghamton. Lindbloom wrote a NYCON grant in support of the retreat. It would be the third year of funding, so it remains to be seen as to whether or not it will be approved.

**Personnel Committee Report.** The committee met several times resulting in the *Employee Handbook* and the Executive Director job description ready for Board approval.

**Doc.#2014 - 16**

**Employee Handbook Approval.** The hostile environment and sexual harassment portions were edited. Lindbloom requested that she be allowed to make grammatical and punctuation changes if discovered without seeking Board approval. Those present agreed to this. O'Bryan moved to approve the *Employee Handbook*. Second by Chabot. Approved

**Doc.#2014 – 17**

**Executive Director's Job Description.** Description has been rearranged and regrouped and is now ready for approval. Entlich indicated that page 2, first heading, "Governance Meetings & Records" needs a comma between "governance" and "meetings." Chabot moved to approve with the correction. Second by Dimitrova. Approved.

**Doc.#2014 – 18**

**RBDB 2014 Grant Applications.** O'Bryan was recused for this portion of Board Meeting

An outside review panel is used for an unbiased review and recommendations; ACITS then reviews their recommendations, endorses, and submits them to the Board for approval. The applications were discussed by the Board.

Elmira College. Digitization/ILL scanner. SCRLC Board Recommendation: See if they can accept \$5,000 in funding (they had indicated accepting less than full funding (\$8,000) would not really be possible. Beins suggested approaching Elmira for a revised proposal to do digitizing rather than to purchase the scanner.

Cortland County Historical Society. \$1,044. Digitization of 1,000 Brockway images. SCRLC Board Recommendation: Approve.

NYSHA. Requested \$8,000 for digitization. SCRLC Board Recommendation: Table until it is known what happens with EC. NYSHA will accept reduced funding and have been awarded two RBDB grants in recent years.

SUNY Oneonta. \$8,490 for collaborative digitization project with area historical organizations. SCRLC Board Recommendation: Approve.

**Grant application issues.** Lindbloom indicated that one of the applicants contacted suggested SCRLC ask for more components in the application to negate the need to go back to the application. This is most detailed application to date, and most granting agencies contact applicants as needed—it is better than trying to second-guess an application. Every situation cannot be anticipated.

**Suggestions and Questions.**

- The Board and ACITS meet to establish priorities and generate ideas and momentum.
- Add or revise questions on form to determine how many times they have applied for and were granted RBDB funding.
- Develop a rubric/criteria to measure what is asked for.
- Actively solicit grants from member libraries.
- Create a chart showing the history of RBDB grants – Institution/Project/Amount Awarded. This will help show how money is spread among the region and library type.
- Have repeat applicants show funding use.
- Since ILL is a direct part of resource sharing, should the focus be mostly on digitizing? Should the grant be only for digitizing projects?
- Equipment can be a better use of funds in that it increases the capacity and geographic area, especially if we ask that equipment be shared (this would be a regional requirement—it is not a State one). Perhaps encourage outsourcing rather than equipment purchase—there may be a better chance of starting/completing the project.

Beins suggested that Cortland County Historical Society and SUNY Oneonta applications be approved but to table Elmira and NYSHA until EC questions are answered. The Board can vote via conference call. Dimitrova moved to approve the motion. Second by Hildreth. Approved.

**Doc.#2014 – 19**

**Regional Focus Groups** (*O'Bryan rejoined the meeting*). This has grown out of a need to rethink job descriptions and skill sets needed for vacant positions and an opportunity to re-imagine SCRLC; a time to reflect not on what SCLRC does now, but what needs the Council (i.e., the members) will have—this is too good of an opportunity to pass up. The Personnel Committee suggested five regional groups led by Board members plus one to take notes. This will demonstrate the Board's involvement and commitment to SCRLC. Are these discussion groups or focus groups? Nace indicated they will be more formalized but not focus groups--more of a guided activity. The groups will include current SCRLC members, all of whom should be welcome to attend and share thoughts. The emphasis will be on what members need from SCRLC and what SCRLC can offer, as opposed to "here are the services we offer now." It is an opportunity to learn where members think they will be and how SCRLC can best meet those projected needs. SCRLC staff will not attend the discussions.

In that staffing will be down 1/3 for awhile, Lindbloom was encouraged to spend saved salaries to outsource whatever is necessary in the interim.

A chart created by Diane Capalongo shows the areas of density/clusters. The Board identified the following teams for each meeting:

**Bath** – Smith, Dimitrova, Hildreth. Corning area members will be moved to Bath (Lindbloom will revise chart).

**Elmira** – Nace, Weisman.

**Binghamton** – Dixon, Bretscher, Brown, Waskie-Laura.

**Ithaca** – Chabot, Beins, Entlich, Gagnon; possibly hold at TC3 (Chabot will contact G. Kiehl).

**Oneonta** – O'Bryan, LeBlanc.

Meetings will last 90 minutes; food and drink will be provided from Board budget line.

The Personnel Committee welcomes suggestions for questions and topics to emphasize. The *Plan of Service* can be used to identify areas needing input, though should not be sent to invitees, as doing so could constrain the conversation.

**Timeline.** By the 6 June Board Retreat – make it a big part of what we do there. The discussion group meetings should be held by mid-May. Teams will determine their own meeting dates.

**Question suggestions and dates should be sent to Aprille Nace by 3/31** - 5-7 questions will be selected.

Nace and Lindbloom will work on the regional lists and the invitations. Lindbloom and all Board members are invited to suggest participants; Lindbloom will also announce in the weekly news. Participants will be asked to RSVP to the appropriate group leader.

**Conflict of Interest Forms Report.** As required, Lindbloom reviewed the document for conflicts and discussed the third question. At least one Board member had circled "Yes" based on the fact that they were a member of a member library. Most everyone answered no. Since SCRLC is a membership organization, most of the Board members are in this relationship. Weisman said the anticipation was that the answer to question three would be no. She suggested re-writing the request to exclude all normal member dealings. Entlich added that the forms are retrospective – so questions regard the previous year, rather than to anticipate a conflict in the future. Lindbloom will seek clarification from SCRLC's accountant and perhaps attorney; she and Weisman will re-write. Board members who didn't return the form should nonetheless complete the current one.

**Doc.#2014 – 20**

**Work Plan 2014** – Lindbloom revised the work plan as per January Board input. In the past, plans were topics of discussion associated with keeping the PoS on track but did not require Board approval. Entlich noted that the top of page 2, third bullet contained a typo (“update”).

**Doc.#2014 – 21**

**Executive Director’s Report.** Lindbloom reported that she received a request from IMLS to adjust a budget item, which could be a good sign. She has been participating in three MOOCs evenings and weekends, including one on library advocacy and the history and future of higher education. They could serve as a loose model to redesign CE and levels of participation in it. How could digital badging and forums help participants to engage and dig more deeply on topics? She looks forward to discussing this with Hardy upon her return.

**Doc.#2014 – 22**

**Advisory Committee Minutes.**

Lindbloom commented that she “tweeted” the legislators for the first time in addition to “traditional” emails. A short discussion ensued regarding how much the senate/governor want or don’t want to give libraries this budget year. Also that the legislature says libraries are at fault and that we don’t have the money we need because we require librarians to have an MLS. Assemblywoman Lifton asked for full restoration. Lindbloom: “Advocacy is not a one day event—it is a process, the relationship we build over time.”

**Adjournment.** Gagnon moved to adjourn the meeting. Second by Smith. Meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m.

Respectively submitted,

Linda Beins, Secretary