

**PUEBLO CITY-COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES
BOARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**

May 1, 2012

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bregar called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Board Members Present: Marlene Bregar, Committee Chair; Jim Stuart

Staff Present: Jon Walker, Executive Director; Midori Clark, Community Relations Director; Jane Carlsen; Executive Assistant/Board Secretary

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Advocacy

Ms. Bregar asked Ms. Clark to share her ideas. Ms. Clark provided a script from the last advocacy effort that was done with the State Library. Ms. Clark said what she really liked about it was that it shows the value of libraries by relaying stories about what libraries do. This makes it personal and about people you know which made it very effective, whether the stories were about PCCLD specifically or not. Susan Fries delivered the stories, and Ms. Clark was there to accompany her in case there were questions, but the volunteer was a very effective spokesperson. Ms. Clark said they also left postcards for people to become part of the movement and to ask for more information.

Ms. Clark also provided talking points the Community Relations team developed to talk about the new libraries by answering basic questions. Mr. Walker provided a list of seven talking points which were boiled down to three or four. Mr. Walker said Board members could use these points "elevator" style or a thorough PowerPoint presentation could be developed. The other thing used for Pueblo West fundraising was a high-level video, and Ms. Clark played the 7-minute video.

Mr. Walker said the presentation, the elevator talking points, and the video will be available.

Ms. Clark described plans to develop a new video for the new campaign which she expects to start in June, and reviewed the process used to develop the last video. Mr. Stuart pointed out the video was actually timeless. Ms. Clark agreed but suggested they need to add different stories for the world today, e.g., coming back into the work force, creating a path to a better life, etc., to show people empowering themselves through the library. There was additional discussion about the video, how it had been effective for fundraising, and whether it could also be used for advocacy.

Ms. Bregar suggested that with some training Board members could be part of a team of presenters with Foundation people and library staff. There was discussion that the video may also be part of what the Foundation decides to use, and the Foundation had not seen the video yet. Mr. Walker said a fundraising campaign will be presented to the Foundation Board in July, and it was uncertain what the outcome of that presentation will be.

Mr. Stuart suggested the video be developed so it could be used after the three libraries have been completed because after fundraising for the three library projects, the Foundation hopes to be able to raise funds to build a corpus for ongoing library support. Mr. Walker said he does not expect the video to be specific to building new libraries.

Ms. Clark said the key to the formula is every piece is plugged into the library's mission in hopes of being able to move someone to become part of that mission. Ms. Clark said it is a model that has been tested and tried, and includes training DVDs with each of the steps outlined.

After a lengthy discussion, Mr. Stuart suggested the public presentations be under the auspices of the Foundation Board, and others such as the Library Board would do that under the Foundation umbrella so there is no confusion. The events would all be put on by the Foundation to get the

BOARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 1, 2012 — 2

Foundation established more strongly, and the Foundation could ask for whoever on the Library Board is interested in being part of that. Mr. Stuart suggested that would establish a framework.

There was additional discussion about the presentations requested, and Ms. Clark explained that she provides the nuts and bolts of library service followed by whatever is big at the moment or topics of interest to that particular audience. Ms. Bregar said she would like to attend one of those presentations. Ms. Clark said the library is invited a lot because people care about the library, but what has been interesting is that the library supporters are not necessarily also library users.

Another interesting thing about advocacy is when it comes to voting, and the ones who are donating are often the ones who are voting, and it is important to engage that group even though they may not be using the library and even though there may not be an election issue. Mr. Walker added that just because someone does not have a library card does not mean they do not use the library, and as we evolve, what constitutes “use” will continue to change. Use is not always tied to circulation. At one time use was not as important as the fact that your community had a library. There was additional discussion about the importance of an educated populace in a democracy, how libraries level the playing field for those who wish to better themselves, and there is no other parallel in a community for a library.

Mr. Walker asked what the committee wants to do. Ms. Bregar said putting the talking points into everyone’s hands will be very important because they do get approached. Mr. Walker suggested having Ms. Clark put it onto a card to provide those “elevator” talking points that will resonate and explain the concept. Some slight adjustments were suggested, e.g., changing “cheap” to “inexpensive.” Mr. Stuart suggested they wait on the public presentations until the Foundation Board has a chance to work on the fundraising campaign, and hopefully the Trustees will be part of the advocacy campaign.

There was a lengthy discussion of the value of presenting to groups and organizations where Trustees and Foundation members are themselves involved. Ms. Clark explained the difference between marketing and advocacy and the importance of volunteers with advocacy, but fund raising will need both, and there will be distinct roles for each group.

Ms. Bregar did a quick review of the discussion which included:

- Talking points card. Midori will refine and provide to Board members.
- Fundraising will be coming from the Foundation.
- Emphasizing the connections between Board members and community groups

B. Board Orientation

Mr. Stuart suggested this will need to be done before the start of the year. It was agreed that this could be deferred until another meeting.

C. Bylaws

Mr. Stuart said the Board needs to remain mindful that the Bylaws provide, “At least one member of the Library Board of Trustees shall reside outside the City of Pueblo.” That was discussed briefly, and it was felt that the Board currently meets that requirement.

Mr. Stuart addressed Article II.7(b), “Supervise, care for, and have custody of all property of the library, including rooms or buildings constructed, leased or set apart therefore.” Mr. Walker said he believes that comes straight from the state law. There was discussion about the Board’s role in setting policy, yet is ultimately responsible for making sure the Executive Director is taking care of things. There was also discussion on the difference between micromanagement, actions of Board members versus those of the full Board, managing a crisis, but in the end, they all rely on a chain of people to be a successful team. Mr. Stuart said it just seemed a little out of sync with the others using the term “supervise” rather than “authorize.”

BOARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 1, 2012 — 3

Ms. Bregar attended the CLiC Spring Workshop for Trustees, and one of the questions was who submits the financial report to the County Commissioners, and it is a Board responsibility. Ms. Bregar said she appreciates that Chris Brogan takes care of that for them. Mr. Walker explained those are sent on behalf of the Board. Mr. Walker said the auditor's report will be based on each of the financial reports that the Board formally approved each month. Mr. Walker displayed the Colorado Revised Statutes and pointed out that those were almost verbatim in the Bylaws.

Mr. Stuart referred to Article II.7(i), "Borrow funds for library purposes by means of a contractual short-term loan when money is not currently available. Such loan shall not exceed the amount of immediately anticipated revenues, and such loan shall be liquidated within six months." Mr. Stuart said it made him wonder how the COPs fall within the Board's authority on that list. Mr. Walker pointed out that COPs are a lease rather than a loan, and referred to 7(g) which states, "Lease, purchase, or erect any appropriate building for library purposes and acquire such other property as may be needed therefore." Mr. Walker said the Board does have this power and authority, and he suggested that Mr. Gradisar could explain this in more detail. Mr. Walker explained the COP lease agreement and its opportunities and obligations for PCCLD.

Mr. Stuart pointed out Article III.1, noting that the Bylaws do not provide for a Treasurer, and questioned whether the Board should have a Treasurer to look at the financial aspects of the library that would work more closely with Chris Brogan. Mr. Walker questioned this as potentially interfering with PCCLD staff chain of command.

Mr. Stuart pointed out in Article III.3, the Board indicated that the Vice President should chair the Board Development Committee, and he is not sure if that should be included as part of the Bylaws.

Mr. Stuart said the Bylaws do not include an Ethics Statement for the Trustees. Although the Board recently adopted an Ethics Statement, it is not in the Bylaws, and perhaps it should be.

Mr. Stuart raised further issues included in the Pueblo Library Foundation Bylaws, such as indemnification, and a number of other issues not covered in the Board Bylaws. Mr. Walker said this might need to be discussed further with Nick Gradisar, but the Pueblo Library Foundation is a private nonprofit corporation while the Library Board is a governmental entity. There was additional discussion on the differences in the strengths, boundaries, rights, responsibilities and obligations between governmental entities and private corporations.

Mr. Stuart also asked about Article II.3(a) discussing provisions where trustees could be removed, "Fails to attend any combination of seven regular scheduled Board meetings or regular scheduled work sessions in a calendar year." Mr. Stuart questioned whether that needs to be reconsidered. There was some discussion of the reasons for the revision.

Ms. Bregar said at the CLiC Workshop, she thought the State Library had a sample set of Board Bylaws. Ms. Bregar asked if the Board might want to take some time to compare its Bylaws with the sample to see if there is anything that should be added. Mr. Stuart said that is a good idea and it would be helpful to look at something specific for libraries. Ms. Carlsen was asked to compare the Board's Bylaws with the provisions in the Colorado State Law to identify any differences. Ms. Bregar will see if she can locate sample Library Bylaws for review.

III. ADJOURNMENT The next meeting of the Board Development Committee was planned for Tuesday, June 5 at 1:30 p.m. in the Executive Conference Room. There being no further discussion, the Board Development Committee adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Carlsen
Secretary