CLRC Planning Committee

March 9, 2012

3:00 p.m.

Present: Pam McLaughlin (Syracuse University), Judi Dzikowski (OCM BOCES), Debby Emerson (CRLC, *liaison*), Deirdre Joyce (CLRC), Claire Enkosky (CLRC)

*Via teleconference*: Wanda Bruchis (Mid York Library System)

Excused: Bob Johnston (LeMoyne College), Fantasia Thorne (Syracuse University)

Action items:

* Make edits to Plan of Service and submit (Debby)
1. Welcome and introductions
* As a standing committee, this committee may need a named person as chair.
1. Minutes from December 1 meeting
* Pam made a motion to approve the December 1st, 2011 meeting minutes. (S/A)
1. Review of SWOT Summit Notes
* From September of 2010, the SWOT analysis was put together by suggestions from all of the committees.
	+ The Vision summit, planned for January of 2011, never occurred.
* Pam remarks that the SWOT analysis does not quite align with today’s CLRC. She asks Debby and Deirdre if they feel that the analysis reflects CLRC’s present circumstances.
	+ Deirdre started working here just a month after the SWOT analysis was compiled. She thinks that the document records good observations of CLRC’s activities at that time, but does not necessarily represent an overall picture of CLRC or offer long term guidance.
		- Pam agrees that it is not a visionary document.
	+ Debby remarked that “relevance” rather than “visibility” is CLRC’s main concern. She suggests that we need to work on meeting members’ needs so that CLRC is always considered relevant.
		- Judi seconds this and cites the Syracuse City School District dropping out as an example of CLRC’s relevancy being insufficient (although for SCSD, cost was also an issue).
* Pam asks if the action items in the SWOT analysis are in the Plan of Service. Debby responds that in general they are, but she would like the committee to identify anything in the SWOT missing from the Plan of Service.
* With regards to a larger training space as an opportunity item, Pam asks if CLRC has considered a mobile lab. Deirdre responds that they are currently writing an HLSP grant to create such a mobile training lab, to include 5 laptops and a projector.
	+ Judi commends this move because time and travel costs have inhibited training participants.
	+ Judi also offers the use of OCM offices when available. She recommends that CLRC look at using other spaces, like local libraries, too.
1. Review of 2011-2016 Plan of Service to date
* Judi asks if CLRC can report on the number of different types of librarians (e.g. school librarians, public librarians) that attend training events. These figures may enhance the Plan’s evaluation methods. Debby answers that we can.
	+ Deirdre adds that offering web-based training to attract school librarians is still an obvious area for growth.
* Wanda mentions that the vision is purposefully vague because it is trying to look so many years forward. Pam mentions that the objectives (i.e. day to day activities) would link the intended results and the evaluation methods, and therefore the objectives would have to be flexible.
	+ RRLC includes a column of operational activities in their document that does not get submitted to the state.
* Deirdre views CLRC’s role as that of cultivating a community of library professionals through our various activities and goals. She considers community to be the center of CRLC’s mission, with relevancy a key component.
	+ First Mondays (pizza nights) are an example of CLRC’s efforts to meet this mission.
	+ Pam adds that synergy is another key component, particularly because this is a multi-type consortium.
* Pam, Judi, and Deirdre point out that the mission statement is lacking the ending: “in order to…” Pam suggests “to improve the lives of citizens” or “for the benefit of users.” The modification of this statement would trickle down to the goals in the Plan of Service.
* CLRC staff members will be in an all day retreat to address the activities that we need to be doing that we aren’t doing yet and the activities that we should stop doing.
* Specific editing notes
	+ In the Plan of Service, Pam notes that many of the intended results are written in passive voice. These should be rephrased so that “CLRC will …”
	+ Deirdre would like to remove the subtitles of the goals, like “CCDA” and “delivery.”
		- The goals should be vaguer and specific programs (like CCDA) should be only explicitly referenced in the intended results.
	+ Section III Goal 2, “CLRC will maintain a useful training lab,” is unclear. Bob points out that III Goals 2, 3 and 4 could all be included under III Goal 1.
		- Bob also suggests that we include an objectives column like RRLC to make the organization of goals and intended results clearer.
	+ Judi comments that numbers should not be included in the Intended Results.
	+ Judi points out that if CLRC invests in a training space, then it must be used more often to meet the increase in cost of overhead.
1. Next steps
* CLRC staff will add the extra Objectives / Activities column.
	+ These will be action steps.
* CLRC staff will also address the goal statements to reflect more of an active leadership role.
* Like SCRLC and ALA, CLRC may take the final draft of the Plan of Service and render it into an abbreviated format for the annual meeting. Sue suggests that it become a sort of “what’s in it for me” document to help CLRC justify its membership.
	+ Pam suggests CLRC update such an abbreviated document annually to update it and keep people involved.
1. Other
2. Next meeting date

Next meeting to be determined by Doodle poll.

Pam made a motion to adjourn the meeting (S/A).

Meeting adjourned at 10:21 a.m.