Welcome and Introductions

President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on October 17, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.


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

Adoption of Agenda

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the October 17, 2017 meeting.

Approval of April 2017 Board Minutes

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the April 25, 2017 meeting.

Board Resolutions

It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-02 for Penny Kastanis (Attached as Exhibit A).

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-03 for Gregory McGinity (Attached as Exhibit B).
It was moved, seconded (Murgui/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-04 for Dr. Kevin Starr (Attached as Exhibit C).

Election of Board Officers

Member Williams reported that the Nominating Committee asked which Board members would be interested in running for President and Vice-President. Anne Bernardo and Paymaneh Maghsoudi agreed to run. An email Board election ballot was sent to all Board members. Based on those ballots the Nominating Committee put forward Anne Bernardo for President and Paymaneh Maghsoudi for Vice President.

President Bernardo called for nominations from the floor. There were none.

It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Anne Bernardo as President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2018.

It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2018.

Board Meeting Date for Spring 2018

Annly Roman reported that the Board had already discussed meeting in April, in person, in Sacramento. Member Ibanez requested to include the Joint Conference of Librarians of Color in Albuquerque, New Mexico, September 26-30 to the 2018 events calendar. Member Williams requested adding the California School Libraries Association Conference on February 1-4 at the Tenaya Lodge in Yosemite.

Roman asked when the Board would like to hold their fall meeting and would they prefer a conference call or meeting in-person. Member Schockman said that he would prefer an in-person meeting at the end of September or early October. Member Buenafe said she preferred that time-period but suggested a teleconference. All other members indicated they preferred an in-person meeting.

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President’s Report

President Bernardo reported that she ended her terms as a member of the Legislative Committee for the Council of California County Law Librarians and as the
County Law Libraries’ liaison on the Executive Committee of the Law Practice Management and Technology section of the State Bar of California.

She was working on developing a “Lawyers in the Library” program at her library and expanding that program throughout other colleague libraries in the county.

**Board Vice-President’s Report**

Vice-President Maghsoudi said that she had been working on a ballot measure for the construction and remodel of their central library.

**Chief Executive Officer’s Report**

State Librarian Lucas reported that the State Library had added a new Deputy State Librarian, Narinder Sufi.

The state budget, approved in June, provided $3 million in one-time funding for career online high school, which allowed people to get a high school diploma online. The program was administered by libraries and 44 or 45 library jurisdictions already participated. The intent was to spend the funds over a three year period on about 2500 seats.

In California there had been an 88% completion rate. Part of that high success rate was an up-front assessment to determine if prospective participants had the dedication, work ethic, etc. to complete the program since if a participant does not complete the program that scholarship could not be reused. $50,000 would go to the company that created the program to conduct intake and assessment.

Under the existing program, each library that received a scholarship had to provide funding for an additional scholarship, so the program had the potential to help 5000 people.

State Librarian Lucas reported that the State Library also received $3 million in one-time funding, to be spent over three years, for the California Civil Liberties Education Program. The original program was centered on Japanese internment. New language was added to the program statute that allowed consideration of projects that could also address other violations of civil liberties. Lucas reported that staff would probably request program ideas in mid-November.
Member Schockman asked if the State Library could take some of the Civil Liberties Education Program money and examine the roll of sanctuary cities in California as a civil liberties issue. State Librarian Lucas stated that the past program had allowed potential grantees to present ideas and State Library staff assessed the proposals to see which fit within the law. Lucas stated that there had been some conversations; particularly by the Assemblyman who carried the bill, about channeling larger chunks of the funding into bigger projects. For example, in 2017 the State Library had allocated half of the one-time grant money for projects that had budgets of $100,000 or higher. One of them was a KCET media campaign to talk about all sorts of civil liberties violations. Lucas stated he someone could put in a similar grant proposal dealing with the sanctuary city issue.

State Librarian Lucas stated that $3 million in on-going public education funding to provide online resources (databases) to the state’s public school kids has also been included. California was the only state in the Country not to offer some sort of a state sponsored suite of online content for local districts. The State Library was unsure if $3 million was enough for a state the size of California.

Lucas reported that he had involved Member Williams in the process and had done some research for them into other states’ processes. He hoped there would be no objections to Member Williams represent the Board on the working group that would be created to make decisions on how the $3 million was spent due to her expertise in education. The library had been working with the education community to put together an RFP. One of the stipulations Lucas wanted included in the RFP was the databases be available to public libraries so kids doing their homework at the library could access the same databases after school.

The State Library received funds to upgrade its digital asset management system. Through that upgrade the library added the Rosetta digital preservation repository. State Librarian Lucas reported that it would take about a year to get that up and running.

Member Schockman stated that, since CLSA budgets originated from the Governor’s office and the Department of Finance, he was interested in the Board interviewing the candidates for Governor. He felt they needed to look ahead as a
community and assess who would continue helping fulfill the mandate for libraries in California.

Member Buenafe said that John Chiang would be the keynote speaker at the California Library Association conference in May so librarians would be able to get a feel for his position. Member Schockman said that while the Board was not political they each had their circles of influence and he wondered how they could go about vetting the best choice going forward. He felt the next Governor had a big role to play in libraries and he hoped the Board would continue to monitor that race.

**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), a statewide, high-speed, high-bandwidth network, managed by the Corporation for Education Network Initiative in California (CENIC).

Cole reported that the project was going very well. 139 of California’s 184 jurisdictions were connected or in the process of connecting and 110 of those were fully connected, including 100% of all the libraries that joined in year one and 33 of the libraries that joined in year two. 633 of California’s 1125 public library outlets (main and branch libraries) are connected or in the process of connecting and 427 are fully connected.

Cole reported that the broadband connections were having a positive impact in California’s public libraries. The 34 directors of libraries that had been connected for twelve months were surveyed and 32 had responded. The result showed that the libraries were seeing: better patron support; better economic development in the community; libraries were introducing new services and programs (this moved slower because programs took time to get off the ground); better support for individual online learning; some reported increased usage of the library’s computers but the lower instance was partially due to the increase in people bringing personal devices because of improved Wi-Fi; increased administrative efficiencies; and fewer complaints about Internet speed.

In year three Technology Improvement Grants were provided to 28 libraries, 12 connecting to CalREN for the first time and 16 adding branches. Nine library
jurisdictions are interested in joining the project in year four and 13 wanted to add more branches. Those numbers were in review and would be confirmed at the start of 2018.

Natalie Cole reported that program staff was continuing to explore strategies for helping libraries with significant inhibitors to participation including financial hardship, and topography or geography issues. Overall 38% of California’s library outlets were connected, but only 22% of rural outlets are connected compared with 50% of city outlets, 34% of suburban outlets, and 34% of town outlets.

Cole reported project funds were being used to help libraries with the cost of connectivity and allowing libraries to use funds that way was one of the strategies. The State Library was also looking at partnerships that could enable public libraries to work with academic and other anchor institutions to bring broadband to rural locations. Additionally the project team was exploring other funding opportunities.

Member Williams asked if libraries were working with schools. Natalie Cole replied that was the conversation was round ways schools, health institutions, and agencies could all work together to make it worthwhile for a service provider to make the connection. Cole said she felt that partnerships and additional funding were the two things that would make those connections happen. Member Williams offered help with schools if needed.

Member Murguia thought at the last meeting Cole had mentioned a loan program for jurisdictions that were not able to front the cost of connecting while waiting for their e-rate reimbursement. Natalie Cole said the grant program had been expanded to allow libraries to use the grant funds to offset some of those costs, which they could not do originally. The State Library also wanted to continue conversations about other loan opportunities because there was a period of time where costs were very high and some libraries needed a way to pay those fees before their discounts come in and they got that money back.

Member Schockman said that he thought Cole’s information was interesting but reported outputs rather than outcomes. He asked if we would get to a point where we were judging outcomes on connectivity investment because that would be useful in advertising and annual reports. Natalie Cole said that she agreed outcome tracking was needed but it would take more money because measuring outcomes was significantly
more work. She thought it was something that could be done as libraries were
connected for longer periods of time since only 34 libraries had been connected for 12
months. Cole also thought that some positive outcomes would be around programing
and increased services which took more time to implement.

Member Williams stated that the State Library had just received funding for
programs, like databases and Career Online High School, which were all done online
and she thought the state library should find a way to market the new broadband
connections with those as examples of what could be done with it. Natalie Cole stated
broadband could impact many of the State Library’s’ projects.

**California eBook Platform with Library Owned Content Program Report**

Lena Pham reported that, prior to the grant; nearly half of California’s public libraries
were connected to the enki platform. The project was rolled-out in May and all
unconnected libraries were contacted to inform them of the opportunity to connect to
enki for free for one year, with an ongoing maintenance fee after. 28 libraries had
applied to be connected and 19 had gone live. As of the October 2017 meeting there
were 104 libraries connected to enki and 113 libraries would be connected this year.

Pham reported that an outreach plan had been created to reach the 68 non-
participating libraries and with the goal of having 75% of all eligible California public
libraries signed up to connect by the end of June 2018.

The Board allocated $200,000 for collection development and Pacific Library
Partnership has disbursed half that to purchase eBooks for the enki collection. Califa
has purchased five new collections; the McGraw Business Collection 2016 Update, the
Update, select eBooks from Independent Publishers Group, and Bibliolabs, which was a
part of Library Journal’s Self-E Select Collection. In the coming months Califa planned
to add 6 new always available collections with focuses on adult fiction, 2 children’s
collections, a travel collection, and technology reference books

Lena Pham informed the Board that the state library could provide them with a
spreadsheet from Califa showing what was purchased including specific titles, licensing
and the prices.
Member Williams asked if every library system that signed up for enki was in the same library and had access to the same books. Pham replied that was the case.

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

Lena Pham reported that the Board had allocated $200,000 to the SimplyE grant. The pilot library for the program, Alameda County Library had gone live on SimplyE. Califa worked with Datalogics to get Alameda set-up on the SimplyE app.

Pham reported that she had a test login to see how the platform looked, and had downloaded an eBook from SimplyE with no issues. The Alameda app was still being fine-tuned to improve access and it should go live to library patrons soon.

Lena Pham reported that the grant could fund six pilot libraries. The five other pilot libraries that had been chosen for the grant were Santa Clara County Library, Los Angeles Public Library, Butte County Library, Porterville Public Library, and the Black Gold Cooperative Library System. There were 45 applicants for this project. The selected pilot libraries represented a variety of library sizes, service populations, eBook vendor subscriptions, and Integrated Library Systems. The libraries that were not chosen could subscribe independently through Califa for $3000, a flat subscription rate for set-up.

Member Williams clarified the program would aggregate all of the library's eBook platforms so if she was searching for a book using the SimplyE app it would cross search and provide the book regardless of the purchasing platform. Pham confirmed that was the case. Williams asked if there would be a user satisfaction/usability assessment. Pham said that part of the plan was to look at user satisfaction, circulation statistics, etc. She believed that Carol Frost at Pacific Library Partnership was already in early discussions about what information could be analyzed to assess if the app was meeting users’ needs and how it could be improved. Williams asked if SimplyE was the only app of its kind on the market. Carol Frost stated that as far as they knew it was the only one.

Member Schockman asked how academic libraries would get access to this product. Carol Frost replied that the product was set-up to deal with eBook collections that were owned by a public library. If someone had a public library card to a library using SimplyE
they would have access. Other agencies, including universities, were not precluded from going into partnership with New York Public Library to buy SimplyE.

Lena Pham reported that another component of the grant was connecting the enki library to SimplyE, which had been completed.

**Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

Wendy Hopkins stated that the project goal was to engage libraries and partners, providing resources, and enhance the library experience which would bring more, diverse patrons and make libraries more sustainable. CEPA compliance, a stumbling block for some libraries, was not required for participating libraries because they were not linking directly to the internet.

Wendy Hopkins reported that a webpage was in the process of being created for the project. A rough draft of FAQs had been created in order to minimize confusion because each library would have an individual project.

One of the interesting things about the projects was the physical furniture needs that the libraries expressed for potential projects. For example, one library wanted to know if they could build a wall around the station to limit noise. That became a construction issue and since LSTA funds cannot be used for construction the project team has carried over that requirement for the CLSA funds to limit confusion.

All technology purchases would go toward supplies and materials for the stations and not for the evaluation of programming. If libraries proposed purchasing subscriptions they had to prove the value to program users and show the subscription could be maintained once the grant had expired. The intent was for each station to support at least two community programs.

President Bernardo asked if the project had been launched. Wendy Hopkins responded that it had just launched which was why there was not much to report. Member Williams asked if the funded projects were designed to be replicable elsewhere. Hopkins stated that innovation stations tended to be moving pieces or parts, each library’s would be different but libraries would be willing and able to share what went into the project with other libraries.

Member Murguia asked for an example of a station. Diane Satchwell stated that the Chula Vista public library, who worked with Qualcomm and the school district, was a
perfect example. The school district allocated a teacher to be at the library after hours and on weekends and students come every day. Microsoft had also come to do coding with the kids. They had made robotic projects and worked with iPads. The kids wrote messages when they leave and those had been recorded on the Chula Vista Public Library’s website video for Innovation Station. That had been a great marketing tool and was where current potential grant candidates were being referred to see an example. Diane reported other schools had also expressed and interest in partnering with their public libraries on similar programs. Member Williams encouraged reaching out to local school librarians.

Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Program 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 accessed new high-speed Internet connections. Coles stated that the project team could already see that project funds would have an impact on communities across the state, fostering partnerships and supporting a variety of technology acquisition and programming in underserved communities. The Committee was scheduled to meet on October 18th to make decisions about which proposals would be funded.

45 applications for funds had been received from libraries in urban, rural, and suburban communities. The applications demonstrated a need for upgraded and new technologies in public libraries and a desire among library staff to provide innovative programing. Most applications were for projects that would serve underserved communities and from libraries that are connected or in the process of connecting to CalREN. Applicants and their partners proposed contributing almost 200% in matching funds to the grant funds they were requesting.

Natalie Cole reported that several libraries drew on their participation in other State Library projects in their applications. Some libraries used information they gathered during Community Conversations; one library connected its proposal to programing related to PLP’s Student Success Initiative which brought libraries, schools, and school
districts together to share data and give students more access to public libraries; and
others wanted to leverage projects developed through the new Virtual Reality program.

In terms of items the libraries wanted to purchase there was a lot of variety including
software, hardware, audio-visual equipment, robotics, and coding. The project team
also saw a variety of programs like makerspaces, fab labs, media labs, literacy
programing (early, adult, computer, financial), and staff training. One library proposed a
whole suite of mobile learning stations focusing on immersive learning experiences.
Another wanted to have teens create a virtual reality experience of their city in the early
twentieth century. Libraries also proposed a variety of partners; academic institutions,
Senior centers, job centers, workforce development agencies, and city and county
departments.

Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report

Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to create an impact study and online
clearinghouse cataloging the economic and social value of libraries. Since that meeting
the set of 65 resources demonstrating libraries’ financial value and return on investment
had been made available on the State Library’s website. The researchers and students
working on the project had identified 50 new resources that focused on libraries’ social
impacts. Those resources had just been received and had not yet been reviewed but
would be going online shortly to compliment the already posted resources.

The project team had connected with colleagues in the United Kingdom who were
conducting research into how libraries could create and connect social and financial
value. The British project was led by a non-profit agency called Libraries Unlimited and
the University of Exeter, and was funded by Arts Council England. Data and research
plans had been shared and we were invited to attend, via livestream, an action research
summit that brought together academics and senior practitioners to discuss how
libraries, social enterprises, and cultural institutions could understand, grow, and
communicate the diverse value they created within communities.

The next steps were to annotate and make available resources on libraries’ social
impact and look at information coming out of the Museum field. Cole reported that the
project team was continuing to identify areas of collaboration with colleagues in the
United Kingdom. They were also going be to developing a definition of value in relation
to public libraries and creating a study to test the definition and demonstrate libraries’ impact.

President Bernardo asked if the project had any crossover with ALA or ILS databases. Cole reported that some of the resources were on ALA but the researchers had chosen the most California specific resources.

Member Williams wanted to know the next step once the project was completed and wondered if those steps were part of this project. Cole replied that next steps were not part of this grant; this was the gathering of the information. She agreed that the data needed to be used to raise awareness. At the UK summit they had highlighted some work by a professor who looked at closing the gap between identity (how we see ourselves) and reputation (how people see us). For example, libraries see ourselves as community builders but others see us as book peddlers.

President Bernardo stated that she thought part of the intention behind the program was to have a pool of information to tap into to send out when we had those high level questions. Member Williams said that she felt it was incumbent upon the Board to have that discussion on what to do with the information.

Member Buenafe shared that the National Institute of Corrections did a similar project with correctional libraries. She had been in Colorado this past summer where they talked about their value especially in the realm of recidivism reduction. The clearing house being developed for corrections was being used to speak specifically to people outside the correctional library world to increase funding for correctional libraries. Buenafe suggested connecting with the National Institute of Corrections to get that perspective and suggestions. Correctional libraries were constantly defending their existence and she thought the data being collected through the grant could be similarly used in the public realm.

**Zip Books Grant Program Report**

Janet Coles reported that that Zip Books was an alternate model to the traditional interlibrary loan and ground to ground delivery and had been successfully used in 30 rural libraries in California since 2013 through a Library Services and Technology Act funded statewide project. Last December the State Library, with the approval of the
California Library Services Board awarded a $1 million Zip Book expansion project grant to the NorthNet Cooperative Library System.

NorthNet contracted with the Califa group to provide administrative and support services for the project. Those two organizations had been working together to administrate the project and meet the objectives that were laid out in the grant proposal.

Coles reported that the objectives that were to be accomplished for the project to date included the creation and convening of an advisory committee, development of a new funding formula for libraries, developing of a new purchasing method, and the addition of 14 rural libraries to the project. She was pleased to report that, to-date; the benchmarks had largely been accomplished. 13 new libraries had been added to the project, had undergone training and begun to implement Zip Books services. Those libraries were largely drawn from the central valley and the central coast. 21 additional libraries were in the process of being recruited to the project, and it was expected that those libraries would be trained and up-and-running early in 2018.

Janet Coles reported that a new set of marketing materials (posters, bookmarks, and book plates) had been developed. An in-service would also be held at the CLA annual conference, bringing together new libraries and legacy libraries to network, share practices, and start sustainability planning.

Coles said that she and Jacquie Brinkley, NorthNet Cooperative Library System, had gone to Portland in August to present at the Northwestern Interlibrary Loan Conference. The session was well attended and had lots of responses from that group afterwards.

Member Huguenin asked if there would be outreach to other geographic areas since there seemed to be a lack of participation in the Los Angeles area. Coles said there would be. The clustering in the central valley was because the project had largely focused on rural libraries up until that point. For the 21 new libraries, they were going to be looking at widening the project to other types of libraries. They were looking at targeting areas that were not geographically represented.

**CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

**RESOURCE SHARING**

Consolidation and Affiliations
Annly Roman reported that the City of Goleta had requested to consolidate with the Black Gold Library Cooperative System (Black Gold). Goleta was part of the Santa Barbara City Library jurisdiction but the city of Goleta owned the library building. Goleta had decided to split off and form an independent library district. The city was a member of Black Gold under the Santa Barbara City Library District but would need to be approved for their own membership when they became their own library jurisdiction. The request was to become an independent member of Black Gold as of July 1, 2018.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the affiliation of the Goleta Library with the Black Gold Cooperative Library System effective July 1, 2018, and waives the September 1, 2017 filing date for 2018/19 affiliations.

BUDGET AND PLANNING

System Plans of service and Budgets

Annly Roman announced that the Board could discuss the final 2017/2018 budget but could not take action because it had been accidentally removed from the agenda and was not properly noticed. Roman said that lack of action would not impact the funding going to the Systems since the Board had already approved the proposed budget, which had not changed, so the Board could address it at the next Board meeting. If the Board felt it was necessary they could also hold a regularly scheduled teleconference meeting in about a month to address the budget.

Monica Rivas reported that the System Population and Membership Figures and the System Plans of Service were both still up for consideration. Rivas reported that the administrative regulations provided for an annual review and approval of the system population and membership figures for use in the allocation formula to distribute state funds. It stated that "CLSA funds distributed based on population shall be awarded based on the most recent available combined estimates for cities and counties from the State Department of Finance." Those numbers were usually posted by June 1st by the State Librarian.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the
System Population and Membership figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the fiscal year 2017/18.

Monica Rivas reported that the System’s Plans of Service were the goals that the Systems provided to the State Library on how they planned to use their Communication and Delivery money. The systems were using funds for physical delivery (mostly contracted delivery), resource sharing, eBook programs like Zinio or Overdrive, some were using enki, and some funded Link+. There were also a few libraries using funds for broadband connectivity.

Member Williams asked for a quick overview of Link+. Diane Satchwell stated that Innovative was a company that provided a link a catalogue that 70 libraries in Nevada, Arizona, and California share. If someone was looking for an item their library does not have, they can get it from one of the other libraries in 3-5 days and it is free to the public.

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Plans of Service for the nine Cooperative Library Systems, submitted for the fiscal year 2017/18.

President Bernardo asked if there was any interest in discussing the final budget or opinion on how the Board wanted to proceed with that item. There were no comments so Bernardo asked for a recommendation from staff. Annly Roman commented that the April 2018 meeting would still be within the 2017/2018 fiscal year so the Board could address the budget in April and still be within the current fiscal year. The Board agreed to proceed with that item at the April meeting.

System Reports

State Librarian Lucas stated that this item was something he had requested be placed on the agenda. He wanted the Board to consider uniform disclosure for the nine cooperative library systems. The state library received financial statements from the systems with varying degrees of specificity.

Lucas stated that if you were to search the State Controller’s website some of the previous systems that consolidated to form the new systems had varying levels of
PERS payment responsibility. It was unclear, at least from the statements that we had, who was responsible for those liabilities, the existing system or the original system.

If federal funds for libraries disappeared and the state of California decided to commit to higher levels of local assistance for public libraries, decisions would be made based on the administration’s understanding of the services the systems were currently delivering. If the administration was not satisfied, the decision could be to try something new. Lucas said the goal of the State Library was to find a statement that everyone could agree on showing the assets, liabilities, and salaries.

State Librarian Lucas stated that the State Library had been in conversations with the State Auditor General to determine what information was required when they audited someone who received state funds. The State Library was going to start asking for those things.

President Bernardo stated that she had thought that all the systems had regular audits and asked if those audits were held to the State Auditor’s standards. Lucas replied that the system audits were held to a standard but the state library wanted to make sure they had all information the State Auditor might request. Lucas thought that since the State Library oversees the systems for the Board, having a complete picture of the financial condition of the existing and legacy systems that had merged into existing systems would be important in future decisions about investment.

Carol Frost commented that each system was quite complex and has multiple sources of funding beyond the money received from CLSA funds. An auditor would be responsible for looking at the overall fiscal healthiness of the system. She thought that the systems completely agreed with the State Library that there should be consistent reporting. There were sometimes differing interpretations for completing the forms so the Systems thought having a uniform way to express everything would be helpful. Frost stated that a lot of variables went into the system budgets so they looked forward to working with the State Library on trying to quantify what needed to be expressed in the budgets and narrative forms.

Diane Satchwell commented that the systems could, when they submitted their CLSA reports, attach their audits to try to give the State Library more information.
President Bernardo asked if State Librarian Lucas was thinking of developing a template to effectively demonstrate where the money was going. Lucas confirmed that was the goal. Member Christmas stated that he felt determinations on how to report the information should come back to the Board.

**CLSA REGULATIONS**

Annly Roman reported that at the April 2017 meeting the Board had approved the updated regulatory language. Since then, state library staff had compiled the necessary paperwork and drafted a notice in preparation for filing with the Office of Administrative Law. The form 399, the Economic and Fiscal Impact report, had just been signed by the Department of Finance and should be received in her office soon. Roman estimated the State Library should be able to file the notice packet with the Office of Administrative Law to begin the regulatory process.

Roman said that the Board had previously discussed wanting to hold an open public hearing to discuss the regulations. The April meeting would be a possibility if the Board wanted to incorporate the hearing into that meeting. The Board agreed that would be the most cost effective way of doing it.

President Bernardo asked if they were looking to make any changes at the current meeting. Roman said that if there were additional changes the Board felt were needed, changes could be made. Bernardo said that in section 20107, the last sentence of “a”, “The definitions incorporated by reference are accurate to California Statutes 2016”, was not necessary. Also in 20107(b) number 2, the definition of a CEO is also present in Education Code 18726 and in CCR 20116 so she did not feel that it needed to be repeated again. There was consensus among the Board that those two items could be removed.

Annly Roman stated that the State Library would need to notify the Department of Finance of the changes but she did not think it would make a difference in the Economic Impact certification.

*It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the California Library Services Act regulatory language as amended to remove the last sentence in code section 20107(a); “The definitions incorporated by reference are accurate to California Statutes 2016.”*
And code section 20107(b)(2), the definition of the “Chief Executive Officer”.

State Librarian Lucas stated that at the Board’s April 2017 meeting some Board members requested that the word “contiguous” be struck from the regulations. Board members favoring removal of the word “contiguous” argued that in an age of digital connections and alternate methods of resource-sharing, physical proximity need not be a necessity for partnership.

Several public libraries and the cooperative library systems expressed concerns; both in writing and at the April 2017 meeting, that removal of the word “contiguous” could have detrimental effects on smaller or rural libraries as well as the cohesiveness they feel is essential to their library systems. Several hypothetical possibilities were raised which some cooperative library systems felt could adversely affect the equitable distribution of California Library Services Act funding should the word “contiguous” be removed. The Board postponed action on this issue pending more information. State Library staff looked at the specific questions submitted by the Systems and tried to assess them.

Lucas stated that the State Library’s recommendation was to remove the word “contiguous” because, based on library staff’s research; the word did not have much effect one way or another. Additionally, the Board had, in the past, waived that requirement. Based on actions that the Board had taken, going back decades, none of the hypothetical adverse effects brought up in the systems’ letters could happen without Board approval.

State Library Lucas said that is seemed unlikely to state library staff based on what was in the law and the 40 years of precedent set by the Board that current Board or future Board members would keep the current funding structure but allow a populous area like San Francisco to merge with Los Angeles and create a giant system that would suck all the money away and disadvantage everyone else in the state of California. So either the method of allocating funds would be changed or the merger would not be approved.

State Librarian Lucas also pointed out that word “contiguous” did not exist in the statute, maybe because it was somehow implicit. Annly Roman stated that
contiguousness was kind of implicit under the definition of that constituted a cooperative
library system. The definition stated that the systems needed to be regional and that the
systems were the cooperative library systems in existence under the Public Library
Services Act of 1963 when the California Library Services Act was enacted in 1977.
Roman stated that the Board had been provided with a list of those original systems,
whose borders were very similarly to the current systems; with the exception of systems
that had merged into larger systems.

Member Schockman asked where the fear was coming from and whether there was
a threat that the Board was not sensing surrounding a word like “contiguous”. State
Librarian Lucas said if Member Schockman was asking if the state library had some
knowledge of an outside threat the answer was no. State Library staff was asked by the
Board to take a look at the issue based on the concerns raised by the systems and the
public libraries and we had done that to the best of our abilities.

Member Buenafe said that it sounded to her like the word “contiguous” did not make
a measurable difference in the regulations, but removing it was upsetting people.
Member Buenafe said that she didn’t see why, if it didn’t really make a difference, they
would use up their good will with the systems and remove the word. Vice-President
Maghsoudi and Member Tauler agreed. Tauler felt that since the Board had the
authority to make an exception, if they needed to they would.

Member Christmas stated that he read the report and read all the comments
provided by the systems and the libraries around the state and based on the report he
did not see any purpose to having the word in the regulations. He agreed with the state
library that the final authority for the make-up of the systems rested with the Board and
since it was not in the actual law itself he advocated for its removal.

Member Williams said that she was not sure if she understood how the word
“contiguous” related to the distribution of materials because some of the letters had to
do with concern over moving print materials from point A to point B. She felt that maybe
the conversation they needed had to do with how libraries moved materials back and
forth. She was unclear about how she felt since she did not think the word “contiguous”
was needed in the regulations but could identify with the concerns.
Member Murguia asked if the maintenance of the word “contiguous” in the regulations would hamper the effort to share e-resources. Annly Roman said that she did not believe so; the systems were already sharing e-resources amongst themselves. Roman believed the issues the systems had with sharing centered on difficulty negotiating for some of those resources even within the larger systems, not contiguousness.

President Bernardo stated that she would be in favor of removing the word “contiguous”. She found it limiting and outside of the Act itself. It was already set in the education code that the Cooperative Library Systems were those that were currently in existence and that could not be changed without a Board waiver. Annly Roman clarified that the Board could waive the contiguousness requirement in the regulations but could not allow the creation of a brand new system since the system definition was in statute instituted by the legislature, not regulations instituted and approved by the Board. Without an amendment to statute the creation of a brand new system that was not one of the legacy systems was not an option.

Gerry Garzon, President of the Pacific Library Partnership library system, Director of the Oakland Public Library and speaking on behalf of the NorthNet Library System and their Chair, Mel Lightbody, stated that when the issue of the word “contiguous” first came up the libraries thought that its removal seemed like a solution in search of a problem. When he went back and read the April 2017 minutes it said that there was a sense that in the 21st century there was no reason why libraries should be required to have contiguous borders. Additionally, in other documents provided to the Board, the idea is presented that in an age of digital connections and alternate methods of resource sharing physical proximity need to be a necessity for partnerships. Garzon felt the sense being conveyed from libraries was that they were already sharing resources, it is not an issue.

Garzon felt that keeping the language benefited resource sharing of physical items. There are over 5 million physical items that were shared annually. Libraries in the Bay area believed that the word “contiguous” added to the equity of what they gave to their communities. The Pacific Library Partnership believed that contiguous cooperative systems really contributed to how services were provided within the systems and
removal of the “contiguous” language appeared to allow that type of mix to be done away with. It seemed odd to be moving in the direction when so much of what the libraries and even the state and local governments are doing revolved around looking at how to invest and protect some of the most vulnerable populations.

At the state level California was trying to look at how to address the increasing housing crisis, how to maintain health insurance for the newly insured, and guarantee legal representation for immigrants targeted for deportation. Public libraries work with all of those folks every day. Libraries had been and always would be the great equalizers in the community where all were welcome and there were materials and services available to meet each person’s needs. PLP and NorthNet believed that the current regulatory language had nothing that addressed equity and eliminating the “contiguous” language further reduced any type of equity that inherently existed in the current model.

Gerry Garzon stated that the comments received by the Board represented a small portion of the public libraries in California saying, retention or removal was the Board’s decision but why make that decision because it is based on the idea that it was not necessary in a 21st century model.

Member Buenafe asked Gerry Garzon about why removing the word “contiguous” might reduce the equity that libraries provide. She was unclear about the correlation. Garzon stated that libraries could never be sure who would be making decisions in the future and one of the concerns was that two systems or a number of libraries might decide to form a system and be able to make a strong argument to the Board that they were providing the best services. He stated that could happen and might shut out a number of vulnerable populations that they felt needed services. Libraries were saying if the “contiguous” word was not currently an issue and was not preventing libraries from operating in the current environment why was it being brought forward.

Member Schockman stated that “contiguous” was in the current language, so as a Board they had to consider that while reading the law. The reality was that there was sharing all the time regardless of “contiguous” borders. Schockman stated that the Board’s mission and value statements talked about local control, local financing, services for the underserved, and resource sharing, so why would they allow some hypothetical mega systems that would destroy their values and mission.
Gerry Garza said that he was going to get away from that hypothetical, but there were a tremendous number of libraries that were telling the Board that they don’t understand why the word “contiguous” is being looked at. What the libraries were saying was that the word “contiguous” was not limiting them. Gerry Garza stated that he wanted to bring-up that while the word “contiguous” is not in the statute, it was in the regulatory language which was there to help interpret the law.

Member Schockman asked if the item needed to be decided at the October meeting. Most Board members felt that since the Board had been discussing the issue for several meetings and since they would like to move the regulations forward the Board should make a decision.

Michelle Perera, Pasadena Library, commented that she had sent a letter and was representing the Southern California Library Cooperative, and she wanted to echo Gerry Garza’s comments. She felt there was a lot of benefit to be had by keeping the language in the regulations.

Member Williams stated that she did not understand the relation of the word contiguous to the fear of larger entities taking over the smaller entities. Member Tauler said the fear was not of taking over but of leaving behind. Member Williams stated that she could not imagine a compelling argument that could be made to the Board that would allow them to leave anyone behind given the Board’s mission. Given that we didn’t know where we were headed digitally, she did not want to see great innovations be stifled over a fear of what might happen.

President Bernardo asked Member Williams if she was saying that maybe sharing resources regardless of contiguous boarders was a violation of the regulations. State Librarian Lucas clarified that in the State Library staff’s examination of the law, contiguousness was a condition of affiliation, not a quality of resources sharing.

Carol Frost, Pacific Library Partnership, stated that there were a lot of examples of libraries doing digital resource sharing effectively. In the NorthNet Library System funds were divided up by a formula so each library in NorthNet received a distribution of funds and then had a menu of services that they could chose to use their funds for such as delivery, Zinio, eBooks, etc. It was up to the individual libraries how they wanted to use those funds. Libraries could supplement those programs with their own individual funds.
from the government. Similarly, there were 17 libraries in California that were sharing
digital resources through the Cloud library. None of those libraries were using CLSA
funds for that and it was working very efficiently.

Frost stated that when it came to sharing physical resources, that was where having
“contiguous” could help because there was the qualification that funding depended on
the delivery of items and they want the resources to represent an equitable distribution.
They felt that the word “contiguous” was a safeguard in the regulations as a
consideration of how resource sharing could happen.

President Bernardo clarified that they were not satisfied that Education code
sections 18743 and 18745 that imposed equal access to all residents in the area served
by the systems was sufficient. Frost stated that was correct.

It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Maghsoudi) and carried with a vote
of seven aye votes (Buenafe, Ibanez, Maghsoudi, Mindnich, Murguia,
Williams, Tauler), three no votes (Bernardo, Christmas, Huguenin),
and one abstention (Schockman) that the California Library Services
Board approves the retention of the word “contiguous” in California
Library Services Act regulations, Sections 20180, 20185, and 20190.

Adjourned Open Session at 12:10pm.
Resume Open Session Public Meeting at 1:30pm

REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION
President Bernardo resumed the public meeting of the California Library Services
Board at 1:30pm.
President Bernardo reported that the Board had completed their closed session and
approved the performance evaluation, with amendments and a recommended 10%
salary increase for the Administrative Assistant II to the California Library Services
Board.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Annly Roman reported that there were two measures the Board had taken positions
on at the April 2017 Board meeting. First was CLA sponsored SCA 3 (Dodd) which
moved through the legislative process but was held up at the end of session and did not
pass. Roman reported SCA 3 was held over on the inactive file and could be brought forward again the next year. There was a lot of work done by CLA and the Lobbyists trying to get the measure passed but it was a tough year because there was an early tax vote which caused many republicans and moderates to be hesitant about casting another positive vote on a tax related issue. Roman reported that CLA had discussed making SCA 3 a priority for next year as well.

State Librarian Lucas stated that SCA 3 amended the constitution and required a two-thirds vote. If the measure did pass the Senate it would go to the more fractious Assembly where it would probably not have as good of a chance of passing. Lucas stated that a more likely bill to get bipartisan support would be something like a bond measure but that would have its own set of complexities.

Roman reported that SB 390 passed through the legislative process but was vetoed by the Governor who stated the bill was unnecessary because he thought that the requirement to consider the Model School Library Curriculum was already included in the LCAP instructions. The Board did send a letter to the committees when the bill was under consideration as well as re-sending a letter to the Governor and his staff once it reached his desk letting them know of the Board’s support.

Member Murguia asked if there was a need for the Board to communicate their support for SCA 3 to Senator Dodd or would they try to move the bill again. Annly Roman stated that the Board could do another letter of support to the Author although the Board’s original letter of support was sent directly to the Senator’s office and the bill had not changed since the letter was submitted. Roman stated she believed that Senator Dodd’s staff had expressed that they were still committed to moving the bill.

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board continues to support SCA 3 (Dodd) and directs State Library staff to draft a letter of continued support to Senator Dodd’s office on behalf of the California library Services Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2017/18

Annly Roman stated that the Board had been provided with some documents to begin the discussion of a strategic plan. Staff had trouble finding the Board’s last full strategic plan but staff was able to provide Board actions which showed the vision
statement approved by the Board as well as the three year goals established and some of the background documentation from the planning session.

Roman stated that it seemed, for the last plan, that the Board had identified some priorities then set objectives under those areas that either individual Board members or a committee of two members worked toward or provided additional information. Roman thought the first step would be to look at the Board’s mission and vision and see if the Board felt those were still viable or needed to be changed.

Member Schockman clarified that the last strategic plan dated back to 2000. He stated that it seemed like there was an ad hoc committee formed at one point with a Chair and the committee drove the process with the rest of the Board providing opinion or getting involved at varying levels. Member Schockman asked if staff saw that as a strategic use of the Board’s time.

Annly Roman responded that it definitely could be but felt it would be more difficult because when the last plan was completed the Board had a lot more money, and programs. Roman stated she did think there were areas where the Board could set priorities and where they might want to be more active and strategic, say legislatively.

Member Schockman stated that it looked like the session took place at the Hyatt and asked if the Board came in early to take independent time for discussion. Annly Roman stated that the Board did have a separate session and that Marilyn Snyder had facilitated. Schockman asked if she was still around. Roman stated that she was and had facilitated strategic planning sessions for the State Library but she was unclear on if the Board would have funds to purchase Marilyn’s time. Member Schockman asked if they could look for a pro-bono facilitator. He felt that there should be an independent facilitator to ensure that everyone could be involved. Annly Roman stated that they could try to find someone who could facilitate outside of a Board member.

State Librarian Lucas stated that elements of the strategic plan could be about what the Board used to do and there was a need for the Board to be doing some of those things now. There should also be consideration of what the Board ought to be rather than only centering on what it was currently doing.

Member Schockman asked if they would be looking at a three year or five year plan. Annly Roman stated she thought the Board should start with a three year plan which
could be updated as needed within that period of time. Member Williams asked if they were considering doing a planning session the day before the April meeting and Board members agreed with the idea of a half-day session.

Member Schockman stated that he would be honored to co-chair an ad hoc strategic planning committee. Member Williams indicated she would be willing to co-chair as well.

*It was moved, seconded (Ibanez, Huguenin) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board appoints Dr. Eric Schockman and Connie Williams as Co-Chairs of the ad-hoc Strategic Planning Committee.*

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment brought forward.

J. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Member Buenafe shared that she had met with the Los Angeles County Public Library and she was meeting with San Francisco Public Library on Friday to talk about some pilot programs to have releasing offenders leave with a library card for the jurisdiction they would be returning to. The resources available at a public library were familiar to many in the library world but a lot of those being released had no idea they could get on the internet for free or that that they had, especially in the large urban libraries, workshops on job skills or resources for housing.

Buenafe stated that the next step was to have a pilot program at LA County's institution, which is in Lancaster. The folks there who took a pre-release class called “Transitions,” would get a lesson about library services as part of their five week class as well as a paper library card that allowed them access to all the electronic services. They would be able to go into a branch and exchange it for a permanent card that allowed them to check out materials.

That kind of partnership between public libraries and institutional libraries was something Buenafe thought would help reduce recidivism and she was encouraged by how enthusiastic the public libraries were. She felt that there had been a change in California about how the incarcerated were perceived and since 95% would eventually go back into communities, this was a way to help them be successful.
Member Ibanez stated that he attended, as an observer, the Pasadena Library’s community conversations with librarians, headed by Cindy Mediavilla. He felt it was a very interesting conversation. He also wanted to encourage Board members to attend the President’s dinner at the CLA. He would be playing in the band.

Member Williams stated that the Sonoma County Libraries were closed during the fires because there were no basic services. There was some very good planning going on for services for the displaced members of the community. No branches were burned and while the Archives were a very deep concern they were unharmed as well.

K. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business brought forward.

L. AGENDA BUILDING

There was no additional agenda items brought forward.

M. ADJOURNMENT

President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services Board meeting at 2:02pm with thoughts toward friends and colleagues in California struggling with the fires.
California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-02

In Honor of Penny Kastanis

WHEREAS, on May 31, 2017 the California Library Services Board, California State Library and the library community was saddened by the loss of a dedicated colleague and champion, Penny Kastanis; and

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board wishes to express its heart-felt sympathy to her husband Terry and their family; and

WHEREAS, the board, state library staff, and the library community will remember Penny Kastanis as a tireless advocate for education, literacy, and California libraries of all kinds; and

WHEREAS, Penny Kastanis dedicated over 50 years to the field of education; in the classroom, in libraries, and through her work with various state agencies, schools, and library, literacy, and educational organizations and associations; and

WHEREAS, the board wishes to recognize the myriad of contributions Penny Kastanis made during her career including her work as faculty coordinator for the Library Media Teacher Services Credential Program at California State University at Sacramento, the director of Educational Technology and Learning Resources Center for the Sacramento County Office of Education, and as a leader and teacher of credentialing programs at Sacramento City College, as well as her participation as a trustee and committee member on various state, regional, and local boards, commissions and committees; and

WHEREAS, Penny Kastanis will always be appreciated for her work on legislation which funded literacy programs throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, the board wishes to acknowledge Penny Kastanis for her leadership and dedication during her tenure on the California Library Services Board and the Library of California Board, where she served as President from 2008-2010;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

the California Library Services Board
extends its sincere sympathy and deep regard
to the family of

Penny Kastanis

for her commitment and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 17 October, 2017
California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-03  
In Honor of Gregory McGinity

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Gregory McGinity for his distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of his term of service as a member of the board; and

WHEREAS, the board wishes to honor Gregory McGinity for his exceptional public service and engagement representing the “Public-at-Large” since his appointment by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on December 30, 2010; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that Gregory McGinity serves as executive director of The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, working for the public good in education, science, and the arts, since 2003; and

WHEREAS, Gregory McGinity worked as the acting chief of staff for the California Office of the Secretary of Education in 2003, and as the senior policy consultant for the California State Board of Education from 1997 to 1999; and

WHEREAS, Gregory McGinity worked as the legislative director for the Office of U.S. Representative Lindsey Graham from 1996 to 1997 and legislative assistant for the Office of U.S. Senator Thad Cochran form 1993 to 1996; and

WHEREAS, Gregory McGinity’s experience and insight have proven invaluable both to the Library of California Board and California Library Services Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

the California Library Services Board  
extends its sincere appreciation and deep regard to

Gregory McGinity

for his contributions and service  
to the libraries and people of the State of California  
on this day of 17 October, 2017
California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-04

In Honor of Dr. Kevin Starr

WHEREAS, on January 14, 2017, the California Library Services Board, California State Library and the library community was saddened by the loss of a dedicated colleague and renowned historian, Dr. Kevin Starr; and

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board wishes to express its heat-felt sympathy to his wife Sheila and their family; and

WHEREAS, the board, State Library staff, and library professionals throughout California will always remember Dr. Kevin Starr’s dedication and contributions to the library community, the California State Library, the Library of California Board, the California Library Services Board, and the people of California during his term of service to California as State Librarian, beginning with his appointment by Governor Pete Wilson on August 31, 1994 and extending beyond his retirement from the position in 2004; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kevin Starr, as State Librarian created and promoted numerous programs for the benefit of the people of California including: Access News, the California Newspaper Project, the California Civil Liberties Education Program, and the English Language Literacy Intensive program; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kevin Starr provided leadership and guidance as the Chief Executive Officer of the California Library Services Board, the Chair of the State Advisory Council on Libraries, and helped establish the Library of California in 1999, and create the Office of Library Construction under the Library Bond Act of 2000; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kevin Starr continues to enrich the lives of Californians through his works as an historian and professor, especially his Americans and the California Dream series; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Kevin Starr will be remembered for his exceptional service to the people of California and work toward the preservation of its rich and diverse heritage,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

the California Library Services Board
extends its sincere sympathy and deep regard
to the family of

Dr. Kevin Starr

for his distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 17, October 2017