

**Forest Park Public Library
Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 5th 2021 @ 6 PM
Zoom**

Committee Members: Susan Farnum, Rafal Radomski, Brooke Sievers (Chair), Pilar Shaker, Chantel Manzanares

Opening of Meeting

A. Meeting was called to order at 6:03 PM by Brooke Sievers

B. Roll Call:

Farnum- Present, Manzanares – Absent, Radomski- Present, Shaker – Present, Sievers - Present

C. Approval of Agenda:

Motion was made by Shaker, seconded by Farnum.

Farnum – Aye

Manzanares – Absent

Radomski – Aye

Shaker – Aye

Sievers - Aye

D. Guest: Kacie Hall, ASL Interpreter

E. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes from January 10, 2020 policy committee meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Shaker to approve the minutes, the motion was seconded by Farnum.

Farnum – Aye

Manzanares – Absent

Radomski – Aye

Shaker – Aye

Sievers - Aye

New Business

A. Annual review of the Material Selection Policy – the committee reviewed and discussed the policy. Changes presented were suggested by Forest Park resident Kristin Pekoll. Ms. Pekoll is the Assistant Director of the American Library Association Office for Intellectual Freedom. Ms. Pekoll was not present at the meeting but sent her suggestions to Board Secretary James Pekoll who is her husband. The committee also reviewed the material reconsideration packet and minor edits were submitted for that document by Kristin Pekoll as well. No additional changes were recommended by committee members.

B. Approval of Changes to the Material Selection Policy and Packet: A motion was made by Shaker to approve the recommended changes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Farnum.

Farnum – Aye Manzanares – Absent Radomski – Aye Shaker – Aye
Sievers - Aye

- C. Approval of the new Security Camera Policy: A motion was made by Shaker to approve the new policy as submitted. The motion was seconded by Radomski. Shaker indicated that the policy came at the recommendation of the State’s updated Serving our Public 4.0 which recommends that libraries have such a policy and keep it posted in the building. Sievers suggested that having it posted on the website was sufficient in her opinion, assuming that there were posted surveillance signs at the building’s entrance. Shaker shared that the policy had been reviewed by the library’s lawyer. Sievers inquired as to whether the policy as written conforms to current Library practice? Radomski, the Library’s IT Supervisor, confirmed that the policy aligns with the security systems current functionality and Shaker confirmed that current staff practice aligns with the policy as written.

Farnum – Aye Manzanares – Absent Radomski – Aye Shaker – Aye
Sievers - Aye

- D. Approval of the Succession Plan: A motion was made by Shaker to approve the Succession Plan as submitted. The motion was seconded by Farnum. Shaker indicated that the Succession Plan was written at the recommendation of the State’s updated Serving our Public 4.0 which suggests that all libraries have such a plan. Sievers inquired about how often the plan would be reviewed since staffing changes could impact the plan’s succession structure. Shaker noted that the document contains language suggesting that the plan be reviewed every three years or as necessary. Shaker asked the committee if this document should be considered official policy or if it is procedural? If it is just procedural then any reviews could be informal and would not require any official meetings of the Committee or Board approval. The Committee consensus was that the document was procedural but that it was important that the Board be made aware of it and kept abreast of changes. As such, Sievers suggested that the signature page be changed to a “last reviewed” page and that it be included in the Director’s upcoming report to the Board rather than as a Board agenda item. The Committee agreed to approve the document as amended.

Farnum – Aye Manzanares – Absent Radomski – Aye Shaker – Aye
Sievers – Aye

- E. Approval of the Amended Board Bylaws to Include Meeting Attendance Requirements: Shaker made a motion to approve the changes as presented. The motion was seconded by Radomski. Sievers indicated that she had initiated this amendment in light of the many new trustees and her desire to make sure that Trustees had a clear understanding of the commitment and expectations involved in the appointment. Sievers also clarified that, since Trustees are Mayoral appointments they can only be asked by the Board to submit a resignation, not required to do so. Shaker asked if the intent of the changes was to have the

requirement apply to any meeting, inclusive of Committees, or just regular monthly meetings of the Board? Sievers stated that she felt that it should only apply to regular monthly meetings. Shaker suggested that the language be clarified to make that more apparent. The Committee agreed to approve the changes as amended.

Farnum – Aye Manzanares – Absent Radomski – Aye Shaker – Aye

Sievers - Aye

- F. Discussion of a Compensation Philosophy: Shaker shared a draft Compensation Philosophy and noted that it had been suggested by HR Source to have a document like this to help staff understand how the compensation structure worked and what the compensation culture of our organization was. While Shaker thinks that this would be helpful she isn't sold on the draft shared, it was adapted from one being used by another library. Shaker doesn't want to pursue further work to the draft without confirmation that it is something that others feel would be useful. Sievers agreed that something like this would be good to have but thought that the draft was too wordy and written at an excessively high level/inaccessible to many people. Farnum agreed that she liked the idea of such a document and appreciated the inclusion of continuing educational opportunities as a component of the compensation conversation as that's something she feels FPPL does well. Radomski also thought that this would be a good addition to our compensation documents but thought it should include some reference to how often the salary schedule was reviewed and how that process worked. Shaker asked if, because this document would be included in the Personnel Policy Manual, it should be considered part of the compensation policy or if it could stand alone as an internal document that didn't need Committee review? The Committee agreed that it does not need to be a policy but that it should be shared with the Board once complete and prior to being shared with staff. Shaker asked if it would be appropriate for the document to be worked on by the Management team and then shared with the board when that group felt it was more ready. The Committee agreed with this idea.

Adjournment

A Motion made by Shaker to adjourn the meeting at 6:47. The motion was seconded by Farnum.

Farnum – Aye Manzanares – Absent Radomski – Aye Shaker – Aye

Sievers - Aye

Respectfully submitted,

Pilar Shaker
Director