SPECIAL MEETING
SWAN BOARD
Westmont, IL October 12, 2018
MINUTES

1. **Call to Order, Roll Call**

   President Bodewes called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. The following Board members were present to establish a quorum.

   a. Ted Bodewes
   b. Jamie Bukovac
   c. Doug Losey
   d. Julie Milavec
   e. Tiffany Verzani
   f. Stacy Wittmann (arrived 9:37)
   g. Rich Wolff

2. **Introduction of Visitors/Public Comment**

   Aaron Skog, SWAN Executive Director
   Dawne Tortorella, SWAN Assistant Director
   Tuki Sathaye, Itasca Public Library
   Dawn Bussey, Glen Ellyn Public Library
   Edith Craig, St. Charles Public Library
   There was no public comment.

3. **Action Item**
   Ratify Membership Approval of Green Hills Public Library District for SWAN Full Membership.

   Wolff moved, seconded by Bukovac that it be

   > RESOLVED, THAT THE SWAN BOARD APPROVES MEMBERSHIP OF THE GREEN HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY DISTRICT AS A FULL MEMBER OF SWAN.

   Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Discussion Item**
   SWAN Organization Identity: Direct Democracy vs. Representative Democracy; "How does SWAN make decisions?"

   Bodewes reminded Board of the direction from Consulting Within Reach (CWR), Curtis Chang – agree on which questions can be answered and which require further discussion and thought.

   There was Board consensus that SWAN has moved from a Direct Democracy to a Representative Democracy. Confusion centers where Bylaws are in opposition with practice. Some of the symptoms of confusion or conflict between direct and representative democracy include:

- Role of Quarterly Meetings
- Lack of input channels which adds hesitancy in making decisions
- Board's role in mentorship, recruitment of new Board members

Representational composition based on library size/budget and geographic area has been applied in SWAN's past Board representation structure. History can help serve as a guide in what worked and what did not.

Engagement is a critical component for representational democracy. How can the Board help engage and encourage new leadership? The Ambassador Committee used in the past was effective in outreach. Perhaps a job description for Board members or updating the Board role document to include outreach, recruitment, and advocacy would be helpful.

Tactical suggestions:
- Evaluate the Board composition and what would work best
- Help new library directors get to know each other
- Include Candidate Forum for candidates to express their vision for SWAN and how they can contribute
- Include non-Board members in Board Committees as a way to bring others into SWAN and serve as a pipeline for leadership.

Potential steps suggested by Consulting Within Reach:
- Clarify term limits around libraries
- Specific allocation of board seats (i.e. by size, region)
- Expand seats to insure more representation
- Change organization entity from Illinois Intergovernmental Instrumentality to 501c3

Looking at timeline of how long it may take to make decisions, can we look at "Year 0" or immediate decisions that can be made?

Recommended order and action of suggested potential steps:
- Expand Board seats to 9
- Review allocation of seats
- Determine library term limits
- Research 501c3

Skog was asked to check with Curtis Chang at Consulting Within Reach on the source of confusion regarding SWAN Advisory Groups. Is this confusion a factor of new members joining SWAN who operated under different advisory roles? Skog believes this confusion is specific to input on organization policy, contributing to the impression that advisory groups are governance related. It will be important to examine what impact consortia size has on culture and what communication dynamics exist between Executive Director and staff, Board, and Advisory/User Groups.

Consensus: Board affirms that SWAN makes decisions as a **Representative Democracy**. We need to clarify how our **Representative Democracy** conducts business.

5. **Discussion Item**
   SWAN Organization Identity: Member-centric vs. Mission-centric; "How does SWAN make decisions?"

   Consulting Within Reach presented the decision that SWAN has been largely member-centric and needs to be more mission-centric. If the organization mission is to provide an ILS that functions well for the patron, what guides decision-making? A modified, mission-centric organization would focus attention on those areas identified as barriers to patrons (e.g. "fix the catalog").

   While there is consensus for including patrons in the mission statement, tension exists between focusing on needs of "my" patrons versus collective patron population. Need to examine what it means to put the patron in the mission statement.

   The SWAN Board found consensus on modifying the current SWAN Mission: Library patrons should be part of the mission statement. There was agreement on mission-centric decision-making: "How do we help members best improve their patrons' experience?"

6. **Discussion Item**
   SWAN Organization Mission: Public Utility problem vs. Climate Change problem; "What is the problem SWAN is trying to solve?"

   Solicited feedback from three to four directors in attendance at the presentation at the previous SWAN Board meeting indicated that until the "Public Utility" is functioning optimally, there is no reason to consider a mission which includes "Climate Change." This is not to conclude there is no role for SWAN in Climate Change activities, but it should focus on ILS improvement and extension. Some library directors did not like the analogy of Public Utility vs Climate Change. If SWAN focuses on improvement and enhancement of our ILS and resource sharing, we can contribute positively to solving climate change problems. SWAN efforts needs to be very focused in specific areas that could impact climate change in the long-term (e.g. ease of access for e-resources, expansion on streaming services, removing barriers like holds on e-books). The plan should concentrate on materials and ease of access, including online resources.

   The Board discussion on the optimal model included research and development efforts in specific technologies related to the ILS, rather than solutions which focus on Climate Change. The Board discussed looking at what applications/services/needs our members would like to see SWAN focus on and which provide the largest benefit for all. If we go in this direction, we need to have staff that can focus on this activity. Relatedly, a conversation about SWAN budget reserves may be appropriate. There are resources that could be used to provide services/solutions for our members. These reserves could fund one-time costs to get something off the ground.

   Clarify: What does Climate Change mean for us?

Consensus: We exist as a Public Utility and in that capacity, we will innovate. Focused strategic R&D activities should target challenges public libraries are facing to help increase usage and accessibility. We need to make R&D a focus and a benefit.

7. **Discussion Item**
SWAN Organization Vision: Software as End Product vs. Software as Transformative Platform; "What does SWAN's solution look like?"

Different examples may help discussion of this organizational vision. The Board discussed that focus needs to start with ILS but include the possibility of expanding beyond traditional ILS services. We want to be a transformative platform, but we need to focus on specific areas of the ILS before we can look beyond.

Skog posed that this question is not solely about software, but about SWAN provided services. The question reframed as "services as a transformative platform" could be viewed as too broad.

Tactical suggestion: We will commit to software research and development, focused on the ILS, but with a vision to transform and enhance the suite of tools available.

8. **Discussion Item**
SWAN Membership Survey Analysis

Discussion was tabled until October 19th Board Meeting.

9. **Discussion Item**
Analysis of IPLAR Data

Discussion was tabled until October 19th Board Meeting.

10. **Discussion Item**
Recommendations on Identity, Mission, & Vision

Discussion was tabled until October 19th Board Meeting. Wolff requested that Special meeting discussion notes be compiled for future review and development.

11. **Discussion Item**
Steps for Upcoming SWAN Board meetings on October 19, November 1.

12. **Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Board, President Bodewes called to adjourn the meeting.

Verzani moved, seconded by Bukovac, that the meeting be adjourned.
Motion carried and the meeting at adjourned at 12:15 p m.

Minutes Prepared by Dawne Tortorella

Respectfully Submitted,

_____

Tiffany Verzani
Board Secretary