

**INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
AUGUST 16, 2011**

\*\*\*\*\*

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library Board met at the Haughville Branch Library, 2121 West Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, on Tuesday, August 16, 2011 at 6:35 p.m., pursuant to notice given in accordance with the rules of the Board.

**1. Call To Order**

President Shevlot presided as Chairman. Secretary Turner-Wright was present.

Mr. Shevlot advised that, at this time, with only three Board members present, he did not recognize a quorum. In recognition of the lack of a quorum, he noted that he would recess the meeting until sufficient membership arrives to provide a quorum.

*Mr. Shevlot announced that the meeting was recessed temporarily.*

In order to best utilize the Board's time in the interim, Mr. Shevlot requested that Laura Johnson, Deputy Director, provide the IndyStat report which is currently listed as Item 11c on the Agenda. He noted that Ms. Johnson's report on this matter is intended to be an informal reporting to the Board on data put together at the request of Mayor Gregory Ballard and his staff which has already been supplied to and reviewed by the Mayor's staff. Mr. Shevlot advised that the Board needed to take no action on the report. Also, a written summation of the report would be available for the Board members not in attendance at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Johnson then gave the IndyStat report. A copy of the report is attached to these minutes.

Upon the arrival of Mr. Lingenfelter, the Chairman announced that he recognized a quorum.

*Mr. Shevlot then called the meeting back from recess.*

**2. Roll Call**

Members present: Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Members absent: Mr. Bonner, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Dudich.

**3. Branch Manager's Report**

Nancy Mobley, Manager, Haughville Branch Library, briefly discussed her Report that had been distributed to the Board. She welcomed everyone to the branch and noted that Haughville is the second oldest branch in the Library system.

Ms. Mobley mentioned that the branch participated as a pilot location for Spanish computer classes and the program has proven to be very popular with the Latino community. The branch will also host an English for Workforce Literacy program in October. The Digital Littles program has been at the branch twice and the children enjoyed it.

She stated that the branch is fortunate to have several volunteers. This Summer, five teens assisted with the Summer Reading Program. Ms. Mobley mentioned that volunteers supplied 303 hours of service to the branch for June and July. The branch has also had interns working at the branch, including the Sam H. Jones Scholar and individuals from the Indianapolis Metropolitan High School.

Mr. Shevlot asked Ms. Mobley about the 15 Minute Express PC and what it was normally used for.

Ms. Mobley responded that it is often used by patrons who wish to print documents or check their email quickly.

Finally, she introduced staff member Chris Murray, who works in adult reference and also conducts computer classes at the branch.

Mr. Lingenfelter asked what the effect of the one day closure had been on the branch. Did Ms. Mobley notice a heavier impact on the other days?

Ms. Mobley replied that “yes”, she thought so.

Mr. Lingenfelter inquired if it was overwhelming the staff at the branch.

Ms. Mobley commented that she wouldn’t say “overwhelming.” She noted that when the branch opens at Noon, there is usually someone waiting that thinks the branch opened at 10:00 a.m. Because many patrons in the area don’t have computers in their homes, they also come in the evening to do their homework.

Mr. Lingenfelter went on to say that he was trying to judge how much pressure there is in terms of being able to use a computer because the branch isn’t open one day.

Ms. Mobley advised that their computers are used “well” and sometimes there is a wait time to use them.

#### **4. Public Comment and Communications**

##### **a. Public Comment**

There were no petitions to come before the Board.

**b. Dear CEO Letters and Responses** were circulated for the Board’s general information.

**c. Correspondence** was circulated for the Board’s general information.

## **5. Approval Of Minutes: Executive Session, Regular and Special Meetings**

### **a. Executive Session, July 21, 2011**

The minutes from the Executive Session held July 21, 2011 were distributed to the Board.

The minutes were approved upon the motion of Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

### **b. Regular Meeting, July 21, 2011**

The minutes from the Regular Meeting held July 21, 2011 were distributed to the Board.

The minutes were approved upon the motion of Mr. Lingenfelter, seconded by Ms. Turner-Wright, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **6. Finance Committee (Jeff Smith, Chair; Robert J. Bonner, Thomas S. Shevlot)**

#### **a. Report of the Treasurer – July 2011**

Becky Dixon, Chief Financial Officer, discussed the July 2011 Report of the Treasurer that had been distributed to the Board at the meeting.

For the month of July, actual expenditures, less investments and debt payments, were 15% less than projected. During July the Library spent less in personal services (salaries and benefits), and collection materials.

Actual revenue was 5.1% less than projected. The decrease was in fines and fees.

July, 2011 expenditures, less investments and debt payments, were 13.79% less than July, 2010. The decrease in 2011 compared to 2010 is due to the reduction in work force and less in collection materials.

July, 2011 receipts were 5.60% less than July, 2010. This decrease was in fines, printing fees and interest income.

Year-to-date Fines and Fees revenue for 2011 is \$762,311 compared to \$954,743 for year-to-date 2010.

Mr. Shevlot stated that he wished to make a point of clarification that the Library has anticipated this to be a pattern with regard to forecasting the amount the Library will not be collecting in Fines and Fees.

Ms. Dixon advised that in the 2012 Budget, the projection for Fines and Fees is down by 15%.

Mr. Shevlot noted that even in the Library's 2011 Budget the Fines and Fees amount collected is not tracking to what was projected when the 2011 Budget was submitted in 2010.

Ms. Turner-Wright wanted to know that if the Library is now running 15% less would Ms. Dixon be going higher than 15% on the 2012 Budget. Would she be projecting at least 16%, 17% or 20% or something higher than 15%?

Ms. Dixon responded that she had based next year's Budget on what she anticipates to be our actual expenditures based on what we know at this point in time. This includes a salary increase for employees and some additional staffing. The overall Budget for next year is 1% higher than this year.

Ms. Turner-Wright noted that if the Library had been running 15% lower (Fines and Fees) and this amount has been fairly consistent through the year, had Ms. Dixon reflected that loss in the 2012 Budget and did she set it at 15% or did she make it higher.

Ms. Dixon replied that she had made it equal to what the Library is experiencing now – it runs anywhere from an average of 10% to 15% less.

Ms. Turner-Wright pointed out that the Library had been consistently running low so she wanted to know if Ms. Dixon had taken all this into consideration and projected the amount a little higher for 2012.

Ms. Dixon stated that she had tried to project for next year's Budget, based on what the Library is spending currently, and then any increase that would be in place for next year. Most of the reduction is in the personal services because the Library has fewer staff. When you look at 2011 and compare it to 2010, our reduction in work staff did not take place until October. Ms. Dixon continued that she looked at July 2011 to July 2010 and that's why it is consistently down. Next year's Budget is based on current work staff that we have in place now.

Ms. Turner-Wright commented that, with regard to her question, she must not be making herself clear, but she thanked Ms. Dixon for the information provided.

Mr. Lingenfelter commented that it is important to note that the Library is not collecting fewer fines and revenue because we aren't collecting them; the Library is collecting the same percentage. It's just that with electronic books, for which there are no overdue fines, because they disappear off your device, along with a bigger push toward people using email renewal which has been better for the Library's patrons, the patrons have had to spend less on fines and fees. The Library has put things in place that have helped patrons not to incur fines and fees. The Library is not ignoring fines and fees.

Mr. Smith made the motion, which was seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, that the Report of the Treasurer be filed for audit.

Motion carried.

The Report is attached to, and made a part of, these minutes.

b. **President Shevlot will Convene a Public Hearing**

*President Shevlot recessed the Regular Meeting at this time.*

Mr. Shevlot announced that this Public Hearing was being held to review the draft of the 2012 Budget.

1) **To consider the 2012 Library Budget as advertised on August 5 and August 12, 2011 in *The Indianapolis Star* and August 5 and August 12, 2011 in the *Indianapolis Recorder*.**

a) **2012 Budget Packet**

Ms. Dixon reviewed the 2012 Budget materials that were distributed to the Board at the meeting.

She referenced the Summary of Significant Assumptions on Revenues included in the materials. For 2012, the Department of Local Government Finance has authorized a 2.9% increase in the growth rate so that was factored in the Budget. Also factored in was the estimate on the impact of the Circuit Breaker. She was informed that local income taxes will decrease by \$1.2 million. The Library will receive the same Intergovernmental revenue including license excise tax, financial institution tax, commercial vehicle excise tax and in-lieu-of property tax (\$3,147,106). The Library is asking for County Option Income Tax for 2012 (\$154,778). She has decreased the fines and fees revenue by 15% (\$1,388,600). Interest income has been reduced by 29% (\$50,000) because of low interest rates. Copy/Printing revenue is down 2% (\$184,000). Grants/Contributions is at the same amount as 2011 (\$220,000). The Public Library Access Card revenue is increased (\$95,000). Miscellaneous Revenue has been decreased by 4% (\$430,000).

Ms. Dixon then commented on the Expenditure side on the 2012 Budget. She stated there was a 2% salary increase for all staff per contractual agreements. The Library is adding 12 FTE positions to cover additional hours of service for 2012. Total increase for these two items over the 2011 Budget is \$301,806. She reminded the Board that the 2010 reduction in work force had been figured into the 2011 Budget when it was prepared last year.

She went on to note that there is also a 6% increase in Hourly Salaries (\$85,271) over 2011. She factored in an 11% reduction in health care costs for 2012. There is a reduction (84%) in unemployment expenses. The Library's PERF increases to 10% for the employer's share and 3% for the employees' share. Postage is reduced (by \$20,000) because of the elimination of paper notices. Utilities are reduced (by \$58,850). Consulting amount is being increased (\$90,000) to consider a compensation study. Increasing amount for Continuing Education (\$70,900). The amount for Liability Insurance has been increased by 11%. The Collection budget is being restored to \$5.5 million. The final Debt payment will be moved from the Operating Account to the Debt Service Account for a 12% reduction. The total 2012 Operating Budget, compared to the 2011 Operating Budget shows an increase of 1.08% (\$408,008).

Ms. Dixon also pointed out that the Capital Projects Fund monies (\$1.5 million) have also been moved into the Operating Fund. The Library will not have a Capital Projects Fund for 2012.

2) **Invite Public Comment from the Audience**

President Shevlot invited public comment at this time.

At this time, Mr. Smith asked that, before the Public Comment began, that Ms. Dixon should explain the term "Circuit Breaker."

Ms. Dixon commented that the Circuit Breaker refers to a reduction in the amount of property taxes. For residential homes, property taxes are capped at 1% of the assessed value. For rental properties it is 2% and for other commercial properties it is 3%. This represents a reduction in the amount of property taxes that the Library now receives. She stated that the impact on the Library for this year is expected to be \$4.4 million less due to the caps. She is projecting the same amount for 2012. Property taxes represent over 80% of the Library's revenue.

Jim Mulholland, representing the Sustainable Library Citizens Coalition, asked for clarification on items contained in the 2012 Budget documents. He stated that on Page 12 there is \$4.5 million shown for the Collection and then in the Assumptions there is \$5.5 million shown for the Collection. He noted that he was curious about the difference.

Ms. Dixon responded that the amount is divided between two categories. The other \$1 million is in Contractual Services for databases and ebooks.

Mr. Mulholland thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the 1,200 members of the Coalition. They are glad to see an increase in the revenue and in the Budget. The Coalition is especially glad to see that some County Option Income Tax ("COIT") will be part of the Library's revenue. Their chief concern is that equitable access be maintained. They are glad to see additional hours of service proposed however they would be disappointed if the Board returned hours to some branches and not to others. It is very important to the Coalition that as revenue is restored, that it would be spread equally across the system and to all the patrons. Speaking personally, and not for the whole Coalition, he noted that if it was a matter of returning the Collection to that full \$5.5 million figure or seeing hours returned to neighborhood branches, he would prefer that the hours be restored. He went on to say that he wished to emphasize how important equitable access is to the Coalition.

Pam Wright, IMCPL Processing Assistant, advised that she was going to read a letter from a Library employee that could not attend tonight's meeting.

At this time, she read a letter from Library employee, Joanna H. Wos, who is a Public Service Associate at Central Library and a member of the AFSCME union. The letter pertained to her concern that a PSA be adequately compensated for the work that is required of them outside of their pay grade.

A copy of the Ms. Wos' letter is attached to these minutes.

Penny Pace-Cannon, a Librarian from Central Library, commented that she was going to read a letter from a Library employee.

At this time, she read the letter which referenced the employee's concern about being at the top of their pay grade and no longer receiving raises but instead receiving a small percentage of their total salary. The employee cites having to pay more for insurance, not being paid overtime for working Sundays and loss of compensatory time for working nights. Employee mentioned that they have worked 32 years at IMCPL.

There was then discussion among Ms. Pace-Cannon, Ms. Turner-Wright and Mr. Shevlot to clarify who the author was of the referenced letter. Mr. Shevlot commented that he had believed that Ms. Pace-Cannon was the author of the letter. Ms. Pace-Cannon confirmed that she was not.

The referenced letter was subsequently identified as coming from Kim Vanderwilt, Reference Librarian at the Lawrence Branch.

A copy of Ms. Vanderwilt's letter is attached to these minutes.

Elaine Jones, a Librarian from Central Library, noted that she was also going to read a letter from a Library employee.

Ms. Jones read the letter which addressed the employee's concern that the Library entered into a partnership with the Court System and Central Library took on the responsibility for the Marion County Law Library. The employee complained that there is no Central staff with legal experience and that the public has unrealistically high expectations for legal help from IMCPL staff which they are not equipped to handle.

This letter was submitted anonymously from an IMCPL employee.

A copy of the referenced letter is attached to these minutes.

Michael Torres, Public Service Associate from Central Library and President, AFSCME Council 62, read a statement to the Board.

He commented that many Library staff are property taxpayers and that tends to be forgotten. After 14 years, he believes the Library is still a great institution with engaged and knowledgeable staff.

He noted that the union members at IMCPL are concerned about two items in the 2012 Budget. They are the \$90,000 being allocated for a compensation study and the issue of overlapping duties of PSAs and PSLs without appropriate compensation for the PSAs. Also, there is concern among union membership about the staff that have been at the top of their pay grade for anywhere from two to 11 years. There is also concern about the loss of other benefits such as insurance at retirement, overtime pay for Sunday, longevity pay, and an hour comp time for working an evening shift. He noted that since the change in hours in October 2010, there is less time to spend with family. They understand the study's purpose but what frustrates staff is that the Library is willing to spend money on information most staff already know and that is that all staff have lost with the 2005 system-wide cuts but for those who were red-circled (salaries

capped) and or downgraded and have been at the top of their pay grade since then and have not had an hourly raise nor a cost of living increase since have lost even more. Therefore, instead of “wasting \$90,000” on a compensation study, they want the Library to uncapped these wages and properly compensate staff.

A copy of Mr. Torres’ statement is attached to these minutes.

Ms. Turner-Wright advised that she wished to know if the \$90,000 proposed compensation study had to do with IMCPL staff.

Ms. Dixon responded that this is an estimated cost for the study. It would be a study for all staff to determine what needs to be done and where do we stand in comparing salaries at IMCPL with other systems compatible to our system.

Ms. Turner-Wright then asked Janet Gartin-Moore, Director, Human Resources, when the last compensation study was done.

Ms. Gartin-Moore replied that the last full study was done in 2000. There was an internal equity study that was done in 2007 but it was not as comprehensive as the one in 2000 and it was not implemented.

Ms. Turner-Wright wanted to know if Ms. Gartin-Moore thought there would be any revelations if another study was done at the cost of \$90,000.

Ms. Gartin-Moore responded that she thought another study was due. They should use a company that’s familiar with libraries across the county. The Library is still working with a salary schedule that was implemented in 2001.

Ms. Turner-Wright inquired if there was a way to put a hold on setting aside that \$90,000 for a study.

Ms. Dixon advised that just because the money is in the Budget doesn’t mean that you have to spend it. If the Board would decide that they don’t want to follow through with the study, then the funds could be reallocated by the Board to be spent on something else.

Ms. Turner-Wright wants further discussion on this item due to the comments that had been made tonight. She wonders if this is an issue that needs to be looked at nationally when what we want to focus on is the needs of our Library rather than go back to a national survey.

Mr. Lingenfelter noted that earlier Mr. Mulholland had said that he was speaking about the amount needed to restore hours versus spending on it the materials budget. Mr. Lingenfelter stated that he thought that was an important number that we might want to look into. He wants to address that number and he also wants to hear from the Coalition to see if that is something the citizens of Indianapolis do feel is necessary.

Mr. Lingenfelter also commented that he knew the Haughville branch manager had said that their computers were full but in looking at the computer usage statistics they show we are down 33% for this year and that is greater than our 26% reduction in hours. He noted that while he does respect and appreciate Mr. Mulholland’s comments about making sure the entire county feels the pain, Mr. Lingenfelter wants to make sure that

we are not cutting services across the board for everyone when we have the opportunity to increase it for all of our patrons as long as they have a way to get there. We need to give our patrons the best service when we are open. He doesn't want to open branches and have someone come in and have a Page answering questions. If we can't put a librarian on the desk, is there a reason to have a library open? We do need to look at Mr. Mulholland's comments but also make sure that we deliver our Budget in a way that provides services to the community.

In regard to the allocation for the compensation study, Mr. Lingenfelter noted that he understands Ms. Dixon's comment that it is "set aside" money and that the Board is not voting on a contract tonight, but he doesn't want a proposal to come in front of him next Spring and have someone say "Well, it was in the Budget" because we did question it here. He thinks that with the arrival of a new CEO, we want to make certain that he or she has all the tools available and he thinks a compensation study might be very helpful working with the Staff Association and the Union to make sure we have positions filled to give the best service to our patrons. So, he doesn't want to tie hands in advance. He thinks this is important to have as a tool. When we get the chance to vote for it we better have answers for why we're spending the money. He agreed, however, that we needed to have that money allocated. He challenged the Staff Association and the Union to be thinking about how we deliver services and how they can help us to respond to making sure we have an overall organization chart and positions that are equitable and serving our patrons well.

Mr. Smith commented that he recognized that \$90,000 is a lot of money, but he would want that tool, as a CEO, if he wanted to use it. If we are putting it in the Budget for no real purpose then that would be a mistake.

Ms. Turner-Wright stated that it was her hope that we bring someone into the CEO position that is 100% aware of what's happening with libraries across the United States in view of the fact that so many of them are working with smaller budgets and have had to deal with cutbacks and she would like to think that we would not need to immediately give that person \$90,000 for such a study.

### **President Shevlot Will Consider a Motion to Close the Public Hearing**

Mr. Smith made the motion to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Turner-Wright seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

*President Shevlot reconvened the Regular Meeting.*

#### c. **Resolution 43 – 2011** (Appropriation of Gift and Grant Proceeds and Transfer Between Classifications and Accounts)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 43 – 2011, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Mr. Smith and the "yes" votes of Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

- d. **Finance Committee Notes – August 8, 2011** were distributed to the Board at the meeting for their general information and are attached to these minutes.

**7. Diversity, Policy and Human Resources Committee (Dorothy Crenshaw, Chair; Jason D. Dudich, Marie Turner-Wright)**

- a. **Resolution 44 – 2011** (Revision of Board Meeting Date)

Ms. Johnson explained that this item had come forward from the Committee discussion. It is proposed that the Library's CEO be authorized to begin some of the administrative changes that might be necessary to adjust the Board meeting calendar for 2012. She stated that this was also discussed in July at some of the other Committee meetings just to try and get the information out to everyone on the Board. The current third Thursday of the month is rather limited in terms of the locations. We have six locations open. If we were able to restore a day of service we would be looking at seven locations available next year. Mondays and Tuesdays typically the Library's busier evenings so we were looking at a proposal of Mondays, which seemed to be the preferred time from what she understood to be a poll of the Board members. The official action to make this change would not occur until the November By-Laws revision but there are a number of calendars, including the community meeting calendar and others, that we need to set in motion to prepare for that change.

Russell Brown, legal counsel for the Library, advised that a change in the By-Laws would be required and that has not been properly noticed for this evening in accordance with the By-Laws so it is not a consideration of a change to the By-Laws. This is simply an attempt to give the administration some direction of the will of the Board. So, there is no By-Law change which would be required for this to be in effect which is contemplated by this resolution.

Ms. Turner-Wright stated that she had been unable to attend this month's Committee meeting. She had spoken to Ms. Johnson about this item before tonight's meeting. Ms. Johnson had told her that on Mondays there are approximately 15 branches that are open in the evenings. Ms. Turner-Wright stated that she felt that changing the date of the Board meetings would be an imposition to the staff because so many agencies are open on Mondays, there would be fewer number of staff members who would be able to attend Board meetings to be able to present issues that they want the Board to know about unless they were notified and would be able to attend the various Committee meetings which are also on Mondays. She also noted that one of the things not listed in the material presented was that a change in the date the Board packets are delivered to the Board members would have to be made.

Ms. Turner-Wright stated that she didn't remember being questioned about what day of the week would be better for a change for the Board meetings. Personally, she noted that Monday would be a very bad day for her if this would become the permanent schedule.

Mr. Shevlot noted that it was his understanding from Ms. Crenshaw, Chair of the Diversity,

Policy and Human Resources Committee, that it was the general consensus of the Board that the idea of a Board Meeting is for the public and given that the Board doesn't have the opportunity, as it once did, to go and travel through the system to the branches, we seem to have found ourselves having the Board Meeting either at the Library Services Center or a very, very small number of branches. So, the idea was how could we get our Board Meeting in more of our branches so more of the public could attend the meetings.

Ms. Turner-Wright responded that she heard that part of it but she stated that she also thinks of the staff as the public too because, as many of them have pointed out, they are the public in a sense, they are the workhorses and they are also taxpayers.

Mr. Shevlot advised that, secondarily, the President appoints Committee chairs and the Committee chairs set the Committee meeting dates. So, just because we have always had the Finance Committee on a Monday at 4:00 p.m. doesn't necessarily mean that the following year it will be Monday at 4:00 p.m. It is at the will of the Chair of that Committee. Whether the Board Meeting falls on Monday, what precedes that would be whatever the Chair of that particular Committee would designate. There would be enough time because everything is always backed up.

Ms. Turner-Wright commented that she understood wanting to have the public involved and moving around to the branches but for her, right now, Monday evening is a very bad day to have a Board Meeting.

Ms. Johnson confirmed that, like the Committee meetings, the schedule of the packet distribution is something that would be scheduled according to the date that was finally set for the Board Meeting to give Board members ample time to review it prior to the meeting. She stated that it was her understanding that was one of the reasons why it was considered to be the fourth Monday of the month so if the current Committee schedule works there could be even more time between the Committee meetings and the Board Meeting or the Committee meetings could be adjusted.

Ms. Turner-Wright pointed out that she felt we should take into consideration that there would be an adjustment for the preparation and delivery of the Board packets but none of those things were listed on the material as preparation for this change.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 44 – 2011, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Mr. Lingenfelter, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot and Mr. Smith. It was noted that Ms. Turner-Wright voted "no" on the motion.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

**b. Patron Security Incident Report Data 2009, 2010 and January to June 2011**

Michael Coghlan, Facilities Manager, reviewed the Report. He noted that the purpose of the Report was to define the process that the Library uses for the reporting of disciplinary actions, events and incidents and then how the Library follows up with that.

Mr. Coghlan pointed out that in June 2010 the Library switched over to a database on our Intranet that allows anyone with a Library email to be able to input security incident information. This allows the Library to track and report incidents and take appropriate action. It also provides a database of individuals and types of incidents that is searchable. Previously, the Library used a manual system.

Mr. Coghlan then referenced two of the graphs contained in the Report. The first graph looks at security incidents in 2009, 2010 and the first half of 2011. There was an increase of approximately 100 incidents in 2010 over 2009. Part of this change is the availability of the reporting methods. For the first six months of 2011, the Library is under where we were in 2009. He believes that the increase showing from 2010 is a reflection of the ease of reporting. The other graph noted looks at two and one-half years worth of incident data across all of the branches. It identifies the branches where the Library sees most incidents occurring. The Library has used this data to help with placement of security guards in our facilities.

Mr. Smith wanted to know what privileges a patron has or does not have if they have been suspended from the Library.

Mr. Coghlan responded that a suspended patron is not allowed to be on Library property for a specific period of time. The patron could, however, access Library services from a computer.

Ms. Turner-Wright noted that a suspended patron could potentially visit various branches and use a certain amount of materials until they were recognized as having been suspended from the Library.

Mr. Coghlan confirmed that this was true but the librarians that work at the branches know their patrons but he acknowledged that IMCPL is a big system and they could go to another branch and use the Library's services.

Mr. Smith also asked about the branches with the high number of incidents on the Report and the use of security guards.

Mr. Coghlan advised that the Library is aware which branches are "hot spots."

Ms. Johnson noted that the Library has adjusted the security guard coverage and hours based on this information. Also, the Library made a considerable adjustment when we reduced our hours. We try to look at this situation each year with input from staff.

She also mentioned that the Library continues to look at the training and preparation through the Library's Security Team. We are also creating a team to develop a "Person In Charge" training module. The Library will use this information to help address issues and to help prepare staff to deal with situations because we know that we don't always have security guard coverage.

Mr. Smith commented that he hoped that the Branch Manager would have some input on the situation at their branch and that they be allowed to request security and that a decision would be made based on items other than just available data.

Mr. Shevlot made an observation about the most heavily used branches. It seemed that there

were fewer incidents at those branches.

Ms. Turner-Wright noted that some incidents are also reflected in the “Dear CEO” letters received by the Library. They complain about patrons viewing pornography, etc.

**8. Building Committee (Jim Lingenfelter, Chair; Robert J. Bonner, Jason D. Dudich)**

**a. Facilities Briefing Report for July 2011**

Mr. Coghlan discussed the Facilities Briefing Report that had been distributed to the Board. Some of the items noted included the following: Shelby Branch Library Renovation Project; Green Library in the Park; Resolution 45 - 2011 (Approval to Award the Contract for the Shelby Branch “Green Library in the Park” Project).

**b. Resolution 45 – 2011** (Approval to Award the Contract for the Shelby Branch “Green Library in the Park” Project)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 45 – 2011, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Lingenfelter, seconded by Ms. Turner-Wright, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

**c. Capital Projects Branch Status Report – July 31, 2011** was distributed to the Board for their review and information. A copy of the Report is attached to these minutes.

**9. Governmental Affairs Committee (Jim Lingenfelter, Chair; Thomas S. Shevlot)**

Mr. Lingenfelter advised that the Committee did not have a meeting this month and there is no report at this time.

**10. Library Foundation Update (Thomas S. Shevlot, Library Board Representative)**

**August 2011 Library Foundation Update** - Mr. Shevlot reviewed the Foundation’s recent activities. Some of the highlights were as follows:

- Last month, the Foundation received many gifts. The top corporate and foundation contributors included:
  - Alerding & Co., LLC; RJE Business Interiors – Most Urgent Need
  - The Sexton Companies – Children’s Fund
  - Fifth Third Bank, Indiana – World Language Book Giveaways
- This month, the Foundation was proud to provide funding for the following programs:

- Ready to Read, funded by various donors
- Fathers & Families (InfoZone), funded by an individual donor
- Curveside Ride (Central Library); Educators Night (Central Library); Science Odyssey; Grant Seminars (Central Library), funded by the Library Foundation's general fund
- Fall Fest (a program of the Library's African American History Committee), supported in part by the Indiana Arts Commission, and the National Endowment for the Arts, a federal agency, as well as the Humanities Endowment
- Shelby Branch Library Project, funded by the Allen Whitehall Clowes Charitable Foundation, Inc.

**Foundation Staff Update** – The Foundation will welcome Development Assistant, Emily Risch to the team on Monday, August 29, 2011. Emily has over five years of experience in the development field and currently works for Evansville Arc. Also, Laura Hundagen has accepted the invitation to serve as the Foundation's Fall intern. Laura will begin her internship on August 22, 2011. She attended Butler University and is currently pursuing her M.L.S. at Indiana University in Indianapolis.

## 11. Report Of The Chief Executive Officer

### a. **CEO Monthly Statistical Report – July 2011 and CEO Quarterly Statistical Report – 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2011**

In the absence of the Chief Executive Officer, Ms. Johnson discussed the Reports that were distributed to the Board. She stated that all categories, except Requests Placed, continue to go down compared with 2010. She noted that this is primarily due to the 26% reduction in hours and the reduction in loan limits. An overview of circulation by format and a breakdown of juvenile/adult usage, program offerings and meeting use statistics were also presented.

Ms. Johnson also noted that this year's Summer Reading Program had over 53,000 participants.

Copies of both Reports are attached to these minutes.

### b. **Confirming Resolutions:**

#### 1) **Resolution Regarding Finances, Personnel and Travel (46– 2011)**

At this time, Ms. Johnson recognized Janet Gartin-Moore, Director, Human Resources, who is retiring at the end of this month. She noted that Ms. Gartin-Moore has been employed by the Library for many years. Ms. Gartin-Moore will be taking another position at Girls, Inc. here in Indianapolis. She advised that there will be a reception for her at the Library Services Center later this month.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 46 – 2011, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Lingenfelter, seconded by Mr. Smith, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

- c. **IndyStat Report** – See notes under “Call to Order” item contained in these minutes.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- 12. None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

- 13. None.

**AGENDA BUILDING**

- 14. **Future Agenda Items** – This time was made available for discussion of items not on the Agenda, which were of interest to Library Board members and the opportunity was given to suggest items that should be included on future Library Board Meeting Agendas.

Items suggested for upcoming Board Agendas are as follows:

**September, 2011** - No items were suggested.

**INFORMATION**

- 15. **Materials**

- a. *American Libraries* (July/August 2011)

- 16. **Board Meeting Schedule for 2011 and Upcoming Events/Information**

- a. **Revised Schedule of Board Meetings – 2011** was distributed to the Board for their general information.

- A copy of the Schedule is attached to these minutes.

- b. Library Programs/Free Upcoming Events updated through September 14, 2011 and September PSAs were distributed to the Board.

- 17. **Notice of Special Meetings**

- Monday, August 29, 2011, at the Library Services Center, 2450 North Meridian Street, at 5:00 p.m.

- 18. **Notice of Next Regular Meeting**

Thursday, September 15, 2011, at the Library Services Center, 2450 North Meridian Street,  
at 6:30 p.m.

**19. Other Business**

None.

**20. Adjournment**

The Secretary announced that there was no further business to come before the Board.

The Chairman then declared the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

A DVD of this meeting is on file in the Library's administration office.

---

Marie Turner-Wright, Secretary to the Board

