Welcome and Introductions

President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board (CLSB) meeting to order on October 14, 2016 at 9:34 a.m.


California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Gerry Maginnity, Natalie Cole, Janet Coles, Lisa Dale, Wendy Hopkins, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, and Annly Roman.

Adoption of Agenda

Annly Roman stated that the reference to the Chief Executive Officer’s Report needed to be removed from the agenda because State Librarian Lucas was unable to attend the meeting.

It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board send condolences to the Lucas Family and pay homage to the legacy that Greg’s father left to the state of California.

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the October 14, 2016 meeting, as amended.

Approval of April 2016 Board Minutes

It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the July 12, 2016 meeting.
Election of Board Officers for 2017

Member Schockman reported on behalf of the Nominating Committee, himself and Member Williams, that they would like to put forward Member Bernardo and Member Maghsoudi as the nominees for President and Vice President of the Board for another year.

The Nominating Committee also wanted to request that the Board move from an annual election of Board officers to a biennial election. That change would require amending the California Library Services Act regulations.

There were no nominations from the floor.

It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Anne Bernardo as President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2017.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2017.

Board Meeting Date for Spring 2017

Annly Roman reported that the Board had been meeting in-person in spring, so members could meet with legislators, and holding a teleconference meeting in fall. A teleconference meeting was held in July and an in-person meeting held in October of 2016 to discuss the one-time funds allocated in the 2016/17 state budget.

Many members expressed a preference for two in-person meetings instead of a teleconference. Member Christmas asked if the budget would accommodate two in-person meetings and was informed that travel expenses came out of the Library Development Services (LDS) Bureau’s General Fund budget so additional travel for the Board would limit LDS’ budget in other areas.

An additional proposal for a half day, all Board orientation was made, which would have required an additional trip to Sacramento. Most Board members agreed to an orientation. There was considerable discussion of whether the orientation could be concurrent to one of the Board meetings, if both Board meetings should be in-person, and whether legislator visits could still occur if the orientation was scheduled concurrent to the spring meeting.
The final determination was that the Board would meet in-person in Sacramento in April and again in fall. The orientation would be held on the day before the April meeting and if Board members wanted to meet with legislators they would try to schedule their own meetings in the early part of the day before the orientation.

Annly Roman said that she would send out a Doodle poll to determine the best April meeting date.

**REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

**Board President’s Report**

President Bernardo reported that she attended the Council of County Law Librarians meeting in August and met with key legislators. At that same time she attended the 125th anniversary of the County Law Libraries reception that was held in Sacramento. Senator Wolk recognized that anniversary with a proclamation.

She also attended the State Bar’s meeting as the Law Libraries’ representative.

**Board Vice-President’s Report**

Vice-President Maghsoudi said that she tried to attend the CLA legislative committee as much as possible.

**Broadband Update Report**

Natalie Coles reported that by June 30, 2018 about 143 library jurisdictions would be connected or in the process of connecting to CalREN, 275 branches would be connected by June 30, 2017, and approximately $2 million would be available to help connect libraries in year three.

In year two, which we are just exiting, there were two phases. The first phase was working with libraries to connect main library branches and the second phase focused on helping libraries in the central valley and working with libraries that wanted to connect branches. In year three, 17 new library jurisdictions would be connecting main libraries, and 22 jurisdictions would be adding branches.

Coles reported that in November participating libraries would be invited to apply for technology improvement grants. These grants would assist libraries with costs related to connecting branches to CalREN.
Member Schockman wondered if the $1 million in one-time funds for software and hardware improvements for libraries recommended by the State Library would impact the technology improvement grant program. Gerry Maginnity clarified that the existing grants were used to connect libraries to CalREN. The State Library recommendation would go to upgrade internal components such as PCs, Wifi, etc., not connect to CalREN.

Member McGinity asked if State Library staff recommended the Board allocate $1 million to upgrade internal components so that libraries could better take advantage of the broadband connection. Maginnity confirmed it could help utilize the connection better but he want to clarify that libraries that were not connected to CalREN would still be eligible for and benefit from the proposed software and hardware improvement grants.

McGinity stated he had thought the estimate was 400 branches connected by 2018. Natalie Coles responded that 400 was the estimated number but fewer libraries applied for branch connections than anticipated. That was why more money would be available in year three.

Member McGinity asked for the total number of library jurisdictions and branches in California. Natalie Cole replied there were 184 library jurisdictions and about 1,130 branches. McGinity stated that it sounded like we were getting close to full connectivity on the jurisdictions but had a long way to go on the branches.

State Library Literacy Program Report
Lisa Dale presented on the California Library Literacy Services (literacy program) Program which, although not under the Board’s purview, was an important program that impacted almost 20,000 learners each year.

Literacy program funding fluctuated down to $0 in Fiscal year 11/12, but had now grown back to $4.8 million a year. That increase in funding allowed an addition nine library jurisdictions to participate over the last two years. Currently, 105 of the 184 library jurisdictions in the state participate in the literacy program.

At the April 2016 Board meeting members had asked about the program’s evaluation and Dale reported that a sample report from the Tulare County Library
System was included in the Board packet. She offered to take specific questions about
the report after her presentation.

Dale reported that each of the 105 literacy programs had to adhere to program
essentials, but each program implemented literacy services differently to meet the
individual community’s needs. Each organization also had their own local funding
support so there were differences in operating budgets with some jurisdictions being
unable to afford a coordinator, technology, tracking software, or family or digital literacy
services.

The final report libraries submitted on their programs provided state library staff with
program status and an overview of program activities. It enabled the tracking of learner
and tutor numbers as well as local partners and support. Library staff also reviewed
program outcome measures in the form of learner goals which track the individual goals
set by learners of each program.

In addition to the final report, Dale stated that each year libraries completed an
application for ongoing funding which asked for information such as the program’s
anticipated budget expenditures, staffing, etc. The application, final report, State library
staff site visits, and communications with the literacy coordinators provided the
necessary oversite and ensured that all programs adhered to the program guidelines.

Lisa Dale informed the Board that the literacy program was funded out of the State’s
General Fund in response to a question from Member Schockman. Schockman then
asked what could be accomplished within the program with an additional $200,000.
Dale said that she would provide additional funding to existing programs to enhance
their participation in offshoot programs such as digital literacy and family literacy
services. Member Schockman stated that later in the Board meeting they would be
discussing library staff’s recommendation to allocate $200,000 to innovation labs. He
suggested investing in the literacy program instead.

Member Williams asked about outreach to schools and the potential for working with
the California School Library Associations and teacher librarians. Dale reported that the
California Library Literacy Services (CLLS) Program had grown its partnerships with the
Department of Education and a number of the programs were reaching out to partner
with adult schools. Dale stated that they hesitated to reach out to younger grades
because the core of the program was adult literacy. There was so much money in education that it was important to protect the $4.8 million allocation for the adult literacy learners and their children. There were, however, a number of programs that partnered with schools to help children struggling with English language skills and some programs used schools as a place to outreach to parents.

In response to a question by Member Christmas, Lisa Dale reported that 38 jurisdictions offered family literacy services. There were still 79 jurisdictions not participating, some due to money considerations. The program was based on local matching, and some thought there weren’t enough adult learners to warrant implementing this type of work intensive, costly program.

Member McGinity questioned the expense of the program, stating that based on the Tulare report the cost was about $69 per hour, per person. He felt the cost was high, even for one-on-one services, compared with other programs. Member Tauler commented that the funding was actually a combination of state and local funding with the local being much higher than the state. Lisa Dale said that for the $4.8 million received from the state, locals contributed about $17.5 million so it was an excellent return on investment.

**CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

**BUDGET AND PLANNING**

**System Amended Plans and Service**

Monica Rivas reported that the Board had received the amended plans of service for the remaining $1.75 million in on-going funding that was allocated to the systems at the July 2016 meeting. The plans took into consideration the direction given by the Board to address digital content, 21st century technologies, and shared resources. The proposals included things like: renew subscriptions to Enki, connection to Cenic, Digi-labs, purchase of eBooks, Link+ (a collaborative state-wide collection sharing program), Zinio, Joomla, and Overdrive. State library staff felt that the systems complied with the Board’s directions while staying with the communication and delivery guidelines.

Member McGinity asked Rivas to define what Zinio, Joomla and Overdrive were. Diane Satchwell, responded that Joomla was a shared knowledge platform, sort of like an intranet, that Blackgold Cooperative was coordinating for all of the cooperative
systems. It would be a place to find sample RFPs, existing policies and procedures to compare, etc. to save time and energy for libraries at a minimal cost. Blackgold already had 7 pages of depository topics that they would be populating and making accessible to public libraries.

Satchwell further clarified that Zinio was a downloadable electronic magazine database and Overdrive was eBooks. Purchasing those had allowed some libraries to get rid of print subscriptions and opened up their budgets to purchase other things.

McGinity commented that he appreciated that digitization was included in many of the plans of service. Several members agreed that the systems did a great job with their amendments.

*It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Amended Plans of Service for the nine Cooperative Library Systems, submitted for the fiscal year 2016/17.*

**CLS A Budget for FY 2016/17**

Gerry Maginnity reported that at the July meeting the Board allocated $1.5 million of the on-time funding but agreed to give State Library staff additional time to develop recommendations for the remaining $1.5 million. Annly Roman reported that two of the main proposals discussed that had needed more research were Bibframe, dealing with google searchability, and Yewno, a data discovery application. Upon further examination, staff felt those programs were not appropriate for the one-time funds based on the direction previously given by the Board. Annly Roman, as well as some public libraries, tested the Yewno product and it was concluded that the product could be helpful for experienced researchers but was not user friendly for those who were unfamiliar with research techniques.

In considering Bibframe, the Library of Congress' system that would have made library records google accessible, library staff had meetings with the Library of Congress and the Public Library Partnership Cooperative. It was determined that the project would have been a limited pilot program. The program would have developed tools for other jurisdictions and made the records for pilot sites accessible, but it probably would have taken additional funds to add jurisdictions. State Library staff could
not determine how beneficial the project would be to California’s libraries so they were not comfortable recommending one-time funds to move that program forward.

Maginnity stated that based on further research into received proposals, discussions with state library staff, and consideration of direction provided by the Board, staff put forward three proposals: $1 million for internal hardware and software improvements for libraries; $200,000 for makerspace type innovation labs; and $300,000 for an value impact study and online clearinghouse of the economic and social value of libraries.

Member Schockman said he liked the software and hardware proposal and the value study, but he felt that the innovation labs proposal was not compatible with libraries’ mission and instead was using libraries as employment training. He suggested that there were better uses for those funds, such as increasing the literacy footprint.

Member Buenafe stated that she did not see the $200,000 for maker space type areas as that different from other literacy programs; it was just a different kind of literacy. Buenafe pointed out the importance of STEM education and making sure libraries were a collaborative partner in education and she thought the labs would be valuable both to increase library patronage and to help people think about alternate careers. Member Christmas agreed with Member Buenafe siting the success of the Riverside makerspace and the community investment and partnerships it had inspired.

Member Williams pointed out that many of the makerspace materials were expendables or consumables. She wanted to make sure purchases would go toward setting them up to be on-going. Makerspaces were big in schools too, she reported, and there were far too many that had empty labs because there was no money for materials, or librarians to lead those programs. Williams said that she would hope that school libraries would be included as partners in the innovation labs as well as the value study. President Bernardo stated that she believed the recommendation did include an advisory board composed of librarians, educators, and employers. She asked if Member Williams was recommending that the California Library Services Board directly oversee the advisory board. Gerry Maginnity stated that he did not think that was the intention. As a group working with CLSA funding the advisory board would report to the Board but it would be difficult set-up the advisory board and expend all funds by June 30, 2019 if every decision was governed by the Board given the infrequency of meetings.
Member McGinity asked how decisions would be made for allocating the $200,000; would libraries be submitting proposals and if so who was going to make the final decisions. Member Tauler also had questions about the exact plan for the innovation labs. She thought they were a good idea but was concerned about sustainability and the purchase of materials. Several other members, including Members Murguia and Maghsoudi, stated that they also had questions and concerns on exactly what the innovation lab program would look like, how many labs would be created and how they would be sustained. Members also asked if the program was expected to influence other libraries to create lab spaces. Gerry Maginnity responded that the created spaces would be models for public/private partnership and those local partnerships would allow for sustainability due to continued investment. In response to a question by Member McGinity he said there was a large demand for these programs.

Member Williams wanted to try to require whichever jurisdiction got the pilot programs to contact local school libraries, the county librarian, and the STEM and the CTE folks within that district. She felt that was the only way to have full community partnerships.

Member Murguia wanted to know if the systems would have rather had the money given to them by allocation formula. Diane Satchwell said that the Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC) was partnering with Chula Vista on their Innovation Lab. Betty Waznis, the director of Chula Vista, had an amazing relationship with her school district and Qualcomm and they all partnered on the program, with the school district providing a teacher at the library, after hours and on the weekends at no cost to the library. The partnerships allowed the program to blossom. It was like a makerspace but much bigger, allowing exposure to equipment and experiences for children in an underserved community who would not get it elsewhere.

Satchwell stated there were many options for providing programs like this, it did not have to be engineering materials; it could also be artists, and sewing machines. She did think the $200,000 would need to be for test sites for libraries with partners already in place. Partners and a plan were why Chula Vista’s program and other partnership programs had been successful.
Member McGinity stated he did not think the Board should fund the $200,000 for the Innovation Labs because he felt there would be ongoing costs. He also had issues with the $300,000 for the impact study because he was worried about the perception of spending money on promotion and he did not feel that the program would make a sustainable difference. His preference was to allocate $750,000 for a digital lab proposal and $750,000 for the software and hardware improvements inside libraries.

Janet Coles, Library Development Services, reported that the State Library had $1 million dedicated toward digitization statewide in 2016/17 and an equal amount for 2017/18. There was a consultant team in place that had met at the state library that day and the day before, positioning themselves to move forward. There were 40 public libraries already on board with the project and they had another 20-25 they anticipated joining in the next 6 months. Coles also observed that digital labs actually were expensive to sustain. There were many considerations, from staff to equipment and infrastructure. She felt that it would not be a wise use of the one-time money, particularly when they are already dedicating $1 million this year and next.

Member Christmas asked state library staff to discuss the thought process that went into the three recommendations. Gerry Maginnity said it was difficult to determine the best way to leverage one-time funding. The makerspaces would be demonstrations that would promote the public library as a center of collaboration, sustained by public/private partnerships. They would be examples going forward that allowed for the sharing of resources and ideas, and exposed people to different career paths, providing a needed emphasis on technology and STEM.

Maginnity stated that the state library was constantly called by libraries saying they need statistics on library impacts to help them dialog with relevant local powers. If the perception persisted that public libraries were just a reading room, local governments were not going to invest more money. State Library staff felt that an impact study and a way to disseminate that information would be a good use of the one-time funds. Member Buenafe said that as the representative for the 110,000+ incarcerated persons in California she felt that anything that continued to elevate the profile of the public library was important. Prisons were teaching that when people were paroled the public library is where they need to go to get access to internet and job programs.
Christmas commented that one of the big issues that public libraries face today was lack of awareness. Some of the cities in the Inland area of southern California, like Riverside, had issues identifying the role of public libraries for budget talks with the city council or board of supervisors for the county. He felt that the value study was a good way to help show the broad spectrum of things public libraries do and help maintain funding.

Member Ibanez said he thought staff had presented good recommendations that fit with other state programs. He felt it should be up to local jurisdictions to determine the best collaboration relationships. Even though it was one-time money, he felt that these showcase programs would encouraged to people to invest.

Member Murguia asked if State Library staff could talk about literacy funding versus other program funding for public libraries. Gerry Maginnity clarified that the Board did not allocate funds for literacy. State on-going funding fits three categories; California Library Services Act (CLSA) funding, the broadband project, and the adult literacy program. The Board oversaw only the funding and programs under the California Library Services Act. Literacy funding was zeroed out a few years ago, like CLSA, and the California Library Association and their lobbyists had been pretty successful in getting that program re-established. Annly Roman stated that the Governor had allocated funding specifically for the literacy program fairly consistently over the last few years.

Member Murguia asked the public library participants if they felt the impact study would be useful. Vice-President Maghsoudi said the State Library had made an effort to do similar things in the past and she was unsure if it was used in the communities. Usefulness depended if your jurisdiction wanted to embrace or use those ideas for promotion. Gerry Maginnity clarified the past project she referred to was a story board called “How the Library Tells its Own Story.”

Maginnity said the past project was story based for marketing, this project would be data driven to address the value of public libraries. President Bernardo said she felt it would be important to have that bank of information. So much of what was presented to legislators now had to be data driven with hard numbers for it to mean anything to them. She was, however, unsure if the recommendation of $300,000 for the project was the
right number. Gerry Maginnity said that estimate included gathering the data, synthesizing it and making it available. Member McGinity and Vice-President Maghsoudi expressed concern over who would be doing the work, was it the state library or would they be hiring a consultant.

Annly Roman clarified that the value study and clearinghouse was looked at by staff as a one-time expense that could be done at the state-level and made available to public libraries to use as was appropriate in their own jurisdictions. Roman said she knew that Greg had discussed initially working with San Jose State to assess what data had already been collected and make it available to public libraries to use in their jurisdictions for whatever they might need; whether it was patrons or the local city council.

Member Christmas thought that this one-time money should be spent on something that would add some value for the long term. He felt the impact study and the makerspaces would be a good investment for increasing awareness of and generating interest in libraries. He felt investment in infrastructure and computers for libraries which could not afford it was a good investment as well. Christmas felt that if the Board allocated the money to the literacy program they would just have created a hole the next year when the funds were not there.

Member Schockman called for a vote on all three issues.

*It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Ibanez) and carried with a vote of 11 ayes and 1 nay (McGinity) that the California Library Services Board adopts $1 million of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to fund software and hardware improvements inside libraries.*

*It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Ibanez) and carried with a vote of 9 ayes and 3 nays (McGinity, Mindnich, Schockman) that the California Library Services Board adopts $200,000 of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to create innovation labs through partnerships between libraries, employers, and educators.*

*It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Ibanez) and carried with a vote of 8 ayes, 2 nays (McGinity, Mindnich), and 2 abstentions (Maghsoudi, Schockman) that the California Library Services Board adopts $300,000 of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to create an impact study and online clearinghouse cataloguing the economic and social value of California libraries.*
President Bernardo stated that when the question was called votes were taken prior to public comment. She invited participants who had additional comments to speak.

Susan Hildreth, strategic advisor to NorthNet Cooperative System and Califa, said that her organizations, particularly Califa, wanted to make sure the State Library was very clear about the purpose of the $1 million allocated for software and hardware. The California Library Association had been asking for additional funds for the broadband program. They were at a critical point in the project where they were done with the low hanging fruit and are getting to the really tough cases where they will have to work with schools and health services to really get connectivity in those communities. Additionally, some libraries had a difficult time transitioning to CalREN because there was a period of time before they could get the e-rate subsidy where they had to spend the full amount on connectivity and they just couldn’t make that little nut. Hildreth said there was still a lot of need in terms of connectivity so she hoped we could really be clear about those funds being for hardware and software.

Hildreth said that she liked the concept of the Innovation Labs but felt it would be good to have an idea of how many libraries would be able to participate. In terms of the study and libraries return-on-investment, she felt that San Jose State had great researchers and staff and if they partnered with the State Library they could help discover or create a really cool tool to do some of that return-on-investment analysis. Those kinds of analysis can be difficult and she suggested the state library make sure that they were asking the right questions.

Hildreth also mentioned the Bibframe proposal that the Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) submitted. She thought that some of the libraries involved in PLP were going to move forward with that effort. She felt that a lot could be done with that proposal in terms of a partnership and the access benefits of a web friendly version of the MARC record. Hildreth hoped there would be an opportunity to request LSTA funds for that effort.

Christina DiCaro, California Library Association (CLA) lobbyist, Stated that she and Mile Dillon wanted to be a resource for the Board with any questions on how funding is appropriated or obtained. She thought it would be helpful to give an overview of the two
ways funding came about in the budget. One is that the CLA legislative committee
identified a need, such as literacy or services act funding, then she and Mike worked
with the Department of Finance and the legislature. The recent increase in funding for
the literacy program, the services act and CENIC was a partisan effort in the legislature.
The second, more unusual, way is that the Governor thinks of an idea. In the case of
the $3 million in one-time funds the Governor decided to give the funds to encourage
libraries to think of more innovative ways of digital delivery.

She and Mike were concerned about $1 million proposal for the internal software
and hardware, and they did relay those concerns to the Department of Finance. They
felt it was duplicative of their advocacy efforts for the $1 million for the CENIC project.
They thought what the Board was doing on the Zip Books and Enki project was
innovative and those were the kinds of projects they could take back to finance as an
example of a program that made a big difference and use them to make the case for
more on-going money going forward. The report on how the Board spent the money
was not due until September 30th, 2017 and the money needed to be encumbered by
June 30, 2017, so if they had been at a point where there was not consensus they
would have a little bit more time to decide.

D. CLSA REGULATIONS

Annyly Roman reported that the regulatory issue was not placed before the Board as
an action item since they were barely getting ready to start the regulatory process. The
language would need to be refined, go through the Office of Administrative Law, and
have public hearings.

Most of the changes recommended where reflections of statute changes made by
AB 1602, which was passed as part of the 2016/17 budget package. The bill removed
some obsolete, unfunded provisions and broadened some of the language to include
digital materials and resource sharing under “communication and delivery.” Additionally,
the Nominating Committee had suggested that elections of Board officers be held every
two years instead of every year so that change had been included for discussion.

Annyly Roman reported that there was a letter included in the Board packet from the
Systems that suggested changes, some of which the state library staff had included in
the draft before the Board. Roman reported that there was also a letter from the California Library Association supporting the systems’ recommended changes.

Roman said that goal was to put forward the regulatory sections that staff felt needed to be amended to make sure that, at the beginning of the process, everyone had a chance to give input on what changes needed to be made and which sections should be addressed. The regulatory process was lengthy and any changes made once the process started would lengthen the process further.

Member McGinity commented that he noticed the contiguous borders issue he had raised a few years ago was addressed in the draft language and he appreciated staff remembering his thoughts. He noted that in Article 5, section 20180, which talked about public library consolidation, contiguous borders was still mentioned and he wanted it removed. Gerry Maginnity stated that section only related to public library consolidation, not systems. Member McGinity said he did not think there should be a requirement that public library jurisdictions had to be contiguous to consolidate. If libraries were using digital delivery, he felt requiring them to be geographically contiguous would not make sense. He understood that last time the regulations were amended arguments were made that, potentially, rurally isolated libraries or less economically viable libraries would be excluded. However, he still thought that in a 21st century world the idea of geographic contiguousness being important did not make sense. Member Christmas stated that he agreed with that position.

Member McGinity suggested that the Board have biennial elections for board officers in an odd year because the Governor is elected in an even year and he felt Board leadership should be selected after any changes made by a new Governor. Members Schockman and Williams stated that they supported that recommendation. McGinity also asked about Article 8, which showed as being deleted. Annly Roman replied that section was being deleted because all reference to the interlibrary loan program, discussed in that section, was removed from statute.

Member McGinity expressed confusion on the System and CLA regulation letters and asked for clarification if all their requested changes were included in the regulations. Annly Roman stated that staff attempted to address some of them. The regulatory section the systems and CLA specifically addressed in their letters was the
communication and delivery definition section, which had been expanded in state statute to include resource sharing. Some of the things the Systems recommended in the communication and delivery regulatory section, specifically in the definition of “other”, included system wide service assessment. Funding for assessment was mentioned in statute, but was not currently included in the regulatory amendments because staff did not know if it made sense to lump it under the communications and delivery definitions.

Additionally, under the same “other” definition, they requested to include “any service, communication, or resource provided…” that fit within the act. Staff did not include the “any service” language because it was overly broad and could include services that were not communication, delivery, or resource sharing. There were also some sections of the regulations that staff was still working on.

Member McGinity requested that staff make sure they could have a robust conversation around the requests from the systems and the language put forward by staff so the Board could make the best decision possible. Member Murguia requested a spreadsheet or other comparison of changes the systems had asked for that was not included so the Board could see the differences.

Member McGinity stressed the importance of being able to amend the regulations as it was a lengthy process that was very time consuming for staff so could not be done regularly. Member Ibanez asked what the timetable was. Annly Roman responded that there was a calendar from the Office of Administrative Law regarding regulation submission and posting dates. Regulations had to be posted for a certain number of days and have public hearings which could extend the timeline if additional changes are found to be necessary. Additionally, the Office of Administrative Law would need to accept the changes as well. She said that she felt like it was ambitious to say it would be done by the end of 2018 but staff would keep the Board updated throughout the process.

President Bernardo stated she agreed with the biennial and odd year proposals that the other Board members had suggested. She added that she thought they needed address some Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act conflicts in sections 20122, 20123, and
20134. Annly Roman said staff had already been complying with open meeting laws and was aware that conforming changes needed to be made to the regulations.

President Bernardo also asked that, when they came up with language, they tried to avoid library-ese as some of those specific terms, such as “discovery layer,” may not be relevant in the future. She then invited the Systems to comment.

Diane Satchwell addressed the contiguous borders issue, say she understood and respected that this was a digital age, but as the representative of five systems, the joining of several large library jurisdictions could have huge repercussions. If San Diego and Los Angeles County were to create a cooperative, for example, Calexico would suffer because the funding formula was based on population. Taking larger players out of the equation would have a phenomenal impact on small libraries, making the poor libraries poorer and only allowing the larger library systems to blossom. Los Angeles County and LA Public were phenomenal players in SCLC, and provided resources to the smaller libraries. As the regulatory language becomes less restrictive they would be able to have more resource sharing. LA County and LA Public were already providing resources to their patrons which freed up the system to provide more funding to those smaller entities within the library cooperative. This took pressure off the county of LA and LA public because those funds allowed the smaller libraries to get their own e-resources or whatever else the system decided to do. Satchwell said she would highly recommend maintaining the contiguous borders requirement.

Carol Frost, representing PLP and NLS, said that when the cooperatives wrote the memo of their suggestions together they tried to think 20 or 30 years down the line because technology was changing so quickly. In their narrative they were trying to embrace the traditional idea of a database and what delivery was going to look like in the future. Frost felt it would bear further discussion on how they could have language that was enduring but inclusive, so that was something they wanted to continue to talk to the state library about before the next Board meeting.

E. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2016/2017

Annly Roman reported that the Board had previously discussed the possibility of being more entrepreneurial. It was one of the concepts that were considered in the use
of the one-time funds to bring together public libraries, schools, businesses, and the
community. Staff left it on the agenda in case the Board wanted to continue discussion.

Member Williams asked if the Career Online High School program was a public
private partnership. Janet Coles responded that Career Online High School was state
funded as a $1 million appropriation to the State Library in the 2015/16 budget. State
Library staff was working with Gayle Cengage and there were 43 library jurisdictions
participating. The $1 million purchased close to 900 scholarships and all but 100 had
been given out. All recipient libraries were required to match the scholarships they
received which doubled the amount of money going into the program. It was a public
private partnership and had been going really well.

Annly Roman commented that she believed Member Schockman knew of another
example partnership between the Los Angeles Public Library and the Los Angeles
School District to give library cards to students. Member Schockman said that the Los
Angeles public libraries were teaming up with campus libraries to give students library
cards. Many students did not know that the public library databases were not available
to them without a library card. Los Angeles was also going into elementary schools to
offer library cards. He felt this should be done in other large jurisdictions

Susan Hildreth commented that LSTA funded a project that the Pacific Library
Partnership and NorthNet were cooperating on called Student Success where they were
modeling that activity through at least 11 pilot libraries in the bay area. There were
many other libraries in California that were already making access to the public library
resources easy for students

Vice-President Maghsoudi said that their library, for the last 5 years, had a campaign
that every first grader got a library card. Member Schockman asked how to model that
program and get it out to other jurisdictions that need assistance. Natalie Cole
commented that was one of the things the Student Success project would be working
on. As the project monitor she was working with Carol and her team to create a number
of models to reach people in different communities because the school library function
looked different in different communities. The beauty of their project was that they were
looking at different libraries in different communities in different schools and producing a
number of models that other communities could look at to see what would work for
them. So the aim of the project was not just the pilot communities but to also develop a portfolio that could be disseminated statewide.

Member Williams said that school librarians and the California School Librarian Associations would certainly be a stand-up partner. She was sure that was something school librarians would be interested in. Member Christmas stated that charter schools should also be included.

Helen McAlary, Ontario City Library, reported that Ontario was in the second year of a program where they went to every kindergarten classroom in the city, about 82, and put a library card into the hands of every kindergartener. They delivered those through partnerships with a number of city departments in Ontario such as Code Enforcement Officers, people from the fire department, or from their budget office. Those individuals went out to all those kindergarten classrooms and made a connection with the kids, giving them library cards, inviting them back to the library and talking to them about literacy. That was done over about a month, and then the program culminated into a Kinder Fair. They had a large resource fair and invite all the different providers of services for children 0-5 to participate. They got about 25 different organizations to participate and they made it fun for the kids with learning stations. It had been a really successful program for them.

F. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Annly Roman reported that 2016 was the end of a two-year session. There was a lot of action with the California Library Services Act with the new $1.75 in on-going funding and $3 million in one-time funds. At the end of the legislative session, which occurred since the last meeting, there was not much legislation still active that was related to libraries. A new legislative session would be starting on December 1, 2016. She knew that Greg had been in meetings with the Department of Finance already talking about the 2017 budget, but they did not have anything concrete to report.

Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that the CLA legislative committee was working on a possible bond measure. Member Christmas asked what election cycle they were looking at and Maghsoudi said that was still being discussed.
Member McGinity asked Annly Roman if they had heard where the tax receipts were for the state. Annly Roman said she thought the most recent report showed receipts as slightly up but they had been down for a few reports prior to that one. She was not sure exactly where it averaged out but it would definitely not be like past years where receipts were way above the estimates.

Susan Hildreth said that she wanted to make sure the Board was aware that the Library Services and Technology Act was up for re-authorization in Washington. It did have sponsors and a lot of support, so they were hopefully it would get through and be signed by the current administration. Annly Roman brought up that the California Library Association was sending out requests to contact legislators.

G. PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no public comments brought forward.

H. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS
Board members commented on the professionalism and civility of the group during discussions and thanks Board members and staff for their work before and during the meeting.

I. OLD BUSINESS
There was no old business brought forward.

J. AGENDA BUILDING
Member McGinity asked if there was information or analysis on what would be needed, in terms of timeline, for digitization of important resources in public libraries. He did not want staff to spend huge amounts of resources, but if that information could be easily available in the future he would be interested.

Janet Coles responded that was part of the digitization program for this year. As part of the first phase, which ran from March to the end of September, public libraries were invited to apply and a team of consultants would survey and interview library staff, local partners such as historical societies, and other entities with important local history to determine the digitization needs. There was a preliminary report that would be coming
out in October but the finding was that many public libraries did not have the staff expertise, infrastructure, or knowledge to support a local digitization program. The project was looking at consolidating services such as digitization, preservation, access and discovery, and centralizing expertise, creating a few centers to serve many.

Member McGinity asked if local libraries had the ability to figure out what needed to be done. Coles said there were libraries at all different levels. Some libraries had robust programs but many of them, particularly the smaller and rural libraries don’t even know what they need to know.

Member McGinity asked if it would be possible to circulate the preliminary report. Janet Coles said they would circulate it.

Member Christmas asked for an update on the one-time funds at the next meeting. Annly Roman confirmed there would be one.

K. ADJOURNMENT

President Bernardo called for adjournment on the California Library Services Board meeting at 12:37pm in memory of Greg’s father, the Chief Justice Malcom Lucas in honor of his service to the state.