Members Present: Jeff Breeden; Chair, Marita Rhinehart; Vice Chair, Ann Langevin, Rachel Hunt, and Erica Tietjen.

Also Present: Director Kimberly Diehm, Assistant Director Anne Karr, Craig Galati (LGA), Brittany Bleak (LGA), Jason Jorjorian (LGA), Peter Ronza (Pontifex), Martin Einert, Jennifer Haag, Deanna Duffy, Jessica Jones, Samantha Evangelho.

The regular meeting of the Library Board of Trustees was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Jeff Breeden.

I. Pledge of Allegiance: Led by Ann Langevin

II. Citizen Participation: Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be acted upon until provisions of Nevada’s Open Meeting Law have been completed. Therefore, any action on such items must be considered at a later meeting. Public comment is generally limited to 5 minutes per person.

There were no comments at this time.

III. Consent Agenda: Matters considered routine by the Board of Trustees and which may be enacted in one motion. Any item, however, may be discussed separately per Board member request. Any exceptions to the Consent Agenda must be stated prior to approval.

Jeff requested a spelling error be corrected at the top of page 2 – “Principle” should be “Principal.”

Marita Rhinehart moved that the consent agenda, minutes of the special December 13, 2017 and the regular meeting of December 20, 2017 as amended, and bills paid of $15,412.87 from the previous month be accepted. Rachel Hunt seconded. Motion carried.

IV. Reports:

Kim reported with excitement that another wedding has been booked for the amphitheater.

Jeff asked about the property to the East of the library. Kim reported that she had spoken the day before with a reverend who is interested in opening a church there. Kim has alerted the City to the library’s interest. Jeff was satisfied with the report and asked to be kept posted as there are developments.

V. Report/Discussion/Action Possible: The agenda items in this section are for discussion and for possible action. The items may be heard in any order; two or more items may be combined for consideration; an item may be removed from the agenda; or discussion related to an item may be delayed at any time.

1. Architectural Firm LGA Proposal & LGA Update- Action Possible, Kim Diehm
Kim verified that the proposal was accepted and had been included in the Board packet. She expressed excitement to be working with LGA and explained that Craig, Jason and Brittany had spent a portion of the day getting staff input. To communicate the outcome of that gathering session, she introduced Craig Galati to the Board.

Craig, shared a few observations. He happily reported that the library is not broken. There are, however, some fixes that can be made and other areas which can be given attention. He observed that the majority of needs and wishes expressed revolve around becoming a stronger community resource.

He shared that the LGA team had witnessed lots of use and a full parking lot which impressed them. He explained that this session had been the kickoff, but a long road remained.

Jason consolidated some goals which had emerged from the long meeting the team had shared with the staff earlier in the day. He expressed that they saw great opportunity due to the strength of the community and were happy to see lots of visitation to the library during their investigation. He complimented a talented staff and named a goal as enabling them to connect with and better serve the community. He highlighted the results from the meeting as follows:

Goals heard from staff:
- Increase revenue generation – Discussed events in the amphitheater, a café, or book sale space.
- Improve accessibility – A drop-off area or closer entrance for those with mobility issues.
- Improve wayfinding and signage – Three types of signage to help with clear direction.
- Separate youth and adults – Create separations for differing sound tolerances.
- Energy conservation – Reducing operational costs and exploring solar opportunities.
- Security and safe working environment – Newly presented concern for the security of both staff and visitors.
- Create a new entry- Current entry is a great space full of symbolism but it has some placement issues as well as acoustical factors. These need some focus while still keeping the “wow” factor.
- Expand programs and offerings – Community partnering opportunities that require different space offerings, programing and flexibility were discussed. Appropriate flooring and other options were presented.
- Connection to outdoor space – The library has great light but the windows are high. Jason talked about creating a connection to the outdoors.
- Create a space for art – An appreciation is evident in the community.
Jason explained that these project notes will be used to create a summary from the staff meeting for Board review. A shared vision for expanded services here will hopefully help to create a buzz so that during community meetings people will tell the team what was missed.

Craig introduced a schedule. He reminded everyone that they will be marching fast with lots to do. The goal will be to have a design to show the public by the library’s 75th anniversary celebration in April. He asked, “How do we connect with the community and build friends along the way?” He talked about the January 31st community input meeting and ways to engage social media platforms and get feedback. Ideas that had been discussed with the staff for spreading the word and receiving comments were also shared with the Board.

Craig assured the Board that creation of an agenda for the January 31st meeting would be their next task. Jeff suggested that all advertisements should also list the dates for subsequent meetings as well. He informed the group that all of the upcoming meetings would be public meetings in the spirit of open meeting laws so the Board could all attend. Kim verified that aside from the community meeting all other meetings would coincide with a regularly scheduled Board meeting. Craig confirmed that their schedule dovetailed through Board meetings as much as possible.

Jenn Haag suggested the library announce the community meeting at the January 23rd City Council meeting and utilize the televised coverage for accessing the public and she clarified the meeting would include more space than just the Board Room.

Ann apologized in advance for a prior engagement that would prevent her from being able to attend and she provided her request that space be allotted for both youth and adults to learn how to code. Marita suggested an invitational article and an ad in the paper.

Jeff spoke for the Board when he said they were excited. He liked what LGA said about building a stronger community resource, not just a library, and he looked forward to working to make the library not only a community center in today’s world but also in tomorrow’s. He said they were thrilled to be a part of the process.

2. Library 75th Anniversary celebration date/plans - Action Possible, Kim Diehm

The date for the celebration was discussed with LGA and Friday, April 20th, 2018 was settled upon. The plan includes showing a newly released family movie in the amphitheater when the sun goes down. The two hours leading up to that will include festivities in the Community Room. She said the library had great success with Moana and would like to show Coco. Jeff verified sundown that day will be at 7:00 p.m. so he would prefer to see the event begin at 5:00 p.m. rather than 4:00 p.m. which had also been suggested.
LGA wants to be a part of it too and will have renderings ready to share. Jeff offered that if the date presents any significant problem, it can still be changed. Rachel shared her approval because it allows for another Board meeting and likes the fact that the date will give them more opportunity to do the event “right.”

3. Classification and Compensation Report approval - Action Possible, Pete Ronza
(The Board Received only odd pages of the report so Kim submitted the full report for those who needed it.)

Pete explained that he developed job descriptions and the classification system and was here previously during Christmas week. He shared that a lot of the report consists of language samples and is written for a variety of audiences. He joked that page 3 (which happened to be an odd page) provides deliverables for the public sector.

Pete demonstrated the complications that can be inherent to the process by sharing his recent experiences in Gibraltar with a large company that has to pay employees in different money systems. He explained to the Board that the key to a pay system is to attract, retain and motivate employees; or as he stated, “You want to get ‘em and keep ‘em from being stolen.”

He discussed the need to be financially sustainable, responsible, and transparent. Because a library uses taxpayer money, being transparent becomes an important objective. The library’s biggest fixed cost is people because the primary business is service.

Pete went through the report highlighting various pages that might have the most impact:

Page 6 deals with how an organization may set a compensation philosophy or strategy.
Pages 7 and 8 are important to see the rhythm of the labor market.
Page 7 refers to the employee and shows compensation and how that moves with different groups.
Page 8 shows different indicators. He gave an explanation of the difference between the CPI and the ECI and verified that ECI is what he used to create the library’s plan. Page 13 demonstrates how this study was built from scratch. Pete spoke with the employees and the information used was acquired from a questionnaire. That information was used to create legally compliant job descriptions. The report includes wording that can be used in the future. Language for use creating policies is given in the back and Pete emphasized the report is written for jobs currently being performed at the library. Based upon the description of work being done, the designed system was compared to the competitive labor markets (where one goes to attract and retain).
Some comparisons can be selected from anywhere while others can only come from looking at libraries of a similar size, mission or depth. The considerations used have to be taken into account when developing a compensation system and utilizing legitimate data is also a required element. He explained it will be necessary to query the market repeatedly. If it is discovered that the market is attracting an employee, it will be possible to defend that the institution has not just made up a system and it is not playing favorites.

Page 14 provides figures used for the compensation system.

Pontifex was asked to give recommendations. The next several pages relate to this:

Page 17 depicts the created salary ranges for the structures. The figures provided are minimum and maximum values. Pete offered a “word of warning” and shared that his job was to value jobs, not people. He emphasized that it is the organization that values people. He expressed that it is natural when we know the people involved to look at the new system and think it is a value judgement on the employee. He informed the Board that is not the case. The system is designed around the organization’s ability to attract and retain. The ability to see how an employee fits into the ranges depends on elements such as education, longevity and skills.

Page 18 states that the library will be supported for the standard minimum of one year of assistance with no additional cost. Something may change or the establishment may need a new job and Pontifex will help to make that adjustment to the system. Pete indicated that the key to the success of the system is not just the transition and rolling it out, but maintaining it.

Page 20 is the hierarchical structure married with compensation structure. It allows the library to create job families and construct other families in the future as needed and it is designed to avoid compression where people are encouraged not to promote and to proceed. The system has been constructed to avoid structural and procedural pitfalls seen in many organizations. The size of our library has been considered.

Appendices are provided to give language to use as policies are created. Some terms and concepts are required for legal obligations with federal law. These will help to keep the library compliant and prevent audits.

In answer to Pete’s invitation to ask questions or have points clarified, Ann mentioned that she had spoken with Human Resources at LVCCCLD and realized that a Step System was not a currently popular system, but she questioned how a schedule for advancement would work under the new design.

Pete explained that Steps were a popular 1950s and 1960s concept. He shared that in some cases they are still used. The problem he identified is they limit flexibility. From a compensation management perspective, they “bake in” your fixed cost. If everyone gets a 4% increase, for example, and everyone receives a step, it becomes a problem if revenues plunge and the fixed cost keeps moving. Hiring freezes and
layoffs will not fix a problem when the increases are not flexible. Merit pay is discouraged because the cost becomes too high. He expressed there is no logic in steps and reiterated that the compression is baked in. An issue that can be created occurs when the management group is not moving and everyone else is.

As a recommendation for how compensation increases can be offered, Pete provided examples. He stated that some organizations are oriented to giving increases as the budget process is done from a pool of funds. Others compensate based on performance. Some use an economic indicator. He reminded the Board that it will be necessary to adjust the ranges every once in a while and give the system a “tune up.” He shared that there are thousands of ways to compensate people, but he chose the one that best matched the culture and environment at this library. Some environments do want steps because the jobs are radically different between scientists and jobs requiring creativity for example. Becoming hostage to income flows is something no employer wants to get caught in because he stated an employer can only arrest people’s pay, not reduce it.

Marita expressed enthusiasm for the plan. Jeff requested clarification on the math involved in the A3 range. Pete explained that he had to construct ranges and construct mathematical consistency between the ranges. He had to run regression from both vertical and horizontal positions. Market Based Compensation is an alternative but he stated it is hard to manage. These compensation differentials, he warned, can create an option that is open to suit. Pete informed the Board that a pure link to market is possible, but expensive to maintain.

The need to compare like sized organizations with a like sized population was discussed especially in light of the competitor here being LVCLDL. Pete shared the competitor is a rare market and clarified this library cannot pay like them. He stated the library has an obligation to pay responsibly within its means and noted that this library’s ability to pay is on the lower end. Compensation is not the only element to be considered.

In creating this system both an internal and external worth combination needed to be incorporated. A hierarchical view will value employees differently than the market does. The strategy needed to view comparable worth from an internal value which includes the knowledge skills for the entire mix of jobs. Jobs that do not have anything in common with each other need a glue to hold them together when Librarians and maintenance positions coexist in the same system.

Pete was thanked for his presentation and he assured the Board of his availability to them for future questions. Following Pete’s departure, the Board members asked Jeff for clarification of the question he had asked. Jeff assured the group that he trusted
the qualifications of the consultant and the point of confusion was identified for the group.

Kim brought attention to a sheet attached to the back of the original packet which identified four employees who fall under the range for their positions. In light of the approaching budget she pointed out the total cost to bring them up to the newly designed range.

Jeff thanked Kim for the information. Kim asked if the Board needed to approve the range and she informed the Board that she needed to send the range into the County office. This sparked a lot of discussion regarding the role the County has regarding authority in relation to the Boulder City Library District. From the audience Deanna offered that the County does not always remember we are not one of their departments. As it is not their money, Jeff reiterated that this does not fall within the authority of the County and should not need to be reported to them. He offered if they provide some proof, it could be brought before the Board to review in the future.

4. Leave Policy - Action Possible, Kim Diehm

Jeff asked to have this policy available for review because at the last meeting Martha stated it was difficult to understand. Within the packet the Board was provided with an original policy and the version that it had been updated to. Ann asked why leave accrual was different between professional and non-professional staff. Kim replied that was not a new policy but had been maintained with the update.

Ann expressed concern that this policy displayed elitism. Kim asked Samantha to speak for the Policy Committee as to the rationale behind the policy. Samantha explained it as a benefit designed for professional employee retention. Professionals have extra training and while the library cannot offer pay to compete with other Clark County libraries, it can compensate with a good leave policy. Discussion ensued about the appropriateness of vacation having relevance to one’s level of knowledge versus the use as a perk to be more competitive.

Ann’s next question regarding maternity leave. From her previous interviews with employees she had concerns about sick leave versus whether the library provided accommodations for this type of leave. Kim and Samantha verified that this condition was covered under the library’s “Extraordinary Circumstances” heading. Discussion clarified that the library provides for four weeks of paid time after both vacation and sick time are used in addition to providing for four weeks of unpaid time off. Jeff explained that FMLA does not require pay, but only holds the job. FMLA rules were clarified and historical occurrences faced by the library were examined. With as few employees as the library has, Marita noted that the BCLD policy is generous.
Ann wanted to know if gender neutrality was permitted for. The answer was yes. Jeff questioned if there is a time limit. Samantha explained that this was once called “Catastrophic Leave” and permitted one occurrence within a year’s timeframe but in the last revision Kim and Samantha confirmed they purposely did not want to write in too many restrictions. Jeff pointed out that the Director has the ability to say no at any point so the policy may not need to have a limit.

Jeff mentioned that the reason the group was reviewing the policy was due to the fact that Martha (the auditor) thought it was confusing. After the review, Jeff stated he did not have an issue with the policy.

There was then some confusion regarding the two versions within the packet. Rachel pin-pointed the issue highlighted by Martha the previous month as employee’s confusion over accrual rates. Samantha addressed this by explaining that each employee has a base or “magic number.” Over time, this had not been calculated or paid correctly for several employees for a number of years. She and Martha had worked to fix that issue already.

Kim verified that the Leave Policy was not included in the 2015 group of policies approved by the Board. Jeff identified that the policy neglected to provide for how leave is accrued. Rachel confirmed from the text that the sick rate is one day per month. The Board determined that the policy as written could be read to be interpreted as having leave issued as one lump sum. Jeff also requested that “full day increments” also be stated clearly. They asked for a revision. With that fix they would revisit the policy and plan to approve it next month.

5. Personnel Policy - Action Possible, Kim

Kim explained the policy with the library logo is the new one to be reviewed. Jeff stated he had hoped for a redline version, but Kim explained it had been such a large re-write that it had been impossible to do so.

Ann brought up the point that this is an “At Will” state and wondered if this was why she did not notice a probationary period mentioned within the policy. Jeff mentioned that for those moving from another state, it can be helpful to clarify this point. It was determined that this library does have an implied probationary period based upon the six month break for the benefit plan. Health insurance is offered immediately. Ann mentioned that there is a mental probationary period and Samantha agreed that the practice is for the library to initiate a six-month review to make sure and employee is fitting into the organization.

Ann then asked about the Harassment Policy. The Board verified that this is covered in pages 3-5. Ann asked, “What if it is the library director?” The wording in the policy accounts for all other situations. Ann indicated that experience has shown this lack of clarity can present an issue for the library. Much discussion followed in an
effort to allow for staff confidentiality and a plan for recourse. Whistleblower policies, retaliation and Human Resource departments in other organizations were part of the conversation. This issue proved difficult to resolve so the Board requested that the Policy Committee explore recommendations from outside HR departments. Marita suggested asking others how they handle such a situation.

If an issue is brought to a Board member it presents a confidentiality problem due to the fact that under the open meeting law, Board members can’t talk to other Board members. Jeff pointed out that it does become a Board action to remove a Library Director. Even with an HR department the process is to disseminate information but the only recourse is to put the issue on an agenda.

Without a good answer, the question brought discomfort. The group determined that the specific issue ought to be written into the policy. Due to the public nature of the organization, the circumstance is difficult. More brainstorming was recommended. Rachel offered to reach out to her contacts with the question before the next meeting.

Jeff recommend limiting changes to that section alone. With nominal changes he requested a redline edition for a future month’s meeting.

Also included in the packet, just for information, was an article about the future of programing in libraries that Ann suggested the Board read. An issue with stapling offered levity and Kim promised the assembling staff would be more cognizant of ease of use in the future. Jeff thanked Ann for the relevant article. Jeff discussed their desire as a Board to leave a legacy of relevancy.

VI. Announcements:
1. Mystery Book Club Organization Meeting, 10 a.m., Community Room, Thursday, January 18, 2018
2. Jerry Barton Celtic Fingerstyle Guitarist, 6:30pm, Community Room, Thursday, January 18, 2018 (name Barlow – correction)
3. Local Author Faire, 1-3pm, Community Room, Saturday, January 20, 2018
4. Kickoff for community plan, 7-8:30 p.m., Both rooms, Wednesday, Jan 31, 2018
4. Boulder City Library Board Meeting, 7p.m., Board Room, Thursday, February 22, 2018, (Note change Wed. to Thurs.)

Jan Haag suggested including the day of the week in the announcement. It has not been done on a regular basis and would be helpful.

VII. Citizen Participation: Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be acted upon until provisions of Nevada’s Open Meeting Law have been completed. Therefore, any action on such items must be considered at a later meeting. Public comment is generally limited to 5 minutes per person.
Jeff thanked the community members for their comments throughout. There were no other comments at this time.

VIII. Adjournment:

Marita moved to adjourn. Ann seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.