Welcome and Introductions

President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board (CLSB) meeting to order on April 25, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.


California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian Greg Lucas, Natalie Cole, Janet Coles, Susan Hanks, Wendy Hopkins, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Annly Roman, and Mark Webster.

Adoption of Agenda

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Williams) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the April 25, 2017 meeting.

Approval of April 2016 Board Minutes

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the October 14, 2016 meeting.

Board Resolution

Vice President Maghsoudi read the California State Library Services Board resolution 2017-01 attached to this document as Exhibit A.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-01 for Gerald Maginnity.

Board Meeting Date for Fall 2017
Annly Roman reported that the Board had previously indicated they wanted to meet in-person. For fall, typically the Board met in late August or early September. President Bernardo brought up a previous suggestion to have the meeting in the State Capitol and suggested looking at October dates as well in order to have more availability. Bernardo said they would wait on the Doodle poll to determine the exact date.

Annly Roman asked if the Board wanted to meet in person in spring and if so, would Board members want to hold legislative meetings. Member Christmas said it appeared most Board members felt meeting in person was valuable. President Bernardo felt legislative visits would be helpful. Annly Roman said that in order to accommodate legislative visits she could put out a doodle poll and take the two best days together.

Nomination of Board Officers

Annly Roman reported that the Board would need to elect two people to be part of the nominating committee to determine potential nominees. Members Williams and Schockman agreed to serve on the committee.

*It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board appoints Connie Williams and Eric Schockman to the Nominating Committee to select board officers for 2018.*

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President’s Report

President Bernardo reported that since the October meeting she attended the Council of County Law Librarians meeting and their February legislative day in Sacramento. She met with local legislators and joined in meetings with legislative leadership about the status of County Law Libraries in California.

She also attended the California State Library Strategic Planning retreat as the Board’s representative in January. She indicated that a report generated from the retreat was sent out and she hoped that all Board members had read it.

President Bernardo continued to serve as the law librarian’s liaison to the Executive Committee of the Law Practice Management and Technology section of the State of California. Additionally, Wendy Hopkins had asked Anne to assist with the next LSTA 5-year plan which was currently proceeding.

Board Vice-President’s Report
Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that her library had unveiled a Pop-up library created with Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds. The project brought goodwill into the community and was being used almost every day. It was a wonderful example of what LSTA could bring to libraries if funding stayed in place.

Chief Executive Officer’s Report

State Librarian Greg Lucas reported that state library staff had been working to get the one-time CLSA money out into the field.

Lucas stated that the President proposed, in his budget summary, eliminating funding for the Institute of Museum and Library Services. It was a $230 million program with about $180 million going to public libraries and about $150 million of that went in block grants to states on a per-capita basis. Of the funds coming to California, 2/3rds went to the field and the remainder constituted about 1/3 of the State Library’s operating budget. Lucas stated that the President had yet to put out a formal budget, but there were a lot of efforts to demonstrate the value of federal investment in libraries.

As a consequence of the President’s budget, Governor Brown put forward a cautious budget proposal in January. The Governor’s rational was that we didn’t know what to expect. One-third of Californians got health insurance through Medical and if the Federal government changed eligibility or the reimbursement formula it could have large financial impacts on California.

State Librarian Lucas thought that only smaller or one time funding requests had any chance of being funded in the Mary revision. He noticed that March, which was not normally a big revenue month, came in $1 billion over the administration’s projections. However, there was still a lot of uncertainty based on the federal government.

As a condition of Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) funding, the State Library was required to create a 5-year plan demonstrating how IMLS funds would be spent. The last 5-year plan ended in 2017 and, as required, an outside evaluation was just completed to assess if we accomplished our goals. The State Library was in the process of creating a new 5-year plan that would go until 2022.

Among the suggestions in the outside evaluation was using the plan as a living document. It could be revisited each year during the 5-year period to measure progress.
and goals could be changed or amended if necessary. State Librarian Lucas said that
was not done with the previous plan.

State library staff would be seeking input from various stakeholders so a very basic
first draft showing the goals, mission, and perceived field needs would be sent out soon.
Some surveying and focus groups of librarians around the state had already been done.

**Lighting Up Libraries: Broadband Update Report**

Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to bring high speed broadband to all
California public libraries by connecting them to the California Research and Education
Network (CalREN) and statewide high speed network managed by the Corporation for
Education Network Initiatives in California. Cole mentioned that they had created a
broadband infographic which really shows the progress and successes to date. (The
infographic could be downloaded at [http://www.library.ca.gov/lds/broadband.html](http://www.library.ca.gov/lds/broadband.html).)

127 of California’s 184 library jurisdictions were connected or in the process of
connecting to CalREN. Within those jurisdictions, 539 of California’s approximately 1100
public outlets were currently connected or connecting. Cole said the project was in year
three and up to 12 new jurisdictions and 75 new outlets would begin connecting. Natalie
Cole anticipated that the project would provide $1.2 million in grants to support new
connections. Additionally, a database was being created on the State Library’s website
that allowed people to search at the outlet level to see which libraries are connected or
connecting.

Cole reported that strategies were being explored for helping libraries with significant
inhibitors preventing them from taking part in the project. These included extreme
financial hardship, or topography or geography that made it hard for them to connect.

Member Schockman was concerned that there was a socioeconomic overly over
who is getting this money and assistance first. He was concerned there were still areas
on dial-up or lacking 21st century connections. Schockman asked how state library staff
prioritized the distribution of funds.

Natalie Cole said that one of the current focuses was libraries that were unable to
participate. In some of these areas it was not just public libraries that struggle to
connect but also schools and community colleges so we are working to explore
partnership opportunities that can try to address this problem.
State Librarian Lucas brought up the federal e-rate program which offered connection discounts depending on the economic level of your community. E-rate was expanded under the previous administration to allow for actual building of broadband infrastructure for struggling communities, but that part of the e-rate program is in flux. One of the California Library Association’s budget proposals was not only to create a mechanism to help connect the difficult geographic areas but also offer micro-loan assistance to those libraries that couldn’t afford to wait the 18 months before their e-rate discount check arrived.

Natalie Cole added that the grant program was expanded this year to allow libraries to put grant funds toward connectivity, which addressed the needs of some libraries that would not otherwise be able to afford the project.

Member Tauler said that her County library had major issues due to branch locations and she suggested that the plan for helping small libraries include technical assistance because sometimes they lack the staff to take the time to determine solutions or figure out the program. She felt the one-person staff libraries were being left behind. Natalie Cole clarified that libraries could use funds for technical assistance.

President Bernardo asked about the $2.475 million ongoing budget appropriation to the broadband program. State Library Lucas clarified that was general fund money paid to CENIC as the fee for California libraries to be part of the network. Lucas said the grant funding was the remainder $1 million Board investment and the original one-time money given toward the project.

Member Christmas asked if it was correct that some jurisdictions were not interested in connecting to CENIC. Cole confirmed that some jurisdictions were happy with their connections and were not looking for a CENIC connection right now.

Christmas asked if there were issues with the implementation process. Natalie Cole said that there were challenges that they are trying to address, such a reimbursement delays for start-up costs. However, the response to a survey done for jurisdictions that had been connected for 12-months showed that the positives were outweighing the negatives.
Lena Pham reported that the Board allocated $300,000 toward a shared eBook platform called the enki library. About half of California libraries were already connected. $100,000 of the grant funds would be used to connect the remaining public libraries to the enki platform. Pham reported that as of January 2017, 91 eligible libraries were not connected. A sign-up form would go to those libraries inviting them to sign up for the eBook platform.

An additional $200,000 would be used for expanding the enki library eBook collection. There are 60,000 titles currently in the enki collection, which focuses on popular niche content as well as indie fiction and non-fiction titles. Califa created a collection development survey, which closed in April, which was sent out to subscribed libraries to get their input on new collection items and availability preferences such as always available content. The goal was to make purchases and fully develop the collection by the end of 2017.

Member Williams asked what amount of the enki collection were multi-use items vs. single checkout. Lena Pham said that she did not know the exact details of that. The library had a collection of always available classics as well as a self-publishing collection which were both multi-use. Member Williams said that she was interested in what conversations were going on in terms of these platforms and their use within the school day for children. Carol Frost said that there was not a lot of good, hard data. It was apparent that most people do not exclusively use eBooks. When it came to studies on youth and eBook use for curriculum data showed children prefer not to use eBooks. However, it was a good to broaden the base of collections to appeal to youth and items they would expect students to use.

**Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader Program Report**

Lena Pham reported that the cross discovery application, SimplyE was developed by New York Public Library with Institute of Museum and Library Services funding. The purpose of the application was to make eCollections across different vendors discoverable using only one app. Currently, patrons that had access to 360 eBooks, Overdrive, and other eBook vendors through their library had to download a different application for each program.
The allocation by the Board was $200,000 to set-up the base infrastructure to allow California libraries to connect to the app. Those funds would also be used to conduct a pilot project with full set-up of SimplyE for six library jurisdictions. There were three California Public libraries that were involved with the SimplyE project development, Sacramento Public Library, Santa Clara County Library, and Alameda County Library. Califa was working with Alameda County library, which had previously tried to set-up the app but were unsuccessful. When Lena Pham last spoke with Califa they indicated Alameda County Libraries might complete set-up on the SimplyE app by the end of May, 2017. Gary Christmas asked if the Alameda County connection was part of a pilot project to test the connection in one jurisdiction so that it would be spread to others. Pham confirmed that it was.

Pham said that there was an ongoing cost for the hosting and maintenance of the app, so a sustainability plan that would probably take the form of a subscription fee from the participating libraries was being developed. More information on the development side of the applications was available at librarysimplified.org.

The other project goal reported by Lena Pham was to make the enki eBook library a discoverable platform on the SimplyE app, which was expected to take four months.

Member Williams asked if all the titles owned by the library would be integrated in a single catalogue or would she have to know exactly which eBook platform had the Book she wanted. Pham said SimplyE should be searchable across all platforms. Carol Frost clarified that SimplyE created connectors to the different platforms to which a library subscribed and it drew from all of the eBook vendors in real time and allowed the patron to read right from the app.

**Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

Wendy Hopkins reported that the Board designated $200,000 in one-time funding to create Innovation Labs through partnerships with libraries, corporations, and educators. The proposal was modeled on the Chula Vista Public Library “Think-a-bit” lab project. Chula Vista partnered with Qualcomm and the local elementary school district to create a lab in the library building which allowed kids to learn science, technology, math and gain experience in STEM related learning. The program was designed for 6th-8th graders but the library found that the program applied to adults and veterans as well. It was
teaching in incredibly innovative ways to encourage excitement around STEM subjects. In the long run it would also help create a stronger workforce base.

For this project, the Southern California Library Cooperative, the State library’s project partner, would set-up a pool of funding and libraries that wished to create these stations or labs could select from a menu of all the resources that would be applicable to their communities. Giving libraries a choice would allow for the creation of creative labs that will resonate with the local community. This would help re-establish the library as the corner-stone of the community.

Hopkins reported that part of the goal was for libraries to develop their existing space. There has been a lot of discussion around new construction and this grant would encourage libraries to repurpose and reimagine the space they already have. It would also encourage technology experimentation for young kids and take them beyond the iPad, iPhone, or games they play while providing them with practical experience with math and science.

The funding would be made available for purchasing necessary technology to enable libraries to create those spaces. Best practices would be ensured and shared through survey, social media, calix, email, and webinars. As the project progressed, the goal was for communities to realize what a huge value the program was and that the library was the only place providing these services.

Diane Satchwell added that Betty Waznis, the head of the Chula Vista project, said that Qualcomm was looking to partner with other libraries in the state. Also, Microsoft has approached the Chula Vista library looking to expand the workforce investment base.

Member Williams asked about making cross connections with local schools. She asked if teachers could participate so that public libraries could use teachers’ and teacher librarians’ expertise. Wendy Hopkins said they had not had those discussions yet but were planning on looping in schools. Diane Satchwell clarified that the Chula Vista school district actually has one school district funded teacher at the library lab at night and on weekends.

Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Programs Grant
Program Report
Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to help libraries, particularly those in underserved communities, make software and hardware improvements to maximize benefits to patrons as they access new high-speed Internet connections. The project would support the purchase of: cutting-edge technology that helps libraries provide innovative services and programming that fulfills the potential of their broadband connections; functional hardware and software that allows libraries to use their new broadband connections effectively; and technology that enables libraries to make the best use of their non-broadband Internet connections should they not be able to participate in that project.

Cole reported that the project would be potentially accessible to all public libraries. Funds would be divided equitably between libraries requesting different types of technology and different types of public libraries—e.g. rural, suburban, and urban; city, county, and special district; lower- and higher-resourced—to provide a variety of programming and service models for the library community to learn from and replicate.

She reported that libraries would be asked to work with community partners and provide cash and in-kind matches for the funds. The level of match required would be tied to the library’s Local Income Per Capita (LIPC) to allow less well-resourced libraries to participate.

A partnership was formed with the national Public Library Association to support the evaluation for this project. Libraries were asked to use the association’s Project Outcome evaluation tools to measure the impact of the programs and services provided with the new technologies. Project Outcome surveys measured knowledge, confidence, application, and awareness over a large breadth of topics including civic and community engagement, digital learning, economic development, education and lifelong learning, early childhood literacy, job skills, and summer reading programs. This would allow the gathering of consistent data on the project regardless of the programming provided with the new technology.

Cole reported that a portion of the funds would provide libraries with virtual reality equipment to contribute to a State Library technology project that was supporting innovative programming in public libraries. Aligning the two projects provided an
opportunity to combine state, federal, and private resources for the benefit of
California’s public libraries and their communities.

Natalie Cole stated that an advisory group would be formed to guide the
development of the project to ensure that it meets the needs of California’s public
libraries. The group would represent a variety of geographic areas and bring a variety of
skills in technology and evaluation.

The next steps for the project would be to finalize the application materials and
guidelines and distribute those in late spring. It was anticipated that applications would
be completed in the fall and libraries selected to receive funds.

Member Schockman expressed an interested in how virtual reality could be used to
enliven and enrich academics. He was wondering if, at the next meeting, state library
staff could provide the board members with a demonstration of virtual reality headsets
so they could see what the children were using. Janet Coles said that would be
possible.

**Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report**

Natalie Cole reported the project was to create an impact study and online
clearinghouse cataloging the economic and social value of libraries. A first set of
approximately 65 resources had been gathered and organized for the online
clearinghouse. The resources were created between 1998 and 2017 and were selected
for their relevance to California.

The resources focused mainly on the economic and financial return on investment
provided by public libraries. They provided a solid foundation for the project and
demonstrated that investing in libraries was a sound use of public funds. The resources
also provided potential methodologies that could be considered for the original research
phase of the project.

The preliminary finding showed that for every dollar invested, $2-$10 is returned,
with an average of between $3-$6. These numbers were compelling, but were just one
way of demonstrating libraries’ value. A more complex approach would consider the
many dimensions of value such as user satisfaction, economic impact, and social
impact. With libraries, it is particularly important to consider the more difficult-to-
measure indirect value of the growth of an informed population with equitable opportunities for learning, leisure, and connection.

The next steps for the project were to prepare the collected resources for inclusion on the State Library’s website; continue to identify and collect resources that demonstrate other dimensions of libraries’ value; and begin planning an original study demonstrating the impact of California’s libraries.

Member Christmas asked how we promote these one-time grants and their value to the legislature, Department of Finance and the Governor’s office. He wanted to know if all the information was provided to the library jurisdictions. Christmas felt that we should be promoting these programs.

Natalie Coles said promotion was part of the reason they wanted to get everything up on the website. President Bernardo pointed out a reported needed to be submitted to the legislature by September.

Zip Books Grant Program Report

Janet Coles reported that the $1 million in onetime funds allocated to Zip Books was awarded to the NorthNet Library Cooperative System and the grant period would run from January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2019.

A detailed project plan had been created by NorthNet and they would be working with the Califa group which has managed the project for the last four years. One of the activities scheduled for the first six months was the addition of 14 new libraries to the project. The libraries will be drawn mostly from the central valley and the central coast area.

An advisory group was selected and held its first meeting in March. The new 14 libraries were in the process of coming on board and those libraries were expected to be offering Zip Books to their patrons by December.

CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION

BUDGET AND PLANNING

CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2017/18

Monica Rivas reported that the preliminary budget of $3.63 million had been sent out to the systems already with the annual plans of service.
It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts, contingent upon the passage of the budget act, the 2017-2018 fiscal year California Library Services Act budget as directed in the governor’s proposed 2017-2018 budget, totaling $3,630,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.

RESOURCE SHARING
Consolidation and Affiliations

Annly Roman stated that this item was a reporting item only. The State Library had received a letter from the City of Goleta Library indicating that they wanted to separate from the City of Santa Barbara Library. The letter was notifying the Board that they wanted to form their own library and join the Black Gold Library Cooperative.

Member Schockman asked why the City of Goleta wanted to separate. Annly Roman said that the City of Goleta, currently contracting with the City of Santa Barbara, owned the library building and wanted to provide their own library services to their local population. Schockman asked if they would be in a system. Roman reported that Goleta was a member of the Black Gold Library Cooperative under the City of Santa Barbara but would need to join a system independently once established as a library jurisdiction or municipality. The Board would need to approve that affiliation.

CLSA System-level Programs

Monica Rivas reported that Board members had been provided with the System Annual reports, which show all Systems on track to meet the goals submitted in the plans of service, and a breakdown of funds used for communication and delivery and administration.

Member Schockman said that the information appeared to show a local contribution. Rivas said that was correct, that systems did receive some local funds.

D. CLSA REGULATIONS

Annly Roman reported that at the October Board meeting the Board had discussed necessary regulatory amendments including: updating language to comply with changes made to statute by budget trailer bill AB 1602 in 2016; changes requested by board members such as having a biennial election for Board officers and removal reference to the word “contiguous” in article 5; and changes to comply with existing Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements. State Library staff took into account:
changes conforming to statute; suggestions from Board members; and suggestions from the Cooperative Systems when providing recommended updated regulatory language (Exhibit B).

In October, the Cooperative Library Systems submitted a letter recommending specific changes to the "Communication and Delivery" section in regulation to expand what was allowable under the section such as databases and supporting technologies. This section contained definitions of reporting terms and adding the requested language did not appear to permit the systems to expand the use of funds. It appeared to expand the reporting requirements. Staff proposed including a new section, Section 20236. The section referenced education code sections which addressed communication, delivery, and resource sharing fund allocations and the ability of cooperative systems to request funds for planning and assessment of system services. Section 20236 was written that way to address the systems' expressed wish of being able to use Communication and Delivery money to assess system wide programs. The new section also clarified that communication, delivery, and resource sharing also included technology resources and accompanying supportive services and fees.

President Bernardo suggested proceeding by discussing each regulatory section individually. In section 20107(a), President Bernardo mentioned a reference to the initiating 1979 statute which should have referenced the 2016. President Bernardo also questioned the staff recommended definition of resource sharing in Section 20107(b), item 6 which required sharing between at least three libraries. She felt requiring sharing between at least two instead of three would be less restrictive. Member Christmas agreed.

Annly Roman stated that a minimum of three had been a system recommendation. Carol Frost commented that system coordinators had discussed this issue and felt that a minimum of three libraries would be better than two. Member Christmas asked if resource sharing done by the systems would be approved by the Board. Annly Roman said resource sharing was an approved use of communication and delivery money and would require approval by the Board as part of the system's plans of service but not as individual projects for approval.
Member Williams commented that by sharing with a minimum of three or more you are accomplishing a larger pool or sharing. Carol Frost indicated that was the systems’ thinking.

Member Christmas said that he still felt there might be an ideal project in the future but only had two participants. He felt adding language for sharing to be done between three or more libraries limited opportunities for smaller options that might be appropriate. State Librarian Lucas said that he believed the Systems’ purpose in recommending a larger number than two was to encourage more collaboration and cooperation and stretch the finite amount of available money.

Jane Chisaki, Alameda Free Library, stated that Alameda liked the minimum of three languages because they found it beneficial to have a third, due to the small size of their library and number of staff, to equalize sharing of labor. It also seemed more equitable because there were more people to exchange and assess ideas and it spread resources around when you require three or more.

Member Ibanez said that he felt what the system representatives were saying made sense. President Bernardo said that those explanations helped with understanding the reasoning behind the recommendation. Most Board members stated that they agreed with the three library recommendation.

President Bernardo also commented that the definition of the State Board in section 20107(b), number 7 was already in statute and so was unnecessary. She recommended removal. Bernard also had a small wording change in section 20122 to remove a superfluous word.

In Section 20136, President Bernard recommended removed the date of July 1, 1979 from the requirement that Systems create a System Administrative Policy Manual by July 1, 1979 since that date was no longer relevant. Additionally, in Section 20140 the Ralph M. Brown Act was cited and the code section was incorrectly shown as 54950-54961 instead of 54950-54963. Annly Roman said those changes could be made.

President Bernardo stated that she was confused why Section 20158, Article 4, System Reference was still included. She thought the whole article should be removed because the system reference program had been repealed. Annly Roman reported that
Section 20158 was the only spot in the regulations to reference population number
review and approval which was still needed for the Communication and Delivery
allocations. Roman offered removing that section from Article 4 and adding it elsewhere.

President Bernardo suggested moving it to Article 3, General Provisions for
Systems. Member Williams agreed because a section in that article referenced a
population profile. Member Christmas agreed as well.

President Bernardo also indicated that the first of the two sentences that comprised
Section 20158 gains its authority from a repealed code section referencing an annual
allowance for the systems. State Librarian Lucas clarified that the important language in
Section 20158 was the collection of population numbers. Lucas recommended moving
that portion of the language into Article 3, General Provisions for Systems which would
then allow for the removal of Article 4.

Member Williams commented in Section 20135(a), number 2 a reference to systems
providing a description of non-users and a list of major unmet information needs of the
System population had been removed. She felt that information would still be useful and
wanted to be sure systems were considering and planning for the full population in their
area. Member Christmas asked why those references were removed. Annly Roman
stated that it was conforming the language to what the systems were current reporting.

Diane Satchwell said that the systems’ databases did not have that capability to
track information on non-users and so they did not report that information. The systems
did still pursue who that non-user. Member Williams said it was important, especially for
grants, but that a regulation mandate might not be the best place to require that
information.

Annly Roman commented that as “Article 5: Consolidations and Affiliations” was
currently marked in the documents before the Board, the word “contiguous” was
removed as well as references to programs and grant funds that were removed from
statute. Those changes were consistent in Sections 20180-20190. Roman commented
that there were board members who felt that in the 21st century there was no reason
why libraries should be required to have contiguous borders. However, the cooperative
library systems provided letters detailing concerns about the removal of the word
contiguous from the regulations. Based on the diverse opinions, State Library staff felt
this issue needed further discussion and more research. The draft language was marked up with the word contiguous removed but staff recommended the Board delay making a decision. The regulatory process was fluid and the Board could always make additional language changes down the road. President Bernardo mentioned that Member McGinity could not join the Board that day but that he, she was sure, would want to discuss the issue further.

Roman reminded the board that it was incumbent on them to only approve changes to system or library jurisdiction affiliations that further the purposes of the California Library Services Act.

Member Tauler stated that she wanted to oppose the deletion of the word contiguous because she felt geographical continuity in library systems was important. Tauler thought removing that term it would create the possibility of larger systems banding together and leaving out smaller library systems. If the spirit of the Act was to promote resource sharing then smaller systems need the ability to participate with the larger systems. She felt very strongly that “contiguous” should remain in the regulatory language because it was important for small libraries throughout the state. Vice-President Maghsoudi agreed.

Member Christmas indicated he thought the Board should wait to decide. He felt the State Library should conduct a study on the impacts of removing the word contiguous and delaying a decision until the next Board meeting. Member Williams and President Bernardo indicated they were in favor of Member Christmas’ suggestion.

Annly Roman stated that the State Library was unsure of what form a study would take. A study of the impacts would be difficult because it was dealing with hypotheticals. State library staff could run the financial numbers if various libraries joined alternate systems but the information would be “what if” information and would create an indigestible volume due to the number of potential library and system affiliations. Roman said staff thought there was more information to be collected. Staff had considered a survey of libraries to see how they feel about the potential language change and its impacts. There could also be an examination of what the Board’s responsibility might be to prevent mergers of large systems or library jurisdictions.
Member Williams said conversation around the word contiguous based on geographical location was limiting and she felt the conversation was more around the idea of 21st century sharing. She felt the conversation needed to center deeply around the possibilities of “what if” in virtual and physical locations.

Member Bernardo said that when the term was discussed in 2014 discussion of the term “contiguous borders” was held open until a new term and definition could be developed for “universal access”. She said maybe that should be part of the study, the definition of direct lending provisions or the need to explore one broad universal access policy.

Annly Roman said the discussion also needed to include how much system sharing was done via vans and physical delivery and how quickly systems were moving away from physical delivery. Carol Frost, speaking on behalf of the Pacific Library Partnership, said that their Board felt that if the term was removed now without changing anything else there could be negative impacts. Frost reported that several libraries were very interested in a product that provided cloud based eBook sharing through consortia, location didn’t matter. She thought it was a great idea that would be an allowable use of CLSA funds under the amended regulations would allow different, distant systems like PLP and SCLC to share resources. Frost stated that maybe some concepts to be explored were providing people the ability to share resources in a different way.

Carol Frost expressed concerns about a survey and because she file it would be difficult to get comprehensive responses due to a lack on context. Diane Satchwell stated System coordinators were also concerned potential impacts to the cooperative systems if contiguous was removed; would it impact their JPAs, would there be legal costs for them to recreate systems. The systems were also concerned with how the affiliation process would change.

Donna Ohr, Chair of the Serra Library Cooperative, expressed support for a study on the impact of changing the language from contiguous to non-contiguous. It was difficult for them to support the language change with no analysis of potential financial and political impacts, or impacts to library services the cooperatives provide. Ohr felt the
suggested change was intriguing but that libraries would be remiss as stewards of taxpayer dollars not to study all of the implications of that change.

Member Christmas said that he thought hearings, maybe in Northern and Southern California, were a good formal assessment alternative to a survey.

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Schockman) and carried unanimously that that a study be conducted, in a form to be determined by State Library Staff, of the contiguous vs. non-contiguous borders issue in the regulations, including possible hearings in northern and southern California to get input from the field.

President Bernardo said that she had concerns about language in Section 20203 which contained “he or she” and “his or her” language. She wanted to replace those with gender neutral language. Bernardo also brought up section 20205, item a, which mentioned a borrower’s home library. She wondered if there was a definition of “home library”. Annly Roman said there was not an official definition but it would be the library that served a patrons place of residence. Other Board members expressed confusion on what constituted a home library.

Diane Satchwell stated that Irwindale had 1500 actual residents, but during the day the population was over 4000. Many of those people reside in the County of LA Library System. If Irwindale decided to charge a non-resident fee borrowers would have to show evidence that they live or rent in Irwindale to avoid the charge. If, for example, someone lived in Pomona but worked in Irwindale they would be charged the fee because it is not their home library. Bernardo said that she understood that explanation but wanted to add a definition of a “home library” to Section 20107.

Article 7, Section 20235-20236, was the Communication and Delivery section that Annly Roman reported on at the beginning on the regulation discussion. Some of the changes being made were to conform to statutory changes such as adding references to resource sharing, and digital materials. There was also the addition of the new proposed section 20236 which referenced funding allowances in statute as well as clarifying that communication, delivery, and resource sharing funds could be used for technology, fees, etc., to support
communications, delivery and resource sharing programs and products. There
was one system suggestion that was not included the recommended regulatory
changes. The systems had recommended a definition of “other” which included
“any service” and staff felt that language was overly broad and extended beyond
what statute authorized. Diane Satchwell commented that the systems
supported those new provisions.

Audience members expressed support for the changes to the articles and the
Board postponing a decision on the “contiguous” language.

*It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously
that the California Library Services Board approves the amended
California Library Services Act regulatory language as discussed at
the April 25, 2017 California Library Services Board meeting, except
for the removal of the “contiguous” language in Article 5, and directs
State Library staff to begin the regulatory approval process.*

E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Annly Roman reported that the California Library Association had one sponsored bill
for 2017, SCA 3, which reduced the vote threshold for bonds for public library facility
construction from two-thirds to 55%. CLA had done state legislative visits recently and a
contingent was going to Washington DC. Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that library
staff had also had local meetings with legislators that were very successful.

Member Williams wanted to bring SB 390 before the Board. The California School
Library Association with the California Teachers Association had sponsored SB 390
authorised by Senator Dodd. This measure amended section 520260 which pertained to
school Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which deals with how schools
spend their funds. SB 390 included the addition of state Model School Library
Standards, which had been passed by the State Board of Education, as one of the
guiding principles for writing those plans.

State Librarian Lucas clarified a formula was used to give out money to schools but
local districts had flexibility to tailor spending of their funds to local needs in their LCAP.
There were a series of standards that districts should consider in creating their spending
plan. SB 390 would include the Model School Library Standards as an additional factor
that should be considered but did not mandate that districts spend money on those standards.

Member Williams asked the Board to write a letter in support of SB 390, which had passed the Senate Education Committee. Annly Roman reported the bill was going to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Member Christmas asked if there was any opposition to the measure and Member Williams said not to her knowledge.

*It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board supports SB 390 and directs State Library staff to draft a letter of support on behalf of the California Library Services Board.*

President Bernardo asked if the Board should write a letter of support for SCA 3, the California Library Association’s sponsored bill.

*It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board supports SCA 3 and directs State Library staff to draft a letter of support on behalf of the California Library Services Board.*

**F. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2017/2018**

Member Schockman asked if the Board should do a strategic plan in parallel with the State Library’s plan. He just felt the Board needed to be more strategic about what they are doing and be more intentional. Schockman indicated that he did not think there would be a need for additional meetings. He thought they could integrate planning into Board discussions.

Member Schockman said that, thinking strategically, given the resources available the board needs to advise smartly. As they go through the process he felt the Board would become more agile as critical thinkers in the role they play for the state. He felt it could be done in collaboration with staff and what staff has done for the State Library plan.

Members Christmas and Bernardo agreed with the suggestion. Annly Roman specified that a strategic planning session would have to be open to the public but it could be incorporated in the next meeting depending on how much business the board had to conduct. President Bernardo indicated they could at least start the process.
State Librarian Lucas asked how the state library could be of help to the board. Member Schockman asked if the state library had an outside person helping with their strategic process. Lucas said that the state library had an outside facilitator who helped lay out the original strategic plan. The state library had a second meeting planned for a six-month update with her then we would proceed internally. Member Schockman asked if the Board could get some of her time to help create a plan in parallel to the state library. Annly Roman said that based on the set-up she did not think the working with the Board would be included in her fee to the state library. Vice-President Maghsoudi asked if there was funding available for an outside person. Wendy Hopkins said that if they used LSTA funding to facilitate a strategic plan it would leave less for the libraries.

State Librarian Lucas said that he was uncertain the process the state library was following was what the Board needed. Annly Roman stated that she thought a plan for the Board would be different then something done for a larger department like the state library but she felt that if the Board set a direction or priorities that would be helpful.

Vice President Maghsoudi asked for clarification on what Schockman meant by strategic plan. Schockman said that he thought the plan should be aspirational, directional, big picture and staff should deal with the weeds of planning and allocation. Annly Roman brought up the funding allocation process for the $3 million in one-time when the Board set broad priorities and the individual projects put forward fell under the umbrella of one or more but were not necessarily designated for a specific priority. She wondered if that was what Schockman was thinking.

President Bernardo said that there was an existing strategic plan, it was just outdated and needed to be revisited. Member Schockman asked to see the existing plan and the Board could start there.

G. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments brought forward.

H. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Board members expressed appreciation for all of the information staff provided and the hard work that went into it.
I. **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business brought forward.

J. **AGENDA BUILDING**

No additional agenda items were brought forward.

K. **ADJOURNMENT**

President Bernardo called for adjournment on the California Library Services Board meeting in honor of the late Dr. Kevin Starr in honor of his service to the Library and the State of California at 1:46 pm.
California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-01

In Honor of Gerald Maginnity

WHEREAS, Gerald “Gerry” Maginnity has provided the people of California with exemplary service and leadership in the many roles he has held during his tenure at the State Library; and

WHEREAS, Gerry Maginnity began his career at the California State Library in 2005 in the Library Development Services Bureau where he served as Assistant Bureau Chief and Bureau Chief, he also served as Acting State Librarian in 2012 until his appointment as Deputy State Librarian on May 22, 2014, and

WHEREAS, prior to his tenure at the California State Library Gerry was deeply involved in the California library community, including working as the supervising librarian at the Lassen County Free Library, regional librarian for the Solano County library, associate county librarian for Fresno County Free Library and working as coordinator for both the Serra Cooperative Library System and the Mountain Valley Library System; and

WHEREAS, Gerry’s in-depth knowledge of librarianship allowed the state library to better serve its patrons, enhanced staff capability and camaraderie and improved service to the more than 22 million “customers” at California’s 1,100 public libraries; and

WHEREAS, Gerry provided high-level vision to the California State Library and its partners during the turbulent fiscal time of 2008-2010, consistently promoting positive relationships between federal, state and public library staff; and

WHEREAS, Gerry educated and mentored staff, inspiring them to engage in work that would serve as a lasting model of professional excellence in the library community; and

WHEREAS, Gerry extended library community cooperation and collaboration beyond the borders of California through his passionate support of and participation in the Seguimos Creando Enlaces Conference which brings together librarians from the United States and Mexico to share knowledge and ideas; and

WHEREAS, Gerry’s knowledge of and experience with library programs, the California Library Services Act, the state Cooperative Systems and the library community as a whole made his advice and input a valuable asset to the Library of California Board and the California Library Services Board that will be sorely missed; and

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Gerry for his contributions to the California State Library and his leadership role in and advocacy for California libraries; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board expresses its sincere gratitude to Gerald Maginnity for his guidance, assistance, and never ceasing support California State Library, the people of California and the library community as a whole; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the members of the California Library Services Board commend Gerry for his achievements and extend to him sincere best wishes in his retirement.

Gerald Maginnity

shall be honored by the California Library Services Board for his distinguished leadership and contributions to the libraries and people of the State of California on this day of April 25, 2017