

**INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
JANUARY 4, 2011**

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library Board met at the Library Services Center, 2450 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, IN on Tuesday, January 4, 2011 at 5:00 p.m., pursuant to notice given in accordance with the rules of the Board.

1. Call To Order

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

2. Roll Call

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

Members absent: None.

The Chairman announced that a quorum was present and that the meeting was duly constituted.

3. Miscellaneous Matters and Discussion

Mr. Shevlot began by thanking everyone for attending this evening's meeting. He noted that this meeting should be a big help in the search for a new Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") for the Library.

At this time, David Sternberg from Loring, Sternberg & Associates, stated that he is a local consultant in Indianapolis and works primarily with the non-profit community. He mentioned that he had been asked to help guide the Board's discussion and thinking around the qualifications for the next Library CEO. He believes the items that will best suit the Library for the future are:

- 1) To have some agreement around what the vision for the Library will be moving forward;
- 2) To create a set of basic qualities and skills that the Board might look for in the next CEO;
- 3) To have an agreement on the process to gather public input on what the public thinks the basic skills and qualities should be for the next CEO; and
- 4) Then, in the end, give the Board an opportunity to discuss how to best search for the next CEO.

Mr. Lingenfelter advised that he wished to address the aspect of obtaining public input in this process. He feels passionate about doing that but wants consensus from the rest of the Board that they are in agreement. We need to make that a question before we go forward.

Mr. Sternberg stated that he would conduct a SWOT Analysis this evening with the Board.

Mr. Shevlot noted that none of the current Board members had gone through the process of selecting a CEO for this Library. In the past, there were Board members that had been serving for several years

and there was somewhat of a process in place, whether it was good, bad or indifferent. He thought it would be helpful for Mr. Sternberg to give the Board his observations or experiences that he has encountered then the Board can discern if they are applicable to our situation. How should the meetings be conducted? Do you have some Foundation help? Who do you select from the community to participate?

Janet Gartin-Moore, Human Resources Director, mentioned that the Library had conducted CEO searches two different ways in the recent past. One was done as a national search with a committee of staff, Board members and Foundation. Receptions were held for the public and staff to come and meet with the candidates.

Mr. Sternberg noted that it should be determined what process will get the most buy-in. Whoever is chosen must prove him or herself. He advised that, for example, if he were in charge of conducting a search for a new President of the IMCPL Foundation, he would create a Search Committee from the Board and other external stakeholders whose opinions were important. He would charge them with determining what the job description ought to be and then determine the best way in which to search for the broadest number of candidates. That Committee would sort through the applicants and decide how the screening/interview process would be done. He noted that the Library can't necessarily make it that simple and that's fine but the Library needs to garner the kind of input that's going to be helpful and valuable from the right places. You can't consider every single person's opinion – it would not end. With that in mind, he suggested that the Board appoint a Committee to review the qualifications and job description and come to some recommendation for the Board about how you go about conducting the process to find the next CEO. Mr. Sternberg stated that it was his opinion that the Committee would include some staff, Board members, someone from the Foundation and potentially people who can represent those who have a discernible interest with respect to what happened in the Library system as of late (those who lobbied to deal with the Budget crisis). Major funders in town or someone from the High Performance Government Team might also have an interest.

Ms. Turner-Wright suggested that when the final candidates are selected that they should do a presentation in a public setting on what they see as the foremost problems for the Library in a climate where there are fewer funds and what they see as goals and concerns.

Robert Scott, counsel for the Library Board, noted that if there were no more than three members of the Board on the Committee then meetings could be less formal in terms of public notices and worrying about Executive Session issues. He mentioned that those Committee meetings could be held privately and serious deliberations could take place. The Committee would not have to conduct the meetings in front of everyone.

Ms. Crenshaw noted that she was confused as to why the Board wouldn't want some public input. She sees that as more of a generic kind of recommendation. They would not be taking the role of identifying the actual person but instead would identify the qualities, characteristics and skill set that the person should have.

Mr. Sternberg replied that the reality is that there are politics involved. He doesn't subscribe to the process that excludes those people. He is trying to get to a process that includes those people in the most efficient way. The Board needs to start the process by identifying qualities and share those with the public and then ask them what they think should be added to the list.

Mr. Lingenfelter stated that sometimes the discussion may need to happen absent the public -- not the decision but the framing of the discussion and the Board needs to come to consensus as to what things are discussed and how.

Mr. Sternberg noted that the Board has to make a decision that is in the best interest of the Library and that might not make everyone happy.

Mr. Shevlot stated that there must be an agreement on vision or the rest doesn't follow. The basic qualities and skill set that the Library will need should be based on what we have known and gone through the last few years and what we anticipate needing for a long term commitment.

Mr. Sternberg commented on the short tenures of the last three CEOs and that it is important for the Board to "get it right" this time.

Mr. Lingenfelter mentioned that it does give the Board the opportunity to reach out to the community to improve the Library's image if the decision is made to bring in a person that takes opportunities rather than bring in a person that wants to cut everything back to a bare bones budget. Do we look for someone that will continue to move the Library forward and, if so, what does that take?

Ms. Turner-Wright advised that the Board needs a starting point of putting together a position description because there will have to be some advertisement for this. We should plan to put ads in the various library publications such as *American Libraries* and *Public Libraries* for the March issues.

Mr. Sternberg continued that the Board needs to decide where the Library is headed in the future. The next CEO should be charged with helping to frame that up so that they need to know how to move the Library forward.

Mr. Lingenfelter referenced the Library's Strategic Plan and the Sustainable Library Plan and how those would be addressed by the new CEO. We need someone that can achieve something not someone that will just "maintain". We don't want to find the best "average" candidate but we want to find the candidate that has the ability to adjust the Plans if necessary.

Mr. Bacon wanted to know if it was mandatory for the Board to select a CEO.

Mr. Scott confirmed that, according to the statute, the Board is charged with the obligation to select and hire the Director/CEO. The statute, however, doesn't provide for the process or any detail on how you go about it.

Mr. Bacon asked if the Library could be run by committee rather than a CEO.

It was discussed that it is required by statute that the Library be run by a certificate-holding librarian as the Director/CEO.

Mr. Smith stated that if he were making the selection, he would seek out the person that is best at their job. The person that has been through what our Library has gone through. He mentioned the Tony Dungy analogy. Who would be the dream person for this job?

A discussion was held among the Board members about the criteria that must be followed and how to seek out the best person for the job. It was noted that the Board will have to make the job look inviting considering all the past problems along with the turnover in the CEO position.

Mr. Sternberg noted that conducting the SWOT Analysis will assist the Board in identifying what is important to them regarding the search. The Board members will find out that they each might have to compromise a little bit during this process.

At this time, Mr. Sternberg began the SWOT Analysis. The Analysis consisted of discussion on the following topics:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Opportunities
- Threats

Mr. Sternberg advised that he would prepare a document based on the results of the SWOT Analysis discussion and send it to the Board for their review.

Mr. Sternberg then discussed the best way to proceed from here and keep this CEO selection process moving.

There was discussion about the make-up of a Committee that would be tasked with reviewing historical documentation and the Board's feedback and then deciding what they think the major criteria of skills and qualifications would be for the next CEO.

Mr. Sternberg confirmed that this Committee would need to come back to the Board with a set of criteria that might possibly be incorporated in the CEO job description.

There were various suggestions concerning Committee make-up. Some of the suggestions made included using three Board members, two representatives from the Foundation, maybe individuals from CICF and United Way, representatives from AFSCME and the Staff Association and perhaps two other staff members, possibly selected from the clerical, "front-line" or IT areas.

At this time, Mr. Lingenfelter, Ms. Turner-Wright and Mr. Smith volunteered to be the Board members that would participate on the Committee.

Mr. Shevlot asked what would take place once the initial Committee's work is completed.

Mr. Sternberg advised that the Committee would probably hold two meetings to do their work. Once the Board is satisfied with the position description it would be presented at an upcoming Board Meeting where a decision would be made about how to go about processing the search (i.e. national?).

Mr. Shevlot expressed concern about the size of the proposed Committee and that it might cause the need for more meetings and the timeline to be extended.

Mr. Sternberg noted that he hoped to have the meetings completed by the end of February.

Mr. Shevlot concluded the meeting by thanking everyone again for attending this evening's meeting.

4. **Other Business**

None.

5. **Adjournment**

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

The Chairman declared the Special Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Marie Turner-Wright, Secretary of the Board

