

Library Board of Directors

Special Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, June 16, 2026, 6pm

Jeanne Marie Gaulke Community Meeting Room

502 State St, Hood River

Sara Marsden, President

Library Board:

Board President: Sara Marsden, *Board Vice-President:* Karen Bureker, *Board members:* Megan Janik, Yesi Rojas, and Jean Sheppard.

The Hood River County Library District will hold this meeting by offering a hybrid format. Participants can attend in-person or on Zoom Conferencing. Please use the following phone number or video link:

1-253-215-8782, <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84928717202>, Meeting ID: 849 2871 7202

I. Additions/deletions from the agenda (ACTION) Sara Marsden

Library Board President Sara Marsden called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Janik moved to approve the agenda. Rojas seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with affirmative votes from Bureker, Janik, Marsden, Sheppard and Rojas.

II. Conflicts or potential conflicts of interest Sara Marsden

None stated

III. Open forum for the general public Sara Marsden

None present

IV. Planning session – Library Director Evaluation Jennifer Schoorl, HR Answers

Schoorl, of HR Answers, met with the Board to discuss reviewing and updating the Library Director evaluation process. Schoorl recommended reviewing job descriptions every one to two years and suggested using Survey Monkey to collect evaluation data, describing effective methods for collating results. Schoorl suggested weighting feedback differently depending on the source (e.g., staff versus Foundation), emphasizing the importance of input from staff Fox directly oversees as well as other staff.

Fox clarified that the community member evaluation involved in evaluating the Director are the Presidents from the Friends and Foundation with whom she works directly. Fox asked what the final presentation to the Board would look like. Schoorl explained she would compile survey data and ratings into both a PowerPoint presentation and a written summary report with takeaways and recommendations.

Marsden asked how the new process would differ from the current one. Schoorl said she would consolidate and reorganize questions, eliminate duplication, and provide a draft of

recommended changes.

Sheppard stated she wanted to ensure staff anonymity, noting that feedback from staff who do not directly report to the Director may be less weighted than feedback from staff who report to Fox. Schoorl responded that the survey would clarify whether a respondent directly reports to Fox, and that anonymity would be preserved through use of a neutral third-party administrator. Sheppard noted past difficulties with participation.

Fox asked whether direct quotes from staff feedback would be visible because it is important anonymity be maintained. Schoorl explained that individual feedback would be grouped and summarized with similar responses so that no one's identity could be inferred, while still capturing the substance of the feedback.

Marsden summarized that Schoorl would address redundant questions and propose changes or additions. Schoorl agreed, adding that the goal was to identify questions useful for tracking trends year over year.

Bureker asked whether year-over-year trends could be tracked. Schoorl confirmed this was possible, and that she could incorporate the prior year's survey to establish a baseline.

Marsden asked whether Schoorl would distribute the survey or whether the Board would continue to do so. Schoorl said she would collaborate with Fox on staff communication, but the survey would ultimately be sent through HR Answers.

Sheppard asked about timing. Fox stated the process needs to be completed before December 31. Schoorl noted a typical turnaround of about two months.

Fox indicated the process would likely begin in October, since it must be complete by December 31. Staff have already been informed the evaluation will occur later than usual this year, as the process is being moved out of the library's busiest season. Fox noted that having all information by the third week of November would allow sufficient time. Then contract approval for the Director position would occur at the December Library Board member.

Sheppard noted that September would be better. Schoorl, Fox and the Board agreed that the process would begin in the middle or end of September.

Schoorl would prepare a proposal for Fox to present at the next library board meeting.

Schoorl left the meeting at this point.

Bureker asked whether other library districts use outside organizations for this purpose. Fox confirmed that SDAO recommended this approach, and that HR Answers is the preferred vendor for this type of HR work and we receive a discount as members of Special Districts Association of Oregon (SDAO).

Marsden asked about cost. Fox said she would obtain pricing information for the next meeting.

Marsden asked whether the Board should also review the job description at that time. Fox agreed this could be done at the same meeting, noting it had been about two years since the last review.

Marsden agreed to proceed, pending cost information.

Sheppard estimated the cost could be as much as \$5,000, given the scope of work involved.

Marsden asked whether Schoorl's involvement could be limited to review and administration, without requiring her to present findings to the Board.

Sheppard responded that the greatest value lies in having a neutral third party involved, which she believes will improve response rates.

Marsden inquired if we needed to conduct this entire process.

Fox added that having an outside party that specializes in Human Resources analyze the data and make recommendations would be beneficial to supporting the staff member in the role of the director and organization.

Fox suggested asking whether the first year might cost more but be less expensive in subsequent years perhaps without requiring a formal presentation.

Rojas stated that perhaps they could request a breakdown of the pricing for the entire process. Fox stated she would request the breakdown from Schroot.

Marsden asked whether one staff member is the only person Fox directly oversees. Fox clarified she directly oversees nine people.

Bureker suggested that, given the scale of the change to the evaluation process, the expense may be worth it in the first year if it would be helpful to Fox, noting that outside assistance may likely not be necessary in future years.

Janik agreed, adding that participation rates could be revisited in the future if turnout does not improve.

Fox noted that Schoorl offered to message staff to encourage survey participation. Fox also stated that she believes feedback from community members (Friends and Foundation) is important for this role, and recommended retaining that survey as well.

Marsden suggested Schoorl could tailor certain questions depending on the respondent's relationship to the library, noting that board members, for example, may not be equipped to answer questions intended for staff.

The Board generally agreed that the current survey contains too many questions.

Sheppard suggested aiming to have information gathered back by September.

V. Adjournment

Sara Marsden

The meeting was adjourned at 6:38pm.

Other matters may be discussed as deemed appropriate by the Board. If necessary, Executive Session may be held in accordance with the following. Bolded topics are scheduled for the current meeting's executive session.

ORS 192.660 (1) (d) Labor Negotiations

ORS 192.660 (1) (e) Property

ORS 192.660 (1) (h) Legal Rights

ORS 192.660 (1) (i) Personnel

The Board of Directors meets on the 3rd Tuesday each month from 7:00 to 9:00pm in the Jeanne Marie Gaulke Memorial Meeting Room at 502 State Street, Hood River, Oregon. Sign language interpretation for the hearing impaired is available if at least 48 hours notice is given.