

League of Women Voters Observers Report

Board meeting attended: Woodridge Public Library

Date and Location of meeting: December 19, 2017 at Woodridge Public Library

Meeting started: 7:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned: 8:10 p.m.

League Observer(s): Mary Hobein

Board Members/Trustees present (P) not present (NP) tardy (T): Jay Tiede (P), John Majewski (P), Jane Whiteside (P), Judy Bloom (P), Clinton James (P), William J. Thompson, Jr. (P), Christopher Tripp (P)

Staff Members Present: Pam Dubé (Director), Deb Fowler (Assistant Director), Patricia Harwood (business manager)

Minutes of previous meeting were approved: Mr. Thompson abstained, as he had not been at the previous meeting. All others approved

Estimated Number Attending (excluding Board and Staff): 1

Agenda can be found at: Woodridge Public Library website:
<http://www.woodridgelibrary.org/board-trustees>

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

PRESENTATIONS: none

CONSENT AGENDA: approved by all Board Members

LIBRARY DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Ms. Dubé attended the Woodridge Village Board meeting, at which Patti Naisbitt, the library's program director, was honored as employee of the year. The Board Members were especially attentive when Ms. Naisbitt mentioned an upcoming story-telling program to be given by the village police chief in February. The Village Board also approved the tax levy by unanimous vote. The recent Frosty Fest was well-attended – more than 500 people. The Director got a lot of positive feedback. The most frequent comment was that this event had something for all ages. More than 100 people attended the puppet show and more than 2,000 cookies were served. Ms. Bloom commented that a lot of teens attended the Finals Snacks and Studies program. Circulation figures are still excellent. As of 11/16, the YTD figures were up by 21%.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Approval of Resolution 17-04, Annual Resolution Authorizing Public Library Non-Resident Cards: The state mandates a formula for setting the non-resident card fees. For Woodridge, this yields a fee of \$290 per household (2 cards.) This was unanimously approved.
- B. Approval of Revised Bylaws: This was discussed at the last meeting. Revisions included changing Ms. Dubé's title from administrator to director and fleshing out the indemnity policy. The changes were minor and approved by an attorney. This was unanimously approved.
- C. Approval of Resolution 17-05, Sexual Harassment Policy: In November, the State Assembly passed a law requiring all government entities (including public libraries) to have a sexual harassment policy. This includes procedures for dealing with allegations and consequences for sexual harassment and consequences for false accusations. The library's policy was approved by the attorney and complies with the requirements of the new law. This law does not require training on sexual harassment, but Ms. Dubé would like to add this to the policy at a future date. The current policy was unanimously approved.
- D. Approval of Vendor to Develop and Administer Community Survey: Two organizations, the NIU Survey Group and Public Research Group were vetted to do a public survey to be used for strategic planning. For a good survey with statistical validity, ballpark figure for cost is \$15,000. Different sample sizes can be used; the larger the sample, the higher the cost. If these companies do the strategic planning as well as the survey, the cost is higher. Ms. Dubé thought that if the survey was good, she would prefer to have herself and the Board do the strategic planning, with an outside person to facilitate. Mindy Schneidermann of the NIU Survey Group gave details of breakdown and validity with size of sample. NIU has worked with many libraries, including the St. Charles Library, which was very happy with the recent survey done. The Public Survey Group had less experience with libraries and seemed to push for doing the strategic planning as well as the survey. Both groups have a template for the survey, but would discuss with the library personnel about what is specifically wanted. They would pick a random sampling for the group surveyed.
There was some discussion as to whether the survey should also be posted on the library website so that others could take the survey. Putting it on the website would cost \$1000. This would also increase the cost of analyzing the data. There was discussion about this. Ms. Bloom had reservations about just using the random sample without including others. Mr. Tiede thought that including the public in meetings about strategic planning after the survey would take care of that issue. Ms. Dubé thought that only people with strong feelings would answer the web survey and this would not accurately represent the community as a whole. It was mentioned that the Park District had done a community survey both ways and did not find the surveys that were not from the random sample useful. Mr. Tiede also thought that the

Board would have a better understanding of the survey process if they heard a presentation from the survey company. He thought the Park District survey was too long and people would be more likely to answer if the survey is short. NIU has a large staff and would get a larger survey group. The Public Research Group, which has a smaller staff, would do a smaller sample at a similar price. Comments from Ms. Dubé, Ms. Bloom, and Mr. Tiede were more favorable to NIU Survey Group than the Public Research Group. The Board unanimously voted to hire the NIU Survey Group. The process would begin in January and take about three months. Strategic planning based on the survey would begin in April or May.

- E. Per Capita Grant Application: All board members are in compliance with training requirements (open meetings act training.) Only one board member was required to take safety training. This was done by Clinton James. The grant has not yet been announced but is expected to be about \$25,000.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: Board members feel that when a new employee is announced, they would like to see a photo. Ms. Dubé said that this is being done, but it needs to be done more quickly.

General Features

	Yes	No	Comments
Did the meeting start on time?	x		
Were members attentive and prepared?	x		
Were members courteous to each other?	x		good camaraderie
Were members attentive to the public's comments?	x		
Was the facility adequate?	x		
Could the audience see and hear?	x		
Were visual aids easily visible to the audience			n/a
Were the meeting facilities handicapped accessible	x		

FOIA (Complete once, unless information changes.) Completed for May 2017 meeting. No changes,

Illinois Open Meetings Act requirements

	Yes	No	Comments
Was the agenda posted 48 hours before the meeting? If yes, note where	x		library website
Did the agenda items clearly describe what was to be discussed?	x		
Were background materials made available to the public?		x	
Was there adequate discussion of the issues?	x		
Was there a closed session before, during or after the meeting?		x	
If there was a closed meeting, was any action taken after the closed session? If so, what action?			n/a

Date Submitted: December 22, 2017

By: Mary Hobein