



Possible Models for Structure and Governance Structures Study FY 2007

MODEL: *Weighted County (revised)*

Submitted by: *Allan Nilson*

Details	Pro	Con
Organizational Structure		
1. Merge SELCO and SELS, becoming one organization SELCO. The new SELCO would continue being a not-for-profit corporation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Name already in place and recognized ▪ Eliminates any confusion of who is actually a SELS member. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will no longer have ability to apply for LSTA as two separate organizations ▪ Requires change in statutes
Governance Structure: Board and Committees		
2. 18- member Board (16 voting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 representative from public library advisory committee – non-voting liaison ○ 1 representative from multitype library advisory committee – non-voting liaison ○ 16 county/library representatives, chosen by joint agreement, weighted by county population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 Dodge ▪ 1 Fillmore ▪ 1 Freeborn ▪ 2 Goodhue ▪ 1 Houston ▪ 1 Mower ▪ 3 Olmsted ▪ 2 Rice ▪ 1 Steele ▪ 1 Wabasha ▪ 2 Winona 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smaller, more focused board ▪ Addresses concern that some counties were underrepresented compared to their population/funding ▪ Even though SELCO and SELS are merged, a separate multitype advisory committee would insure that their needs would be heard since they have no direct representation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Libraries may feel they have less influence ▪ May be difficult for libraries/counties to agree on representative ▪ May requires change in statutes since county representative would now be a county/library representative ▪ Even though county part of the selection process it may not satisfy statutory requirements – change in state law may be necessary

MODEL: *Weighted County (revised)*

Submitted by: *Allan Nilson*

Details	Pro	Con
3. Board meets in person every other month and electronically as needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fewer meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less direct contact with Board ▪ Longer agendas and meetings
4. Continue standing committees for major topic: finance, personnel, technology, foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee structure already exists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Budget		
5. Merged SELCO/SELS budget with separate funding streams. SELS becomes a “program” within SELCO budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced accounting and audit expenses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worries by public libraries that other types of libraries will benefit from RLBS
Membership		
6. Membership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public Libraries would be required to be members ▪ Any other library with Board approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding is stable (no public library could withdraw) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change in state law required ▪ Would a standard for what constitutes a public library have to be set? Set by state or SELCO?
7. 2 librarian advisory committees that meet every other month <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public ▪ Multitype 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides venue for librarians that feel “underrepresented” to express their concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committees are large and unwieldy