MINUTES

I. Call to Order and Consideration of Trustee Absences
   5:29 p.m. Sally Leclair
   None absent

II. Amendments to the Agenda
    Amend the agenda to reflect
    • Regular Meeting Schedule and Holiday Schedule (Resolution 2019-11-02) is for
      year 2020
    • Add the check register and expenditures for October to the Consent Agenda
    Motion amend the agenda.
    Bambi Statz motion; Kim Cameron 2nd
    All approve

III. Approval of the Agenda
    Motion to approve the amended agenda for Tuesday, November 19, 2019.
    Marcus Davis motion; Darcy Schlichting 2nd
    All approve

IV. Consent Agenda:
   A. October Board Minutes
   B. Correspondence: Letter from branch staff regarding salary schedule
   C. Check Register and Expenditures-September & October
   D. October Budget to Actual and Balance Sheet
      Motion to approve consent agenda as amended.
      Marcus Davis motion; Kim Cameron 2nd
      All approve

V. Reports
   A. Friends of the Grand County Library, Inc.
      Marla Gall: The Fraser Valley Progressive Dinner fundraiser is sold out. The pie sale
      fundraiser will be on November 26. The Friends will not have a meeting in December
and will hold a workshop in January. The Friends is looking for additional board members.

B. Grand County Library Foundation
Jim Sloan: The rally for Grand County Gives and Colorado Gives Day will take place on December 3. The Foundation continues to work on their new website. Tentatively planning for the annual Foundation meeting to approve 2020 budget and appoint officers on December 3.

C. Public Comment
Public comment opened 5:36 p.m.
Public comment was given. Members of the public expressed their desire for the Board of Trustees to postpone approval of the proposed salary schedule until the December meeting based on concern regarding variation in the % increase of midpoint wage emphasizing some positions with 0% and others 8% or above which creates a sense of distrust and lack of fairness. Also, job descriptions are outdated and need to include and recognize specialty skills. Concern was also expressed regarding slow movement through salary scale. Comments made by Jeanette McQuade, Michelle Grant, Tess Riley, Gaylen Matzen, Heidi McNinch, Sue Luton, Merilyn Hunter.
Public comment closed 5:53 p.m.

D. Public Hearing for the Proposed 2020 Budgets
Public hearing opened 5:54 p.m.
Public comment was given as follows:
- Jeanette McQuade would like the Board of Trustees to be more engaged with the public during the budget process.
- Marla Gall said she values the library staff and asked the Board of Trustees to reevaluate the proposed salary schedule.
Public hearing closed 5:56 p.m.

VI. Information Items
A. Review by Executive Director of October GCLD Department Highlights and Statistics
Polly Gallagher: Highlighted various programs and accomplishments at each library branch. Mentioned first amendment audits and how they pertain to libraries. Surprised to find that staff members had access to the Trustees’ working documents folder. Determined that this should be a Trustee only folder as it is a working documents with content such as email/addresses of Trustee applicants and prevents content to board being presented from multiple platforms. Trustees discussed the idea of staff representation besides Polly on the Finance Committee and the possibility of taping Trustee meetings in the future.

B. Meeting Calendar:
a) Hot Sulphur Springs Town Board, Thursday, November 21 at 6:30 p.m. - Polly Gallagher and Marcus Davis will represent the District at this meeting.
b) Kremmling Town Board, Wednesday, December 18 at 6:00 p.m. - Polly Gallagher and Jim Sloan will represent the District at this meeting.
c) Upcoming Board Committee Meetings
   • Finance - December
• Policy – January

C. Review of 2020 Strategic Plan and Proposed Goals
Polly Gallagher: The action plan is still being finalized. Postponing until December meeting.

D. Trustee Self-Evaluation
Trustees discussed the self-evaluation survey filled out by all members. The main goals determined were to make sure all Trustees have equal time to express their views and to keep meetings on track as a business meeting of the board of trustees, not allowing for too many interruptions.

E. Trustee Interviews
   a) Jeremy Krones
      Interview was conducted.
   b) Eric Sandstrom
      Interview was conducted.
   c) Janet Thomas
      Interview was conducted.

Trustees discussed each interview candidate and the expertise each would bring to the Board of Trustees.

Motion to move the recommendation for approval of Jeremy Krones to fill the District 2 Trustee position to an action item.
Marcus Davis motion; Darcy Schlichting 2nd
All approve

Motion to move the recommendation for approval of Janet Thomas to fill the At-Large Trustee position to an action item.
Marcus Davis motion, Darcy Schlichting 2nd
Jim Sloan abstain
All others approve

F. Forgiveness of uncollectable debt

Motion to move the forgiveness of uncollectable debt to an action item.
Bambi Statz motion; Marcus Davis 2nd
All approve

VII Action Items

A. Motion to approve Resolution 2019-11-01: A Resolution for Setting and Posting a Regular Meeting Schedule for the GCLD Board of Trustees for the Year 2020
Marcus Davis motion; Jim Sloan 2nd
Bambi Statz opposed due to known conflicts with two meetings
All others approve

B. Motion to approve Resolution 2019-11-02: A Resolution for Setting the 2020 Holiday Schedule
Darcy Schlichting motion; Bambi Statz 2nd
All approve

C. Motion to approve the proposed 2020 Salary Schedule
Polly Gallagher and Trustees discussed the proposed salary schedule and clarified information. The main goal of the salary schedule is to pay fair and equitably related to
what the market demands. Determined that pay for performance needs to be evaluated. The District will perform a job description review in early 2020. Finance Committee members want to take the public comment from this meeting into consideration before approval; they will meet at least once before the December Trustees meeting and potentially make adjustments.

Motion to postpone the approval of the 2020 salary schedule until the December meeting
Marcus Davis motion; Kim Cameron 2nd
All approve

D. Motion to recommend approval of Jeremy Krones to fill the District 2 Trustee position.
Marcus Davis motion; Bambi Statz 2nd
All approve

E. Motion to recommend approval of Janet Thomas to fill the At-Large Trustee position.
Darcy Schlichting motion; Kim Cameron 2nd
All approve

F. Motion to approve Resolution 2019-11-03: Forgiveness of uncollectable debt
Marcus Davis motion; Bambi Statz 2nd
All approve

VIII Executive Session 24-6-402(4)(f) C.R.S. Personnel matter regarding the 6 month review of the Executive Director
A. Motion to move into Executive Session.
Marcus Davis motion; Bambi Statz 2nd
All approve
8:02 p.m. moved to Executive Session.
Present during Executive Session: Sally Leclair, Jim Sloan, Darcy Schlichting, Marcus Davis, Bambi Statz, Kim Cameron, Polly Gallagher

B. Motion to return from Executive Session at 9:01 p.m.
Marcus Davis motion; Jim Sloan 2nd
All approve

IX Adjournment
9:03 p.m. meeting adjourned.
Jim Sloan motion; Darcy Schlichting 2nd
All approve
Grand County Library District  
Board of Trustees  
Granby, CO 80446  

November 14, 2019

Dear GCLD Board of Trustees,

We respectfully request that the GCLD Board of Trustees not approve the proposed 2020 pay grade scale as drafted at its November 19 meeting. We ask the board to postpone its decision until the December 2019 board meeting to allow time for consideration of GCLD staff concerns on this matter and other points addressed below.

While we realize that the board is tasked with difficult decisions in approving a budget that is sustainable, we question the integrity of a model that disproportionally increases the salary ranges for positions at the highest level in the organization. The proposed salary scale favors a few at the top, while most staff will see little or no change in pay. This keeps the majority of GCLD’s employees near salary range minimums regardless of experience, skills, professional development, performance, and achievements—which serve to further GCLD’s core values and mission.

We believe the proposed 2020 pay grade scale perpetuates inequality throughout the organization, creating a greater disparity between its employees based solely on a market analysis that may not reflect current industry trends. (This is dependent upon which organizations have been utilized as comparables in the surveys.) Similarly, the job descriptions used as a basis for the market analysis do not accurately represent the current responsibilities and duties of staff. Furthermore, the proposed 2020 pay grade scale does not take into consideration the special circumstances of GCLD’s financial history nor its transition into a new compensation philosophy. (This may take years to implement as intended, depending on what GCLD can afford each fiscal year.)

In a year where the district is expected to see a 17 percent increase in revenue, it is unjust that only a few at the top will benefit. Recalling that GCLD did not fund any merit increases or market adjustments in 2013 and 2014 as well as in 2017, is the board comfortable approving a pay grade scale and budget that does not align with the compensation philosophy it seeks to achieve? Knowing that the compensation philosophy adopted in 2017 was never intended to “make up” for a time when the plan was not funded, the disbursement of funds now available can be done in a way that supports the entire compensation philosophy (both pay grade scale and pay for performance) in a more equitable manner.

Staff also have concerns regarding the amount proposed in the 2020 budget to fund pay for performance increases. The pay for performance line item should not see a cap at 1 percent simply because this is the same year in which a pay grade scale adjustment will be made. The two budgets should have no bearing on each other. Why should some employees take a hit on their earned increase in pay for performance simply because a budget cap was put in place to fund large increases in pay grade for a select few employees?

Since the district adopted a compensation philosophy in 2017, the budget to support pay for performance has never been adequately funded to award employee achievements and merits. This “practice” of not being able to support pay for performance has led to decreased employee morale and lack of trust in the organization.
Ideally, we feel a pay for performance budget should be drafted not by some arbitrary amount left over by other line items, or by a percentage used in year’s past, but rather be funded by an amount that can support pay increases commensurate with actual performance of staff. If the district cannot financially support the funding needed to honor pay for performance and simultaneously keep a sustainable model, then the current compensation philosophy is not working and needs to be reevaluated.

If the entire compensation philosophy takes years to implement properly due to fiscal constraints, then how does our organization reconcile support for pay grade scale adjustments for a few but not for pay for performance adjustments for all? Why fund one and not the other? Why promise next year, when next year’s budget is uncertain? Staff believes the time to make equitable pay adjustments is now.

In addition, increasing the line item for professional development and conferences without increasing the pay for performance funding poses an issue for staff and supervisors. By obtaining professional development and continuing education, staff will be increasing their knowledge and skill set to better perform their position. With higher job performance, an increase in pay for performance should result. When we encourage professional development without the ability to compensate staff for their increased performance, we simply widen the gap between an employee’s performance and pay.

Staff understands the board’s cognizance and sensitivity to public perception as well as the need to be responsible stewards with taxpayer’s dollars. We are not asking for an increase in the overall budget, rather a reevaluation and redistribution of funds in certain line items. A more equitable distribution of pay increases will improve public perception as opposed to the public seeing administrative staff receiving a disproportionate distribution of funding.

Will the board:

1.) Adjust the pay grade scale to an equal distribution across the board, as a one off, until we can appropriately fund our compensation philosophy.

2.) Implement the pay grade scale at a smaller percentage over the next 3 years, rather than all in 2020.

3.) Increase the pay for performance fund to support the intended compensation philosophy.

4.) Make appropriate, equitable adjustments for all staff in the year 2020 while the district’s budget can financially support it.

5.) Come up with ideas to support the compensation philosophy in a manner in which it was originally intended.

Please know that we all share a passion for libraries and for furthering our library district as a whole. We take pride in connecting people with information and serving our community. Our roles in the district are not just jobs, but a fulfillment of purpose. This is not mindless work that anyone can perform. GCLD staff are positive, driven, dedicated professionals. The district would be wise to compensate all of its employees fairly.

Please reach out to staff members whose signatures you see below for clarification or discussion.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jeanette McCutcheon,
Chief Executive Officer
Tessa Quinlan
Deputy Director
Geyle Meltzer
Assistant Director

Michelle Hart
Heidi McNinch
Lucy Suton
Donna Cline
Christine Reindeer
Lauren Park
Debra Petrus
Dear GCLD Board of Trustees,

Please see the additional attached correspondence from members of GCLD staff regarding Action Item C (Approve the 2020 proposed 2020 Salary Schedule) on the November 19, 2019 GCLD Board of Trustees Agenda.

The attached table breaks down the changes to the hourly pay of each level, showing the increase in hourly rate for employees, using midpoint as an example (few employees have reached midpoint, but it is used for illustration.)

Branch managers, library services specialists, library resource specialists, tech support, facilities, cleaners and substitutes are receiving salary range increases of 0% to 2%, while four administrative level staff are receiving adjustments that range from 9% to 14% increases. The majority of the funds allocated to support the pay grade scale adjustments will go to only four positions out of the entire 31 GCLD personnel.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration on this matter,

Michelle Grant
Branch Manager
Granby Library
970-887-2149
mgrant@gcld.org

Grand County Library District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARY GRADE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF PROPOSED CHANGE TO PAY GRADE SCALE</th>
<th>CURRENT HOURLY PAY (MIDPOINT)</th>
<th>PROPOSED HOURLY PAY (MIDPOINT)</th>
<th>ACTUAL INCREASE IN HOURLY PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 10</td>
<td>*Substitute LSS</td>
<td>0% INCREASE</td>
<td>$14.13</td>
<td>$14.13</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 20</td>
<td>*Cleaner</td>
<td>3% INCREASE</td>
<td>$15.34</td>
<td>$15.77</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 30</td>
<td>*Library Service Specialist</td>
<td>2% INCREASE</td>
<td>$17.64</td>
<td>$18.08</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Substitute Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 40</td>
<td>*Library Resource Specialist</td>
<td>2% INCREASE</td>
<td>$18.80</td>
<td>$19.28</td>
<td>$0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0% INCREASE</td>
<td>$20.67</td>
<td>$20.67</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 60</td>
<td>*Branch Manager</td>
<td>0% INCREASE</td>
<td>$22.84</td>
<td>$22.84</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kremmling/HSS &amp; Juniper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 70</td>
<td>*Tech Support Specialist</td>
<td>0% INCREASE</td>
<td>$25.24</td>
<td>$25.24</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Director of Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Branch Manager (Granby &amp; Fraser)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 80</td>
<td>*Director of Library Resources &amp; Technology</td>
<td>11% INCREASE</td>
<td>$29.90</td>
<td>$33.46</td>
<td>$3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Director of HR &amp; Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 90</td>
<td>*Director of Public Services</td>
<td>14% INCREASE</td>
<td>$31.44</td>
<td>$36.49</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 100</td>
<td>*Executive Director</td>
<td>9% INCREASE</td>
<td>$43.27</td>
<td>$47.55</td>
<td>$4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Few employees are at or beyond midpoint. The pay rates are for comparison purposes only.