

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE PARK RIDGE PUBLIC LIBRARY HELD
TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 505 BUTLER PLACE, PARK RIDGE, IL**

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Trizna called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

TRUSTEES PRESENT: Robert Trizna, President; Berardino Parisi, Vice-President (*via phone*); Charlene Foss-Eggemann, Secretary; Karen Burkum, Stevan Dobrilovic, Joseph Egan, Patrick Lamb, Judith Rayborn

TRUSTEES ABSENT: Michael Reardon, Treasurer

OTHERS PRESENT: Janet Van De Carr, Library Director; Jodi Bemis Whitney, Angela Berger, Anastasia Daskalos, Linda Egebrecht, Staci Greenwald, Claire Griebler, Gretchen Kottkamp, Parry Rigney, Laura Scott, Library Staff; Anne Lunde, Park Ridge Journal; Taryn Galbreath, Pioneer Press; Joshua Kiem, Park Ridge resident

APPROVAL of REMOTE ATTENDANCE

Mr. Trizna explained that beginning this evening there is a new procedure whereby according to State law, members of the Library Board need to formally approve the attendance of any trustee by remote means. Tonight Mr. Parisi is in Salt Lake City for business purposes. There being no objections to Mr. Parisi attending remotely,

Mrs. Foss-Eggemann made a

MOTION: to approve the attendance at this evening's meeting by Berardino Parisi, Vice-President, via electronic means.

Mr. Egan SECONDED the motion

Roll call vote: 7 Yay: Burkum, Dobrilovic, Egan, Foss-Eggemann, Lamb, Rayborn, Trizna
1 Absent: Reardon

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Egan MOVED to approve the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Lamb SECONDED the motion

Roll call vote

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

COMMENTS FROM THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Mr. Trizna solicited questions from the general public on non-agenda items. There were no comments.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

Mrs. Foss-Eggemann noted that there were no items in either of the correspondence folders, however at each Trustee's seat was an invitation to the MCYAF (Maine Community Youth Assistance Foundation) September 15, 2016 Community Heroes Benefit Dinner.

Per the next item on the agenda, Mr. Trizna called for a motion pursuant to Illinois Open Meetings Act 5 ILCS 120/2a to go into executive session at the conclusion of the regular meeting to discuss a personal matter.

Mr. Egan made a motion

MOTION: for the Board to move into Executive/Closed Session at the end of the current Board meeting to discuss a personnel matter.

Mrs. Rayborn SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Trizna asked if there were any comments. There being none, Mr. Trizna said he has a statement to make in regard to this motion:

Mr. Trizna stated that his "understanding is that this closed session will be for the review of the Library Director. One of the reasons that we are entertaining going into closed session is that in at least one year passed if not two, the Board had done this in open session. Recently the Board received a written opinion from the City's attorney, who is also the Library's attorney, indicating that something called Section 11 of the Personnel Records Review Act of the State of Illinois requires that we go into closed session whenever we discuss or debate an employee's performance evaluation.

As an attorney who does not practice in this area, I want to make that very clear, I believe that opinion is patently and totally wrong. Be that as it may we don't yet know what kind of penalties might accrue to the Library Board or to any member of the Library Board for disregarding advice and doing a personnel review in open session. We also don't know what other liabilities the Library or the Library Board or any trustee could incur because the Library's attorney chose not to address those issues that were raised with him just the other day, in fact refused to address those issues. Separate and apart from a legal issue, the question becomes, and the question that I think we need to address is, why is it important that the Director's performance be evaluated publicly rather than in a secretive closed session? The answer is, I think, fairly simple because it is the Director who is the only Library employee that this Board has the authority to hire, to fire, and to directly supervise. That means the Board's supervision and the Board's evaluation of her performance is one of our most important duties as stewards of the public trust and public tax dollar; and one of the most important ways we, as Library trustees, should be judged for how well we are performing our duties.

Consequently, the most direct and concrete way the taxpayers can assess how well the Board is performing that extremely important duty, and that important part of our stewardship, is for them to see and hear us evaluating the Director's performance; not hidden away in some secretive closed session, but in full view of those taxpayers and the press who provide the funds to pay the Director's salary, otherwise keep the Library going, and trust the Board to do our jobs.

Over the years there has been no transparency in how this process has been conducted. Last year, and I think perhaps the year before that, the Board attempted to inject some transparency to the process and I believe it worked quite well. The City Council did the same; the Park Ridge Park District has done the same; not surprisingly, the two school districts have done just the opposite. Nevertheless, it's up to the Library Board in my opinion to be as transparent as we can, not for every employee, but only for the one that

we have the ability to hire, fire, and that we are charged with supervising. It's not an easy position to be in and I don't take the position lightly that this is something that should be done publicly. No employee wants to be scrutinized in the harsh light of public opinion, but that's what comes with that particular bit of territory and we as the trustees need to be scrutinized for how well we do our jobs and that being one of them. That being the case, I will be voting 'no' on the motion."

Mr. Trizna inquired if there is any further discussion or comments. There being none, Mr. Trizna requested a vote be taken on the MOTION on the table:

MOTION: for the Board to move into Executive/Closed Session at the end of the current Board meeting to discuss a personnel matter.

Mrs. Rayborn having SECONDED the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MOTION PASSED with vote: 6 Yay: Burkum, Dobrilovic, Egan, Lamb, Parisi, Rayborn
 2 Nay: Foss-Eggemann, Trizna
 1 Absent: Reardon

TREASURER'S REPORT

In regard to the Year-to-Date Budget Report on page 43 of the packet, Mr. Egan stated that the *Employee Benefits* line item still has no year-to-date figure and he realizes that last month there was this same discussion and the Library was waiting for the City to make an entry. Mrs. Van De Carr replied that the City was asked again to do this. Mr. Egan asked if she has any indication if they have made any progress. Mrs. Van De Carr replied that not at this point because there are still no figures available. Mr. Egan asked if the City has posted their employee benefits yet, to which Mrs. Van De Carr replied she doesn't know and the Library doesn't have access to that data. In response to Mr. Lamb's question regarding who has to be asked, Mrs. Van De Carr replied it is generally the Assistant City Finance Director, Andrea Lamberg, and she is the one who responds to us. Mrs. Van De Carr emphasized that she will continue to ask for the information. Mr. Lamb asked Mrs. Van De Carr to make another written request and to copy the Board, stating he hopes the contributions are being made and just not being posted. Mrs. Van De Carr thanked Mr. Egan for bringing up the matter, adding she was going to mention it later in her report.

Mrs. Van De Carr directed the Board to the Technology Replacement Fund report on page 39 and explained that she asked the City to transfer the \$100,000 from the current year's budget into this fund and was informed that their new procedure is that they're going to transfer it incrementally on a monthly basis. Mrs. Van De Carr explained that the two Library funds that this impacts are the Library Technology Fund and the Motor Vehicle Replacement Fund. She added that to-date nothing has been deposited into these two funds. Mr. Trizna asked if this is the Library's money. Mrs. Van De Carr stated that it is, and is already in the Library Fund but the money must be transferred from the Library Fund to the Technology Fund.

Mr. Trizna stated that it seems that if the funds are not going to be transferred all at once, someone needs to articulate why instead of it being done on a monthly basis. Mrs. Van De Carr stated she has only received an email stating how this is being done not why. Mrs. Rayborn stated that it seems it is extra work for them do it over a period of twelve months rather than all at once, especially based on what the Board was just discussing in regard to the *Employee Benefits* account not having been posted for three months. Mrs. Van De Carr stated that the City has many funds much larger than the Library, so it may make sense for very large funds to transfer on a monthly basis, but she isn't aware of why and she will attempt to get an explanation for the Board. Mrs. Rayborn asked if the Library finds it has a reason to spend that money would it have access to the funds, to which Mrs. Van De Carr replied yes. Ms. Berger explained that the funds are in the Library's possession, they are in the "Library Fund" as opposed to the "Library Technology

Replacement Fund". Mr. Trizna asked Ms. Berger what physical action would have to take place to make this change with one action, to which she replied in a single transaction it would be a journal entry.

Mrs. Van De Carr pointed out that on page 37 the receipts for the FY16 Per Capita Grant have been added to this report. She explained that the information at the top of the page is the budget that the Board approved for the FY15 Grant. They funds from the two grants don't get combined, and when the FY15 grant is fully expended staff will then bring a budget to the Board for approval for the FY16 Grant funds.

Mr. Trizna asked Mrs. Van De Carr for the record – and because maybe someone watching the video of the meeting may not understand – if this grant money is from the State of Illinois and if the Library counts on this money to do anything specific. Mrs. Van De Carr replied that the "Per Capita Grant" is based on the City's population and historically Per Capita Grant money has been used to fund new services and collections; this funding gives the Library the opportunity to do so without impacting the Library's operating budget. She added that the list at the top of page 37 shows that staff are focusing on digital materials – one of the Library's newer collections. Mrs. Van De Carr reported that for the last few years we received approximately \$1.50 to \$1.42 per capita and it was cut back significantly this year because of the State's budget issues. Mrs. Van De Carr added that the Library was pleasantly surprised to receive the Grant this year.

Mr. Dobrilovic asked since the Library is now in the fourth month of FY17, and the Library has spent a little under 50% of the FY15 Grant, does the Library have specific plans for the use of the FY16 funds, and when does she anticipate that the FY16 funds will be expended. Mrs. Van De Carr replied that the State expects libraries to expend the grant by the end of October of each calendar year. Therefore, the Library's target is to either have the funds spent or committed by October and staff will go to the Library Resources Committee sometime this fall with a proposed budget of how staff wishes to spend the new funds. Mr. Lamb stated that as Chairman of the Resources Committee he looks forward to having that meeting. He added that it appears that combined there is \$50,000 in this Fund which is valuable, to which Mrs. Van De Carr agreed.

The Year-to-Date Budget Report indicates that as of July 31 with 25% of FY16/17 completed, the Library has expended 17% of the operating budget and 19% overall.

Acknowledged in the packet were gifts to the Library Restricted Fund by Century 21 Elm Realtors, and the Park Ridge Lions Club, as well as Buy-A-Brick donations by Fosco and Mazukelli.

LIBRARY DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mrs. Van De Carr stated that this evening at each Trustee's seat is a memo regarding overdue fines. Last month the question "what is the total of late fees owed" was asked. She explained that it was difficult to get this data from its integrated library system, stating she had a conference call with staff at CCS (Cooperative Computer Services), who manages the Library's integrated library system and this is the amount that they were able to provide. The data includes items that were overdue from 2010 to the moment the report was generated by CCS staff on August 12, 2016. She added that the total amount of late fees owed for that time period is \$42,507.97.

Mr. Trizna stated he doesn't see a report on aging, to which Mrs. Van De Carr replied no, she hopes to have more data by next month. She added that the Board also asked if staff waives late fees, and if so why. So after the last meeting she asked Circulation Manager, Ms. Daskalos to have her staff record the reasons why they were waiving late fees, adding that only full time staff in Circulation have the authority to waive late fees. The reasons recorded are listed in the memo. Mr. Trizna stated after reading the memo he still wonders why the fees are being waved and he assumes there's no written guidelines on when to waive the fee. Mrs. Van De Carr replied no, it's a judgment call based on experience; if we feel someone is abusing the goodwill of the Library, staff have the ability to place notes in the patron's record so that staff can look at that record and see if this person

is having fines waived and for what reason. Mrs. Van De Carr invited Ms. Daskalos to come up to the microphone and speak.

Ms. Daskalos stated that there is a way to track the patrons' comments; staff can add a comment to the patron's record and staff are trained to investigate before they make a decision so they definitely look in the record to see if they've ever had fines waived before. Staff have to manually add the comments, but we do a good job of keeping track. She added that it's not the same patrons coming in over and over again and we deal with hundreds of patrons on a daily basis. Ms. Daskalos added that the staff are trained on that and we do want to be fair to all patrons and there have been patrons who've asked me 2 or 3 times and I say 'I'm sorry but that's not fair to the other patrons who live in Park Ridge who do come in pay and their fines'. So I do think we have a really balanced customer friendly approach to this.

Mr. Lamb stated he thinks this is the right approach. He's adding up the fines this last month, it's \$115 this last month, so if it is \$115 every month well then that's \$1,200 and a more significant number, but obviously he believes staff has to use its discretion as relates to whether or not the "dog ate the book". Ms. Daskalos stated that "there are a lot of times where I have waived \$5 off of a \$50 fine saying 'if you pay today I'll waive \$5'. I've been working in circulation for about 8 years and in that time only one patron has ever not paid their fine. I believe that if you don't help them out a little bit they'll walk out the door and never come to the Library again". Mr. Trizna stated that's outstanding and that's initiative that we endorse.

Mr. Lamb stated that Mrs. Van De Carr said that the \$42,507 reflects fines back to 2010, which is six years ago; he assumes the Library takes collection action after a few years. Mrs. Van De Carr replied, no, the Library takes collection action after 60 days, but what triggers the collection action is the person owes us either \$50 in materials and/or \$50 in late fees. Therefore, the \$42,507 is an accumulation of small fines of \$2, \$20, 50 cents, etc., but anyone who exceeds that \$50 threshold immediately goes to collection.

Mrs. Van De Carr stated that another question last month was in regard to cash reconciliations and we are still attempting to gather that information. In the process of this research we discovered that we will have to change the way staff are being trained because we found that staff have been recording all fines as cash and not as credit card or waived. We will have more information soon.

Mrs. Van De Carr reviewed the statistical reports beginning on page 45 of the packet which shows that circulation and year-to-date circulation for July was down slightly.

Mrs. Van De Carr explained page 47 shows the Library's total registered borrowers which indicates the number of citizens who have a Library card. She reported that typically the annual database purge of all library cards not used in the prior three years is conducted at the end of July, at which time this dip in borrower population is seen, and then it climbs again over the course of the year as new borrowers obtain a library card.

Mrs. Van De Carr pointed out that page 55 shows July Computer Use, Virtual Visits, Wi-Fi usage, and Media Lab sessions, along with revenue collected. She reported that the Library launched the new website on July 1 and American Eagle was unable to capture usage data (Google Analytics statistics) for the website for July 1 through July 11. Mrs. Van De Carr explained that the statistics reported on page 55 and 56 only show July 12 through July 31 (12,889 visits). She explained that she has contacted American Eagle to see if that data can be captured. She pointed out that the Wi-Fi sessions are also showing as "zero" and both Computer View and American Eagle are working to retrieve that information as well.

Mrs. Van De Carr added that at the bottom of page 55 is the chart reflecting Business Use Fees collected. She explained that last month the Board asked that this chart indicate the number of unique users who used the Library under the Business Use policy in each month. Mrs. Van De Carr explained these numbers are not cumulative, for example in July four people were in the Library enough times to generate \$170 in Business Use Fees, and explained that the chart indicates users

in the Library once or multiple times, beginning in March, 2016, when the policy fees went into effect. Those numbers may increase when school is back in session.

Mrs. Van De Carr reviewed the personnel report, stating this is the time of year when some of the students leave for college and new Pages are then hired. She reported that one student page left and one was hired, and one new volunteer started this month doing shelf reading in Reader Services.

Mrs. Van De Carr reviewed page 64, which indicates the historical information for the Library Fund. She explained that the Library has a policy that requires that the Library have funds equivalent to at least six-months of operating funds in the Library Fund, which is equivalent to approximately \$2.1 million. She added that is because the Library receives most of its income two times year – i.e., in the spring and again in the fall. There was further discussion about the Library Fund, the tax rate, and the referendum levy.

Mr. Trizna stated he thought the reason the referendum took place in November 2014 was to be able to have the funds as part of the levy in December and therefore the Library would have that money in 2015, to which Mrs. Van De Carr explained that the Library began to receive the additional funds approved in the referendum in the fall of 2015.

Mrs. Van De Carr stated that since it's back to school time she felt it would be a good time to introduce the two people responsible for partnering with local schools and to give the Board an overview of some of the programs they have created. Mrs. Van De Carr invited Staci Greenwald, School Services Coordinator and Librarian, and Claire Griebler, Teen Services Librarian to give their presentation. Ms. Griebler explained that she works with District 64 and District 207 (middle school and high school) students in grades 6 through 12. Mrs. Greenwald explained she is responsible for working with District 64 schools (Kindergarten through grade 5) and the private elementary schools.

Ms. Griebler and Mrs. Greenwald spoke for 33 minutes, and also showed a video that demonstrated the services they and their departments offer to teachers and students, stating that they emphasize to the teachers and LRC directors in the schools that the Library is here to help them save time and help them in any way possible; from gathering reading and research materials for their classrooms to hosting storytimes and book discussion groups for middle school and high school students. They also explained that they promote students having a library card, and the Library has a program where out of district students who attend Park Ridge schools can obtain a temporary library card for use during the school year. Mrs. Greenwald explained that the Library has partnered with District 64 to arrange for use of their van, so someone from the school comes and picks up Library books requested by the teachers and takes them to the schools, and then brings them back from their schools when the teachers are done with them.

Mrs. Greenwald stated one of her favorite things to do is her monthly visit to Jefferson school to conduct a special needs storytime. She explained that the kids get excited to see "the Library lady". Another program is the Reading Patch Club, which has been a Library program for at least thirty years, wherein the kids can earn specific patches for reading books about particular subjects.

Mrs. Greenwald explained that she and Ms. Griebler do a lot of summer reading club visits at the schools at the end of the year. Staff sees a spike in library card and Reading Patch Club sign-ups after the school visits. Mrs. Greenwald also explained another program that has been at the Library for at least thirty years, which is the Battle of the Books. Staff assembles a reading list of 60 books for 4th and 5th graders. Each school has a team that represents the school and in January and February they compete against one another to answer questions about those books.

The other very popular program is "*Book Madness*", which is a program started two years ago. It takes place in March like basketball's "March Madness", but students vote on books instead. Some of the most popular books among 4th and 5th graders are paired against each other and the kids vote on their favorite books until there's just one winner. Students can fill out a bracket ahead of time and they get points based on what they get correct, then the 3 kids with the most points at the end win

Target gift cards. It's just a fun way to see them compete and the boys love this program. Mrs. Greenwald showed the video for "*Book Madness*" that she showed during school visits last year, adding that using the videos reaches more kids and builds excitement for the program. She added that 714 kids participated this year, out of approximately 1,259 students in 4th and 5th grade, so that is approximately a 57% participation rate for all 4th and 5th graders. They were allowed to vote more than once and they were encouraged to do so, and at the end of the session there were a total of 11,923 votes cast. Ms. Griebler stated that *Book Madness* is such a popular program for the 4th and 5th graders, that now the 6th grade and older students are asking her to hold a version of *Book Madness* in Teen Services. She commended Mrs. Greenwald on creating such a wonderful program. Ms. Griebler stated she hopes to incorporate it into her programs this year.

Ms. Griebler explained some of her favorite programs she conducts at schools. One is the Literary Lions Book Club (the kids came up with that name by themselves), which she started with Denise Reeder, the librarian at Lincoln Middle School. Lincoln offered a book club a few years back but it wasn't quite successful so they decided this school year to try it again. Ms. Griebler and Ms. Reeder held an interest meeting in September and only two kids attended, but they decided to forge ahead anyway. To be an official club at Lincoln you have to have at least 5 kids, even though only two kids showed an interest in the beginning, more and more kids started attending each session and at the end of the year there were a total of 14 kids, which was amazing, considering so many were also in sports and other clubs. It was really nice that instead of sitting at home watching TV or doing homework, they came to the library after school and hung out with her and Miss Denise and read a book. Ms. Griebler said that one time last year the group was able to Skype with an author which was really fun for the students. She added that she and Ms. Reeder want the students to be in charge of the club so they're the ones who pick out the books they're going to read. It's a really fun club that they hope will grow even bigger in the next few years.

Ms. Griebler stated that the second thing she does, and probably her favorite, is that she conducts three book talks throughout the year. In the fall she gives a book talk at every school she can get into – Lincoln, Emerson, St. Paul of the Cross, Mary Seat, Maine South – every fall, every winter and then every spring and she talks about 10-15 books, and this is to groups in size from 30 students to an auditorium full of students.

Ms. Griebler stated that she and Mrs. Greenwald want to talk about their goals for this school year. *Tutor.com* is again being offered by the Library and so we are making sure to promote this program at all of the back-to-school visits and back-to-school fairs and let everyone know that the service is back. Probably more parents are excited about this than students, because the parents have been taking a lot of information cards at these visits.

Ms. Griebler mentioned the teacher library card program that was recently approved by the Board. She and Mrs. Greenwald will work on getting as many teachers as possible signed up for these special library cards once the agreements are finalized.

In regard to the Illinois Book Award Voting, Ms. Griebler reported she just added the Abraham Lincoln Award books to the high school collection and announced that she has been selected to be on the award's nominations committee. The Abraham Lincoln Award is an award given to a title selected by high school students.

Mrs. Greenwald reported that the Children's Services department has the Monarch, Caudill and Bluestem books out for the kids. This year for the first time, she is working on coordinating with the schools, since a lot of the schools don't do voting on their own, she is hoping the Library can be the central voting location, get kids more excited about it and get them coming into the Library looking for those books and to vote on them as well.

Mrs. Greenwald stated that both she and Ms. Griebler are always trying to get into the schools as much as possible, getting into the LRC's and classrooms to do book talks, storytimes, and thinking of new ways to help out the teachers and be there for the students.

Ms. Griebler stated that, as she mentioned before, because *Book Madness* has been so popular at the elementary schools and the kids are growing out of elementary school and get to the YA Loft and ask her where's *Book Madness*? She reiterated that she is working on the program now so that it will be ready in February for the middle school and high school kids when she does her winter book talks so she can promote *Book Madness* there as well.

Mr. Lamb commended them both for their hard work and creativity and said he loved the videos and the Board applauded them.

Mr. Trizna asked how the students access the videos, to which Mrs. Greenwald said that many schools are in the middle of testing at that time so she gives the link to the teachers to show to their classrooms. She added that the videos are also linked on the Library's website so they can watch it whenever they want to do so, and then she is able to visit some of the schools and present the video at that time.

Mr. Trizna asked Mrs. Greenwald if they have a database of email addresses for the students who participate in these programs – like the 714 students who participated in the *Book Madness* program. Mrs. Greenwald replied, no, we don't collect students' emails; she stated that the department has an email list for the teachers who sign up for that, to whom information is sent regarding Library programs, the newsletter, etc.

Josh Kiem, Park Ridge resident – commented that he is married to a preschool teacher and he stated he would be in trouble if he didn't mention that Library staff does a great job for the preschoolers as well, and asked that they not forget the preschoolers as schools start.

Mrs. Greenwald stated that staff also visits the preschools, they won't be forgotten.

The assembly applauded Ms. Griebler and Mrs. Greenwald for their presentation.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Planning & Operations:

Mr. Parisi reported that there were three policy items and potential decisions this evening as well as one bylaw decision.

The Committee discussed adding rule #11 in Policy IA1, Purchasing: Requests for Legal Counsel from Trustees. Mr. Trizna solicited comments and questions regarding the motion. There being none,

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Parisi made a

MOTION: to approve *Policy IA1, Purchasing Policy* as revised

Roll call vote.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Parisi stated that the next matter discussed in Committee was the current policy, *Policy IB4, Test Proctoring*, which relates to the use of the Library as a test proctoring site. Mrs. Van De Carr shared with the Committee of the Whole the cost to the Library to support this service. It was determined after a detailed conversation that the cost to the Library is greater than the current price point of \$5 to have a test proctored by Library staff. The Committee decided to raise the test proctoring fee to \$35 and for staff to monitor its use over the next eight months, at which time the Board will make a final determination as to what the price should be, or whether the test proctoring service should be discontinued.

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Parisi made a

MOTION: to modify *Policy IB4, Test Proctoring* to reflect a fee of \$35 for test proctoring; to monitor the use of this service for 8 months and review it again at that time.

Roll call vote.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Parisi stated that the Committee discussed a revision to the By-Laws in regard to the procedure whereby invoices are approved and in regard to dollar amount. The Committee agreed that there is room to improve the current procedure and established a threshold of \$5,000. There was discussion regarding the verbiage of the Bylaws. Mrs. Van De Carr explained that by the time that the warrants had gotten to the Board President, they had already been approved by several individuals including the Board Treasurer and the City Finance Director. Mr. Trizna added that the expectation was that the Board Treasurer would be an adequate safeguard for the Board and that the City Finance Director would be a proper check and balance from the City side. Mrs. Van De Carr reminded the Board that every month in the Board packet, the Board receives a list of every check that the Library issued in the previous month along with the vendor's name and the reason for the check. Mr. Egan verified that the \$5,000 limit matches the limit for Mrs. Van De Carr to be able to approve an expense without Board approval. In response to Mr. Lamb, Mr. Dobrilovic stated that he modified the warrant affidavit and it reflects the change in the procedure on the table this evening.

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Parisi made a

MOTION: to approve the Bylaws as revised.

Roll call vote.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Parisi reported that the final matter on the table is the motion for *Policy IA1a, Payments for Goods and Services*. Mrs. Van De Carr stated that this is actually a new policy that resulted when Mr. Reardon and Mr. Dobrilovic were discussing the changes in the Bylaws they had volunteered to review. Mr. Dobrilovic felt the Library needs a policy that outlines the procedure that was discussed by the Board and reflects the Library's actual procedures. Mr. Trizna stated that the actual policy appears on page 77 of the packet. Mr. Dobrilovic explained that he took on the task to draft some language to reflect the streamlining of the payment policy. He felt it was unusual that the Library had a very elaborate procedure in place for the payment of goods and services but it wasn't in writing. He therefore suggested that the Library have a written policy that describes the procedure with the numerous checks and balances so that it is on record.

Mr. Parisi stated since he is unfamiliar with this particular policy and procedures, he is uncomfortable making the motion.

Mr. Egan stated that he believes that under rule #1 there should be a period at the end of each sentence of points "a" through "g". Mr. Trizna suggested maybe a semicolon instead. Mrs. Van De Carr stated that will be reviewed and revised as appropriate.

Mr. Dobrilovic made a

MOTION: to approve the punctuation change to draft Policy IA1a, *Payments for Goods and Services*.

Mr. Trizna seconded the motion.

Roll call vote.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Dobrilovic made a

MOTION: to approve draft Policy IA1a, Payments for Goods and Services as revised.

Mr. Trizna seconded the motion.

Roll call vote. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Communications & Development:

Mrs. Foss-Eggemann reported that the Communications & Development Committee discussed the June 2016 Patron Satisfaction Survey results. There were fewer comments to the online respondents than from the in-person survey participants. The survey was promoted through an email sent to subscribers inviting them to take part and there was also a pop-up message on patron computers inviting users to take part in the survey. There were over 700 respondents to the in-house survey and 758 respondents to the online survey. Overall the response to the question, "how satisfied are you", exceeded the 95% set by the Board as a strategic goal. The Committee discussed how to modify the survey questions, questions about people being able to respond more than once and trying to prevent duplication. The Committee also discussed whether to keep it anonymous or asking for names, or somehow identifying respondents without taking a name. In the end the Committee decided to try a survey where it was optional to provide a name so that respondents could have their comments heard, and also be able to give Library staff the ability follow up in case the comment required a response

The Committee decided that the next survey should be scheduled to take place in early November since the Strategic Plan asks the Library to solicit the public every six months. The Committee will discuss the substance of this survey next month, whether to conduct a one-question or multiple-question survey, etc., depending on the needs of the Library but the overall satisfaction question will remain in the survey.

Mrs. Foss-Eggemann reported that the Committee discussed an idea she had to enhance the Library Improvement Project. There may be many nice touches and special items the architect may suggest that the Board won't be comfortable spending tax payer dollars on, however, there are so many people in this community that love our Library that they may want to sponsor or donate some of those special extras to make the Library even better. She stated that in that regard, maybe the Library can host an open house or gala, with maybe donated entertainment, as an opportunity to showcase the architectural drawings and ideas on the wish list, to give patrons and potential donors an opportunity to see them. Maybe even have a registration for potential donors. She added she would like to consider convening a committee by September 30, 2016 consisting of Library Board Trustees and interested citizens. Counting the Trustees as de-facto members, hopefully have 9 community members, and of course a couple who can really spearhead the entire project. Mrs. Foss-Eggemann added that of course, all of this will depend on when Studio GC will be ready to break down all the specific features by line item. Mrs. Foss-Eggemann announced that if anyone is interested or knows anyone who would be interested in being on the steering committee for a 2017 "open house" or gala to fund enhanced improvements to the Library to please inform the Board.

Building & Grounds:

Mr. Egan reported that the main focus of the Building & Grounds Committee meeting was the status of the Library improvement project. The Board wants to meet with Studio GC for them to present their status-to-date, progress, ideas and costs. Mr. Egan reminded the Board that the date for this meeting is Thursday, August 25 at 7:00 pm in the Library's third floor meeting room. In response to Mr. Trizna, Mrs. Van De Carr stated that eight trustees responded "yes" and there was one non response for this meeting.

FRIENDS OF THE LIBRARY

No report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Egan stated he has a comment regarding the response the Board received from the City attorney in regard to Mr. Trizna's questions to their legal opinion as it relates to the Illinois Open Meetings Act and conducting the Director's review in public. (As per Mr. Trizna's explanation earlier, recently the Board received a written opinion from the City's attorney, who is also the Library's attorney, indicating that Section 11 of the *Personnel Records Review Act of the State of Illinois* requires that the Board go into closed session whenever it discusses or debates an employee's performance evaluation.)

Mr. Egan stated that he "felt that the response we got back from our counsel was inadequate and unresponsive. I was not satisfied with the answers that he provided, which was basically 'we have a disagreement'. I thought the questions that were posed to him would provide us a basis for your legal counsel that he gave us, of which he answered none of those questions. I for one was not satisfied with the answer he provided. I don't know if others feel the same way. I would like to see more on that topic."

Mrs. Foss-Eggemann stated, "I agree with you. I was disappointed with the response because I thought the questions put to him were very legitimate questions and it didn't seem like there was any effort to answer those questions in a substantive way with additional research. It was just, 'this is our response' and I believe he said 'it's not going to change' so the conversation was stopped and I don't feel that's the way we should be doing business."

Mr. Lamb stated that "as a 35-year practicing attorney, and this being our legal counsel, regardless of whether I agree with his opinion or I don't agree with his opinion, that wasn't what bothered me. What bothered me was the fact that when questions were asked, that they took the position that 'because Mr. Trizna obviously disagrees with our opinion' that they had no reason to answer the questions. And the problem is whether I agree with Mr. Trizna's questions or not also is not relevant. All of us Board members benefit from – especially those who are not in the legal community – benefit from factual responses to a question so that each of the trustees themselves can have a larger 'pool of knowledge' or 'resource' or 'reference', in order to help them individually make a decision regarding (it) regardless of what the issue is. In this case maybe the issue is sensitive to this attorney, but that's what was bothersome to me. I'm not sure where we go from that point. Maybe we seek a separate opinion from an attorney who will answer those specific questions. It takes time, it takes some research and again, not necessarily whether or not I agree or I disagree with Mr. Trizna, it's the matter of at least answering the questions so each trustee can then form their own opinions based upon, again, additional information because that's the role of our outside legal counsel."

Mr. Egan said, "I would like to add one thing. I agree with all that you said. I think it goes beyond difference of opinion. I thought some of the questions posed to them was to 'provide the basis for your following statement'. I don't know if there's a difference of opinion. I wanted to hear what the basis was for some of those pieces of advice he gave and at this point I don't see that."

Mr. Trizna opined that "the attorney's response suggests a level of unprofessionalism and it suggests a level of irresponsibility that I find troubling in a fellow attorney who in all other respects I like and respect. I just think it's an unprecedented type of response and I think it effectively disrespects not just me because the question was posed by me on behalf of the Board. We followed the procedure even though it wasn't officially implemented at the time of having both Mrs. Foss-Eggemann and Mr. Parisi sign off on all of the questions so that we weren't burning attorney time for frolic and detour. That being said, it was beyond disappointing, and how we deal with it I guess is something that probably needs to be discussed at the next COW meeting."

Mr. Trizna solicited comments or questions from the Trustees and audience; there were none.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Trizna asked for a motion to adjourn the current meeting with the understanding that the Board will be going into closed session and will not be reconvening to take any action out of closed session tonight.

Mr. Lamb made a motion

MOTION: for the Board to adjourn the regular meeting and go into Executive/Closed Session to discuss a personnel matter.

Mr. Egan SECONDED the motion.

Voice vote. No one opposed.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Trizna confirmed that due to State law, because Mr. Parisi is participating via remote means, he will not participate in the closed session.

Mrs. Van De Carr stated that at this point the camera and recorder will be turned off.

CLOSED SESSION

Regular meeting ADJOURNED TO CLOSED SESSION AT 8:35 p.m.

Closed Session CALLED TO ORDER at 8:46 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT – CLOSED SESSION

Mrs. Foss-Eggemann MOVED to adjourn the Closed Session.

Mr. Lamb SECONDED the motion.

Roll call vote

Closed Session adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Egan MOVED to adjourn the Board meeting.

Mr. Lamb SECONDED the motion.

Voice vote

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.