

Oregon State Library
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
August 29, 2013
Oregon State Library, Salem

Board members present: Ebonee Bell, Aletha Bonebrake, Sam Hall, Susan Hathaway-Marxer, Ismoon Hunter-Morton, Ray Miao.

Guests present: Kelly Jensen, Senior Consultant with Mass Ingenuity, Vicki Jorgensen, DAS Enterprise Human Resource Services, Sarah Miller, Deputy Chief Operating Officer.

Staff present: MaryKay Dahlgreen, Margie Harrison, Shawn Range, Jessica Rondema, Susan Westin.

Chair Aletha Bonebrake called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m., declaring a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were a few edits suggested for the minutes from the June 21st Board meeting. **Miao moved to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2013, Board meeting, with the discussed edits. Hathaway-Marxer seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

REPORTS OF BOARD CHAIR AND TRUSTEES

Executive Committee Report

The Board members reviewed the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting on July 27th. Miao had a question about the IMLS site visit. IMLS officers perform site visits every five years. Ann Reed arranged for them to visit with some of the libraries that have grant-funded programs. It is also a monitoring visit to be sure we are paying attention to the fiscal details and allowable costs. These are not surprise visits. Reed took them up to Astoria to witness the grant dealing with the unserved, to the University of Oregon for the digital newspaper project, and to the Multnomah County Library for their numerous grant-funded programs.

Bonebrake requested that the agenda be altered slightly. The open forum will be announced at 1 p.m., but we will hear from Sarah Miller at that time. If someone is present for the open forum, they will be asked to speak afterward. **Miao moved to approve the agenda as modified. Hunter-Morton seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

Other Board Reports

Hunter-Morton and Bonebrake met with Government Research Services. Hunter-Morton reported that there was lively conversation with many participants. They had a discussion about archives and law libraries, Hunter-Morton spoke about her experience as an archivist and a librarian.

Bonebrake reported that the GRS team seemed to be identifying concerns that would affect how effectively the State Library can provide its services to continue to meet our mission. The staff

seemed to have moved beyond favoring the status quo and now wants to protect their ability to perform the mission. One concern regarded the collection, and the differences in the missions of the Archives and the State Library. There was discussion about if the patron accessibility of the State Library can blend with the Archives ability to store items more safely.

The GRS team also complimented John Borden, our Legislative Fiscal Analyst, for attending the Collections workgroup meetings for the transformation. They felt good about having been heard. Hunter-Morton added that it is important to build a level of trust between different information professions, each of which does what it does for a reason. We should trust each other in a professional way and find a way to work together. Records management is often being outsourced to Iron Mountain. Bonebrake also reported that GRS was delighted to announce their web exhibit honoring the 75th anniversary of the Oregon State Capitol building. They are very proud of this partnership.

Miao asked a question about Hunter-Morton's comment regarding outsourcing records to Iron Mountain and how items are tagged to pull out information. Hunter-Morton mentioned an integrated system. Dahlgreen said that the Oregon State Archives uses a records management system to help agencies with retaining and destroying their records. We are looking at putting our Oregon documents into their records management system. We have done some tests, but want to make sure that the items will still be accessible.

Hathaway-Marxer visited with Library Administrative Services and had a very good conversation. She mentioned her one line management philosophy of acting as if the company you work for is your own. The group discussed the fact that there is a lot of talent in this agency to do what employees intuitively think needs to be done. Something that isn't being done, as much, is blowing our own horn, marketing, or sharing information. There are staff members who could do this successfully, and some are doing this now, but we do not have a coordinated effort. There was discussion of a coming together of talented people in this agency who could market this agency. Hathaway-Marxer also got the sense that there is something coming up in terms of capital requirements for technology equipment. There are things that we have pieced together with the tools we had, like the Oregon Documents Repository. The agency may need the next level of technology tools.

The LAS team also discussed policy maker perception of the library. Our lecture series is a good way to get people in the building and there is a fondness for it. Hathaway-Marxer said that LAS is certainly made up of talented people who think outside of their own box. There is the sense that we are edging close to decision-making with regard to the transformation. The group also talked about Iron Mountain, the private business that stores documents and records. Dahlgreen will gather details about Iron Mountain and email the Board.

Miao visited Library Development. They seem to trust the process that we are going somewhere, but do not know the outcome of the transformation. They only know the vision in a general sense, which is becoming a 21st century library. More clarification may be needed for teams and the Board. Miao could not find in the ORS mention that State Boards set the strategic direction of the agency.

LD has a number of very important projects going on. Three RFPs have gone out. One is regarding statewide databases; proposals have come in from a number of vendors. After the

database proposals are evaluated, the LSTA council will make a recommendation to the Board for their December meeting. There will be several options to consider regarding how this will be operated and how much it is going to cost. Another RFP that has gone out is for the digitization project, which focuses on methodology and criteria, rather than digitization itself. The third RFP was for outcome-based evaluation training, which some of the staff at the State Library have taken. This methodology involves stating outcomes rather than level of effort. This will be a very key concept for the State Library and all libraries. About 180 people have taken the training so far, which has been well-received. The agenda for the Outcome Based Evaluation Training appears on the cover of the Board packet. Miao handed out the Outcome Based Training packet that was created for the training.

Hall and Bell visited with Talking Book and Braille Services. There are a number of activities that TBABS has in mind. One is the idea to build a recording facility so they can record their own Oregon books using volunteers. The team provided a document which outlines the logistics of creating the recording studio.

They are also marketing their services to kids in Oregon schools with IEPs (Individualized Education Plan) which is a natural connection. Hall said that this effort is resulting in information about TBABS going to designers of IEPs, and that this was something that was talked about in the study group two years ago, about which the Legislature felt there was not enough progress made. Now we have a report that they have made progress on these recommendations. The brochure will be delivered today, which will go into the packets that parents receive. They also discussed evolving technology, how people use BARD, and how they'll be able to use BARD through the new apps coming out, as long as they know about them. Hall pressed the team about the transformation plan. Since the major recommendation for TBABS is that they expand what they do, they are not too concerned. They are trying to think of creative ways to do more, viewing this as a chance for positive change rather than reacting to a crisis.

Bonebrake would like to give an update on the Benchmark 38 action item that has been in the Board minutes and on the agenda numerous times. After the update, Bonebrake would like to postpone this item until the Public Library Division (PLD) of the Oregon Library Association has completed the public library standards. They are looking at the expectations for the State Library to monitor, what public libraries are doing and how it might impact Library Development responsibilities, and who will take over gathering benchmark data. The Progress Board has been defunded, but we still use the criteria for measuring the number of Oregonians without adequate library service for the State Library.

Dahlgreen said that PLD is currently working on the standards. They want to know what the State Library wants to do about the standards and accrediting libraries. She recommended that they come to the Board with a proposal.

Bonebrake mentioned an article written by Mary Ginnane called "The Library Benchmark," from the September 1999 issue of the OLA Quarterly. The State Library Board acknowledged the history of the standards and the fact that OLA is currently working them. Bonebrake also suggested that we drop the name "Benchmark 38." Dahlgreen said that Benchmark 38 was a measure of unserved and underserved Oregonians, which is still a huge issue. Hall asked how we define unserved and underserved, to give us some guidance in how to spend our money. We are

now waiting for the library community to create standards for us to use in helping to define unserved and underserved. Hall mentioned that a few years ago, it was decided that the Board would take a leadership role. Hathaway-Marxer said that the PLD has been doing a lot of work on this, and are making slow and steady progress. She agreed that we need to set this aside until PLD has finished their work.

Hunter-Morton commented that when she thinks of underserved and unserved, she thinks of the digital divide; of those without computers or internet access. She thinks about her library's underserved population. Working locally with state guidance would be beneficial, since every library knows their community.

Bonebrake suggested that the Board discuss serving the unserved/underserved at the December planning meeting and make a firm commitment to have a coordinated response. Miao had a question about what we mean by "underserved." Not every state library is overseeing standards for libraries. Bonebrake said that the Board will work with these standards once they have been completed. Dahlgreen will see if PLD can do a presentation at the Board's December meeting. Bonebrake wanted to be sure that the Board will discuss how we should define unserved and underserved. Hathaway-Marxer will connect with Su Liudahl again. PLD has asked the State Library if we would be willing to accredit libraries. This needs to come to the Board from the library community through a proposal.

REPORTS OF THE STATE LIBRARIAN AND STAFF

Activities Since the Last Meeting

Dahlgreen reported that we have spent the remaining money for the biennium. She commented that the managers have done a very good job managing debits and shifting funds. The Board acknowledged receipt of the Affirmative Action report from Vicki Jorgensen. Dahlgreen handed out the updated version of the Quarterly Performance Report. The number for visits to the databases is down slightly, most likely due to summer. The numbers in TBABS continue to increase and BARD downloads are very impressive. Volunteer hours are lower because of changes in types of duties available in TBABS. Robin Speer and the staff on the Volunteer Cross Team workgroup are working to re-imagine the Volunteer Program based on professional volunteers. Miao asked about Robin Speer and the Volunteer Program. We have also been trying to work with other agencies and look at best practices.

In GRS, numbers have been going down for a number of years, which perhaps shows that we need to change the way we are doing business. The Volunteer Newsletter is sent out to staff and to the volunteers, from Robin Speer. GRS has a quarterly newsletter as well.

A number of our staff attended a Lead the Change training and distilled the information for the rest of the staff. The five employees all participated in this group project, presenting this version of the training on two half day sessions so all staff could attend. This is a good example of having our staff go to training and bring information back to the rest of the agency.

Staff has had concerns over the last several months about communication within the agency. Dahlgreen reported that we have been beefing up the communication. Every week, a "This Week at OSL" email goes out highlighted agency-wide activities as well as some "food for thought." Every other week, Dahlgreen has been doing a Transformation Update. These are very well

attended and everyone seems to be very engaged. We have also been sending out “In the Loop” updates from the Transformation Project Team. These will most likely start up again in September.

Dahlgreen had a meeting with Department of Administrative Services Leasing. They had many ideas about the spaces in our building.

Margie Harrison, GRS Program Manager, attended training on digital solutions in Ann Arbor, Michigan. She is sharing her knowledge with her team.

Dahlgreen is very excited about Library Development’s involvement with Cover Oregon, the health insurance marketplace that Oregon has created. The Metropolitan Group, in charge of promotion, approached the State Library specifically and asked how libraries can help. Arlene Weible is working with all the Oregon libraries to provide information.

On Tuesday, TBABS hosted the Telephone Pioneer Room Dedication. The telephone pioneers were retired workers from AT&T who used to come into TBABS and fix cassette players. The room that they used to use is now repurposed. TBABS decided to dedicate this room to the pioneers. Four of them were present at the event.

We had a visit from Pam Davenport, our consultant from the National Library Service (NLS), who will be writing a report. Dahlgreen will be showing this report to the Board. Davenport was very impressed with TBABS and the great work that they do with limited staff. We have had two very good site visits this summer, from IMLS and NLS.

In LAS, Shawn and the IT staff worked with Enterprise Technology Services to move our firewall to the central data center. We are working to move things that can be moved to an enterprise model. This then frees up our IT staff to do more creative things for our agency. It is a model that can provide us with more flexibility as well as some services that we can’t currently afford, or have needed to create using “home-made” systems.

Dahlgreen showed the Board her Ready to Learn card, which is from the LSTA grant that was granted to the Pendleton Public Library and North Central Educational Service District.

OPEN FORUM

No one was present to comment.

NEW BUSINESS

Bylaws Change for GRS Advisory Council

Harrison recommended the approval of the changes to the GRS Advisory Council bylaws, which will align the council’s process and bylaws with those of the Board’s other two advisory councils LSTA and TBABS.

Hall moved to approve the recommendation of the GRS Advisory Council bylaws as presented. Miao seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Recommendations of the LSTA Advisory Council

Westin presented an update on the Douglas County Library Foundation. They submitted a letter requesting LSTA funding that was discussed at the last Board meeting. The Board agreed with the recommendation from the LSTA Advisory Council that Douglas County should come back with a full proposal. Ann Reed has met with the Douglas County Library Foundation to help guide them through the process and assist them with allowable costs. They have submitted a full proposal, which will be discussed at the LSTA Advisory Council meeting on September 19th. The proposal will come to the Board in October, along with the rest of the grant proposals.

Dahlgreen added that the Board will need to think about cost-sharing for our databases. This will most likely come up when the council comes forward with their recommendation for databases. Up until five years ago, we paid 50% of the database costs for public libraries and academic libraries, the total amount for school and tribal libraries, and the total amount for small public and academic libraries. We began using LSTA funds for the entire cost of databases in 2009 when we signed a contract with Gale. There is a precedent of cost-sharing for databases and it is in our statute. This will be a discussion item for the Board in December. Westin agreed to provide the Board with different cost models in October, to assist discussion in December.

The Task Force for Statewide Collaborative Reference Services has a recommendation that they are sending to the LSTA Advisory Council for their meeting on September 19th. This recommendation will be sent to the Board with the LSTA materials in October. They are asking to continue with the virtual reference model, but want move away from full payment by LSTA funds over the course of a few years with a campaign to help people understand why it is necessary to pay for this.

Bell wanted to revisit the issue of accepting the recommendation of the LSTA Advisory Council from the last meeting to change the membership of the council. The portion of the recommendation suggested adding a person to the disadvantaged persons group, which would reduce the citizen users to one. Bell didn't see that those two groups were mutually exclusive, and did not see why a member can't have two different titles. Bonebrake said to rename a member position in a more specific category precludes a more general category representative. Hunter-Morton sees that someone can be both.

Bell made a motion to reopen the conversation that the Board had regarding the recommendation for the membership of the LSTA Advisory Council. Hunter-Morton seconded the motion. Hall suggested the amendment to reopen this conversation in October. Bell and Hunter-Morton agreed to this amendment. Motion approved by Bell, Hunter-Morton, and Hall. Motion opposed by Bonebrake, Hathaway-Marxer, and Miao. Motion failed.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

Board Procedure for Annual Evaluation of the State Librarian

The Board has been given the materials necessary to complete the State Librarian evaluation process. We have the guidance of Vicki Jorgensen, HR Manager. The Board approved this process in June. Bonebrake has been contacting and interviewing members of the library community. She will write up the feedback and give it to Jorgensen. In the Board packet are the

forms for the Board members to provide feedback. Jorgensen has asked the team coordinators to collect feedback from the teams. She will then collect the team feedback and library community feedback. In the open session at the October Board meeting, the Board will follow the procedure spelled out on page 44 of the Board packet. According to the statute, it can be done in closed session, unless the State Librarian requests an open session. However, the conclusion has to come out in open session and salary discussions must also be done in open session. Bonebrake will then draft the written State Librarian evaluation to send to the Board members for review after the meeting for review. In November, Board members will respond to the written evaluation they received from Bonebrake. In December, the Board will complete the evaluation of the State Librarian.

Miao noted that ORS 192.660 does not mention salaries or compensation. Jorgensen will find out whether salary can be discussed in executive session. Hunter-Morton read the ORS. It does not mention that this can be discussed during executive session, so most likely it is not allowed. Jorgensen will clarify this issue for the Board.

Rondema will send an electronic version of the Board feedback form to Board members to be completed and sent to Bonebrake by Oct. 14th.

The Board members will receive the library community feedback, feedback from the teams, the management team feedback, and Dahlgreen's self-evaluation. This will be discussed in October, after which Bonebrake writes the written evaluation. They will discuss the evaluation feedback from the staff and community and vote on the scores for each measure. By September 15th, Jorgensen will forward the feedback from the staff and the community to the Board members. Jorgensen will also look into the role of the Board with regard to salary step-increases.

State Library Transformation Report

Sarah Miller, Deputy Chief Operating Officer and Project Sponsor, and Kelly Jensen, Project Manager at Mass Ingenuity, gave a report on the State Library Transformation.

The Board had not yet received the Interim Report to the Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on General Government, which is a status report about the transformation project. Copies were handed out to the Board members at the meeting. To create the report, the project team needed to consider all the existing inputs that have been available from reports, committees, budget note reports, and other work from the project team. The budget note that was created in the legislative process requires the OSL to build a transformation plan that lines up with the Governor's budget and to report OSL's progress to the Legislature at interim milestones. The report talks about the process that was used to arrive at these recommended changes.

The project team came up with two categories of recommendations. The first ten changes are transformational in nature and involve a series of alternatives. The OSL is scheduled to present to the General Government Subcommittee on different service delivery alternatives and asking for their feedback. The OSL and the OSL Board won't be making the policy choices; but instead hope to have those choices made by the Legislature. Once OSL has feedback from the subcommittee, the project team can begin creating a detailed implementation plan for the chosen alternatives. There will need to be regular check points with the legislative decision-makers.

The group went through the alternatives that have been identified by the project team on the single page summary, which is a subset of the changes in the full report. One of the intriguing changes regards other state agency libraries. The report raises the question of incorporating those collections into the State Library's collections. Potentially, the agency libraries could be out-stationed libraries, but the management of the collections could become a responsibility of the State Library. There are conversations about creating a portal for library services inside state government, which would connect the Law Library, Archives, state agency libraries, etc. The assessment model could be changed to a tiered model to allow different state agencies, who have varied library needs, to engage in the services differently. It could be a fee for service or a tiered assessment.

Library services to the public have also caused concern for the Legislature in the past. Alternatives include limiting services to the public, or finding alternative funding models in order to continue to provide the public with library services.

The next two transformational changes deal with collections, including Oregon heritage materials. The Advisory Committee had some concerns about the language used in this section. There is acknowledgement that the State Library has heritage collections, but it is not inherently core to our mission. The Legislature can tell OSL to take a leadership role or engage with partners, potentially transitioning materials to other entities. Non-governmental collections, such as poetry and genealogy have been paid for with assessment funds, and are not services to state government. Either OSL needs to stop doing them and find a permanent home for those collections, or seek alternative funding to continue these collections in the future.

The TBABS service delivery model has been reviewed and discussed. The Commission for the Blind does not believe they have the capacity to take on TBABS and they do not serve Oregonians with physical or learning disabilities, which OSL does. Over time, some efficiency could be made with minor investments to improve the program. The next change is the search engine administration for the State of Oregon website, a task which DAS will most likely absorb.

The Oregon Documents Depository Program has been a subject that has caused concern for the General Government Subcommittee with regard to what the State Library does for agencies versus what the State Archives provides. A smaller, facilitated, group discussion may be necessary for the State Archivist and the State Librarian to discuss options.

The two options for Center for the Book are as follows: move the program to a different cultural organization or discontinue it as a State Library program.

The cultural enrichment components, including the lecture series, are beneficial but should not be funded with state assessment. The final change regards Plinkit, which the State Library uses to provide websites for small libraries. The options are to stop providing it now, or stop this service in the near future. OSL would make sure local libraries have a plan before discontinuing this service.

The seven enhancements are services that we will continue to provide, but can include components to improve them. Some of these ideas involve expansions. If OSL discontinues some of the services, we may be able to redirect those resources into potential expansions.

Bonebrake participated in the Transformation Advisory Committee. She commented that at the first meeting, she saw all the sticky notes, which illustrated how much work had been done by the Project Team and each of the workgroups. At the meeting on Monday, they looked at the draft of the final report, which had already gone to the General Government Subcommittee. The group made language and clarity changes. People from different agencies and organizations had good recommendations to make, clarifying their point of view.

Hall had a concern about the Board's role in this process. He is concerned that the subcommittee will be picking alternatives without knowing the background. He was hoping the Board could make their recommendations about the preferred alternatives.

Miller said she would be very comfortable if the Board wanted to recommend preferred alternatives. There was concern that the subcommittee wouldn't be able to provide substantive feedback because of the number of recommendations. The subcommittee has not yet scheduled a hearing. The Legislature may have a full Interim Joint Ways and Means Committee meeting instead. Miller and Dahlgreen will either be given a hearing and meet with individual subcommittee members, or they will have the individual meetings only. It would be better to have the Board make suggestions for the preferred options, rather than the State Librarian, if the Legislature asks for preferences. Miller is trying to keep Dahlgreen neutral in this process, since she manages people who are heavily impacted by these outcomes.

The interim report begins with an executive summary in the first few pages. The summary talks about the process, the inputs, and the work that has been done. Miller's estimate of the work put into this process is roughly 1500 man-hours since the legislature met (about 8 weeks).

The General Government Subcommittee will most likely meet in November. OSL will check its progress with them in November, so any needed legislative changes can be proposed during the February session. The Governor gets to introduce five bills, and the State Library Transformation is scheduled to be one of them.

The draft report with the changes incorporated from the Advisory Committee will be finished by Mass Ingenuity by today, and will be emailed to the Board.

Miller asked Bonebrake to aggregate the Board feedback about their preferred alternatives.

Hall asked if it would be a good idea for Bonebrake to be present at the hearing to express the Board's preferences.

Bonebrake mentioned having a full conversation about the report in October, before the November legislative days.

The Board will give feedback to State Librarian, to advise her about their preferences. Hall is concerned that the Board's preferences will not be heard before the September meetings. Bonebrake said that the Board is not really influencing the process. But it is important to understand how they feel about the alternatives so they know how to respond when alternatives are chosen.

Miller made a commitment to distribute the most complete version of the report to the Board seven days prior to the October meeting, so they can have a substantive conversation about the specifics.

Dahlgreen said that the project team looked at everything State Library does. Together with the workgroups and all other information, we had the basis for identifying what needs to change. We grouped the 92 items we currently do, and sent them to the “how” workgroups. We were looking at the bigger picture at this point, not the details. We identified alternatives. If a service is going to be pursued, the next step would be to identify alternate ways to fund it.

Considerations for the alternatives are included in this report, but not full comprehensive consequences of these alternatives.

Dahlgreen and Miller will meet with committee members in the days leading up to the hearing. Co-chairs are currently deciding whether or not the subcommittees will meet. Hall asked if Borden will suggest which alternatives to focus on. Miller said that Borden will be providing his opinion about whether this report answers their questions, but he will not direct how they should spend their time.

Hall asked how we will know what the legislator’s reactions are to the presentation. Miller can synthesize what legislators tell her so she can give good direction to state agencies. She won’t know if they are in agreement about alternatives until these individual meetings. She is asking the Board to trust her ability to manage a legislative strategy. Dahlgreen and Miller will send a joint message at the end of the week of the September legislative days giving the Board members an update about what happened.

Bonebrake reiterated that at their October meeting, the Board will discuss the feedback that has been received and how they might react to the alternatives. She thanked Miller for taking time out of her vacation to speak to the Board.

Hall is concerned that the transformation process is trumping substance. He is concerned that we won’t get clear direction from the Legislature. He thinks we should be concerned about which alternatives are given consideration. Hall wants to be sure the Board has a message for what the library should be doing.

Bonebrake said that the Board wants to guide whatever comes out of this process and make it really positive. She can’t see how the Board has any external input other than giving feedback to Miller and Dahlgreen. She agreed that the Board should go on record identifying the alternatives they prefer and discussing the alternatives they may not agree upon. This is the first opportunity that the Board has had to give their input.

Hall had hoped to have a discussion today about the alternatives, so they would be able to advise the State Librarian.

The Board agreed to schedule a telephone meeting on Friday, September 6th from 1 - 3 pm to discuss their feedback regarding the alternatives. This will be announced and will be open to the public.

PLANS FOR NEXT MEETING

The next Board meeting will take place on Friday, October 25th. The dates of the December meeting and retreat have been moved to December 19th and 20th. Next February, the Board can start meeting at different locations. The Board discussed tentatively planning to meet on Friday, February 21st, at Concordia University. The OLA Conference will be held in Salem next year, on April 16th, so the Board meeting will also be in Salem.

Board members were asked to bring their calendars to the October meeting. The action items were then read aloud.

The meeting adjourned at 3:18 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

- Rondema will make the edits to the minutes from the June Board meeting
- Dahlgreen will send the Board members information about the company Iron Mountain
- The Board will discuss unserved/underserved at the December meeting with the Public Library Division presentation
- The staff will bring cost-sharing models for databases to the October meeting
- Rondema will send the Board members the electronic version of the State Librarian Evaluation form with the due date of October 14th
- Board members will give their State Librarian evaluation forms to Bonebrake by October 14th
- Jorgensen will find out about if the Board can discuss salary during executive session and the Board's responsibility regarding step increases
- The February 21st Board meeting is tentatively planned for Concordia University; the April meeting will be on the 16th in Salem. The Board will set the remaining dates and locations at the October meeting; Board members will bring their calendars to the October meeting
- December meeting has been moved to 19th and 20th
- The Board will meet by phone on September 6th from 1 – 3 p.m.
- Hathaway-Marxer will reconnect with Su Liudahl regarding library standards
- Jensen will send the updated report to the Board
- Jensen and Miller will send the most updated version of the Transformation report to the Board seven days prior to the Board meeting in October
- Jorgensen will give feedback from the staff and the library community to the Board by September 15th