CLRC Planning and Review Committee

Thursday, December 01, 2011

9 a.m.

CLRC Training Room

Present: Bob Johnston (LeMoyne College), Sue Bond (OCPL), Judi Dzikowski (OCM BOCES), Pam McLaughlin (Syracuse University), Fantasia Thorne (Syracuse University), Debby Emerson (CRLC, *liaison*), Claire Enkosky (CLRC)

Excused: Wanda Bruchis

Action Items:

* Send out links to the other 3R Plan of Service (Debby)
* Review Plan of Service draft and compare to SWOT analysis to compile list of new CLRC goals (all)
* Create a Google Doc of the Plan of Service (Debby)
* Make comments on Google Doc version of Plan of Service (all)

Agenda:

1. Welcome and introductions
* A significant amount of work was done on CLRC’s new Plan of Service up until early September of 2010. Our deadline for submitting our five year plan to the state was April 1st, 2011, but for a number of reasons, including the uncertainty of state funding, the state gave all state funded systems the option of extending that for one year. Our new deadline is April 1st, 2012, although this five year plan would still include 2011-2016.
* The committee is currently without a chair. Olivia Opello was chair but asked to be relieved of her duties because of time constraints.
* Introductions were made.
1. Review of SWOT analysis
* The SWOT analysis is little over a year old. Each of the CLRC standing committees met and performed a SWOT analysis. Then the CLRC staff and Planning Committee compiled the results into a single SWOT analysis.
	+ 8 committee chairs participated, and Debby assumes the column, “Agreed,” represents the number of committee chairs who agreed on that strength.
	+ Pam asks if much outreach was done outside of the committees to get more input for the SWOT analysis. Bob recalls some surveys being sent out to member organizations.
* Debby notes that some of the fields were not as highly marked as she would have expected. For example, under Weaknesses, “the ability to prove ROI for an individual institution” was only noted by two people. She remarks that she views this particular benefit as very difficult to quantify.
1. SWOT analysis notes
* Potential areas for CLRC focus or improvement:
	+ Judi notes that one of the school libraries’ biggest challenges is teaching people to control their digital profile and online presence.
	+ Pam mentions that Syracuse University is struggling to market their resources to potential users.
	+ Sue remarks that one of OCPL’s biggest hurdles is that users expect the same material in a multitude of formats. This can be a part of resource-sharing.
	+ Judi also suggests that there exists some duplication of effort, like OCPL and the BOCES all subscribing to the same databases for the same students. This problem may be alleviated by more CLRC-led resource-sharing and pressure on vendors.
	+ Bob explained some of LeMoyne’s efforts with vendors. Pam suggests that this kind of explanation be shared by CLRC to all of its members, not necessarily to the open public, but possibly in a closed discussion.
1. Previous 2006-2011 Plan of Service
2. New categories
* Previous plans of service had a Technology Services category, but that had been eliminated because it’s integrated into everything we do. Ten categories have been reduced to nine.
1. How to proceed
* Debby prepared an initial draft of what our new Plan of Service might look like.
	+ Pam asked how directly the Plan guides the activities of the Council. Debby responded that it is something that we are required to do by the state, and it must be approved by the state. She feels that we should make an honest effort to make it useful and reflective of our work. She recalls that at the Rochester Regional Library Council, they referred to their plan of service several times and it was beneficial.
	+ Pam would like to see outcomes assessment from the previous plan. Judi suggests that this is the role of the Annual Report, which should be guided by the Plan of Service.
		- Pam recommends that the Annual Report and its assessments be revisited for the decision-making of the 2011-2012 Plan of Service.
* Check marks indicate the level of completion, since this Plan of Service includes the year of 2011.
* The DHP section is dependent on funding, because it is a contract from the state. Judi and Bob both suggest a clarifying caveat be included in the Plan of Service.
* Pam and Fantasia ask about the use of the SWOT analysis in the development of this Plan of Service draft. Debby responds that she only included a few elements; it is still a draft.
	+ For example, one of the goals is an increased training space, but we cannot sign a lease in a larger office because of the instability of state funding.
	+ Pam remarks that, to make the document more compelling, phrases like “continue to do” should be changed to “expand” or “increase.”
	+ Fantasia stresses the importance of awareness and marketing. Marketing is currently listed as a weakness on the SWOT.
* Pam mentions that CLRC’s relationships to the legislators are especially important.
* Pam suggests that the committee dive into the Plan of Service and compare to the SWOT in order to come up with a list of new goals to consider. She also suggests CLRC compare its Plan of Service to the other 3Rs’ Plan of Service.
* Judi notes that the term “legislative day” be reworded to “Library Advocacy Day.”
* Debby reports that the 3Rs are trying to work together as a group more often, so Intended Result #4 under Goal 1 of Section VIII (“CLRC staff will actively participate in NY3Rs to support statewide and multi-regional projects and activities”) should move up in the list.
* There was nothing about RBDB funds. On Page 8, Debby included a new point about RBDB funding being allocated to members.
1. Other
2. **Next meeting date: early January, 2012 to be determined via Doodle poll**
3. Adjournment at 10:45 a.m.