Welcome and Introductions

President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on April 17, 2018 at 9:38 a.m.

Board Members Present: Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Aleita Huguenin, Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Adriana Martinez, Elizabeth Murguia, Sandra Tauler, and Connie Williams.

California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Narinder Sufi, Carolyn Brooks, Natalie Cole, Janet Coles, Susan Hanks, Monica Rivas, Annly Roman, and Mark Webster.

Adoption of Agenda

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the April 17, 2018 meeting.

Approval of October 2017 Board Minutes

It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes of the October 17, 2017 meeting.

Board Resolutions

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library Services Board Resolution 2018-01 for Dr. H. Eric Schockman. (See Exhibit A)

Board Meeting Date for Fall 2018/Spring 2019

Annly Roman reported that the Board had already decided they wanted their next meeting to be in Sacramento and a Doodle Poll determined the best date was October
4, 2018. The question before the Board was what their preference was for the spring 2019 meeting. Member Murguia stated that she would prefer an in-person meeting and Members Martinez and Christmas agreed. Member Williams stated that since the Board had discussed a need for greater advocacy that would be a good time to pursue that.

Roman asked what time period the Board would prefer. She stated that April tended to get a little crazy for the legislators if the Board wanted to meet with them. Most Board members indicated April as long as they were not on top of the legislator’s spring break.

State Librarian Lucas stated that when the Legislature came back from Spring break their schedules were very busy and policy committees were meeting around the clock and they were beginning to have Sub-committee hearings for the budget. He wanted to say the deadline for introducing bills was at the end of February. He felt that early April would be a good time but they might want to consider March as well to be ahead of their Spring break. Member Christmas suggested the end of March or first part of April and suggested the Board come in a day early the meet with legislators.

Annly Roman stated that she would send out a Doodle Poll with attention to which days would work for legislator meetings.

Nomination of Board Officers

Annly Roman stated that she knew in the regulatory changes the Board would be moving the two year terms for officers with elections to be held every odd year, but since the regulations were not in place yet roman felt they should at least start the process for nominating officers for the next meeting. If the regulations were to be finalized and approved before the October meeting and the Board decided they wanted to postpone until the next year they would have the option to do so.

Roman reported that normally the Board would elect two members to serve as the nominating committee. The nominating committee, for the last few years, had solicited names for those interested in running for one of the officer positions, and then put forward a poll to the Board to gauge Board opinion. The nominations had been based on that feedback. The Nominating Committee could also have solicited interest in leadership and decided amongst themselves who to nominate.

Member Williams stated that she was happy to serve again and Member Ibanez volunteered as well.
It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board appoints Florante Ibanez and Connie Williams to the Nominating Committee to select board officers for 2019.

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President’s Report

President Bernardo reported that she had been busy advocating with the Council of California County Law Libraries for state funds to subsidize the county law libraries statewide. Their request was not to backfill the libraries for their losses since 2009 but to stabilize the libraries for a period of time so they can come up with a long term solution. They would be in budget hearings beginning that week with the legislative committees. So they had been visiting at district offices to try and make that happen.

Bernardo stated she had also been following the CALIX listserv, various small library listservs, as well as special libraries listserv. She did continue to attend a number of training webinars. She was able to attend the previous months Northern California Association of Law Libraries in Sacramento and they had Patrick Sweeney as a guest speaker. Bernardo felt it was a very good day as Pat had a special boot camp for County Law Libraries on legislative advocacy. Pat was the founder of everylibrary.org.

Board Vice-President’s Report

Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that she continues to represent the board on the California Library Association’s Legislative Committee. Locally, unfortunately, they lost their bond measure by ten votes.

Chief Executive Officer’s Report

State Librarian Lucas reported that over the last six months most of what the State Library had been doing was fiscally related. Coming up on the first of May was the first budget sub-committee hearing on the Governor’s proposed budget from January which contained $9.5 million in library related spending. Of that amount $6.5 million is one-time funding, $5 million of which was directed at helping local libraries connect to the broadband network that is operated by CENIC. Part of that $5 would have helped libraries pay some of the cost of connection and there was a new pot of $3 million which was aimed at helping libraries to be able to deliver broadband at a higher capacity. Libraries connected to CENIC could connect at one gigabit but some libraries lack the
ability to connect at that speed inside the library because of the age of their system, and
a variety of other reasons. So the second pot of money is aimed at trying to facilitate
improving capacity. One of the reasons that was proposed had to do with the Board
funded Lighting Up Libraries program because a number of the applications were more
for basic capacity/hardware sort of issues then what the State Library had expected.

Of the other $1.5 million, half of that is to help the NorthNet libraries connect their
catalogues digitally. For example, you could live in a community in one of the 24
counties that are north of Sacramento, look on your laptop at your libraries for a
specific book, hit a button and it would be all of the catalogues combined. So it would
provide access to significantly more information and materials than is currently
available. NorthNet is finding the money to pay for the ongoing costs of that, so the
Governor’s proposal was to pay for the upfront cost of setting up the digital catalogue
connection. The other $1 million that related to book delivery was for Zip Books, which
was another program that the Board had supported.

Those funds would allow the library to expand that program into different areas. It
had been a success in rural parts of the state so the library was expanding it to the
central coast where Maureen and the Black Gold Cooperative Library System was as
well as the central valley and two larger urban library jurisdictions, Long Beach and
Hayward, to see how it would work in a more urban environment.

The State Library had been asked by the International Federation of Library
Associations to make a presentation about Zip Books at their annual convention in
Kuala Lampur, Malaysia.

Lucas reported there was another $2.5 million in ongoing money for the California
Library Literacy Services Program to help bring back a portion of the program that used
to exist, which provided family related literacy services. The program was traditionally
aimed at adult learners. In the past there was a component that included the kids of the
adult learners, so you could have a family-wide literacy strategy. If you could intervene
with a kid at a younger age there is a larger benefit and potentially end the cycle of
illiteracy. You read these studies about how just having a book at home or books to
read at home was a step toward ending that cycle. There were jurisdictions that did
have literacy programs that involved the entire family and what they had found and
reported to the State Library was that having the kids involved incentivized the adult learner and had the other benefits he mentioned previously. Assuming the budget was passed by the legislature and approved by the Governor that $2.5 million would get the literacy program to the highest amount of money it had ever had.

Finally, Lucas reported there was another $500,000 in ongoing money. $300,000 for fees CENIC had to pay to the Public Utilities Commission, etc. to maintain its broadband network and the rest to add a position at the State Library to focus exclusively on helping libraries benefit to the maximum extent they could from broadband connectivity. Part of that role would be to focus on; there is a federal program with a variety of discounts. One of the discounts they already took advantage of when libraries connect to CENIC, but there are other ones for equipment. There were a variety of different pots of e-rate discount money that the state could get a bigger share of and the idea of getting a person to focus on that was to help get more money from the federal government.

State Librarian Lucas reported the Congress ignored the recommendation of the Trump administration and did not line out the money for the Institute for Museum and Library Services and approved the Library and Information Services Act funding at a slightly higher level than last year, he wanted to say about $8 million more. If things held up the way they had in the past, California was about 13% of the population; the money was handed out on a per-capita basis so California would potentially get $800,000 more. That was for the 2018 federal fiscal year. The 2019 federal fiscal year was still in flux, but there was a lot of really good advocacy work that was done at the Federal level by the American Library Association and State Librarians from across the country. Lucas said he felt that generally there was a lot of reluctance by members of Congress to vote against libraries and literacy.

Member Martinez mentioned that the Zip Books program was designed for rural communities primarily but that she thought State Librarian Lucas had mentioned that it was now going into some of the urban areas. Luca stated that when it was done as a pilot the rural areas seemed like they would benefit from it the most because of geographic remoteness. Long Beach and Hayward would be trying the program to see if it worked. Again, it was a delivery system for library materials that worked in a number
of cases, but it was unlikely that it would have fully replaced the traditional delivery of books.

President Bernardo asked if State Librarian Lucas could update the Board on the K-12 online content for schools. Lucas said that the Governor’s budget for the current fiscal year included $3 million for online resources for K-12 schools. Up until this year California was the only state in the nation that didn’t offer a suite of online content of any kind to public schools. Texas, for example, spent $6 million a year for online databases for 5.3 million kids, New York, Ohio, Michigan and others had programs as well. The Governor’s late chief of staff, Nancy McFadden, thought that it was important for California not to be the only state that didn’t provide this and put $3 million in the budget to make it happen.

The State Library had worked with the Riverside County Office of Education to put together an RFP and had about eight bidders. The end result was that the $3 million was split between three different databases; TeachingBooks.net, Encyclopedia Britannica, and ProQuest which is one of those larger database companies. The thinking by the team of educators and librarians, which included Member Williams, who evaluated the proposals, was that there needed to be a broad mix of databases available to kids. The Governor’s office wanted the resources to be available to school kids at the beginning of the next school year. The contracts had been awarded to those three bidders. TeachingBooks and Britannica had said that they would make themselves available, as part of the deal, in public libraries around the state. ProQuest, there was still some discussion about how their doing that would look like. The three database providers had split up the 1000 school districts in the state and were gathering the needed information to connect the schools to the databases. 100 school districts had already been signed up.

Member Williams stated that she felt this was a ripe opportunity to make the connections between school and public libraries.

**Lighting up Libraries: Broadband Update report**

Natalie Cole reported that, over the past four years the California State Library had been engaged in the state-funded High-Speed Broadband in California Libraries project. The goal of the project was to bring high-speed broadband to all California public libraries
by connecting them to the California Research and Education Network (CalREN), which is managed by the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

Cole reported that the State Library continues to make strong progress on the project. A total of 143 jurisdictions had joined the project. 139 of those jurisdictions were connected or were in the process of connecting. Four additional jurisdictions, Los Angeles County, San Diego Public, Roseville, and Santa Clarita, had signed contracts and were working through the connection process in the current year. An additional 17 jurisdictions that were already connected were adding branches in year four. From all those jurisdictions there was the possibility of approximately 150 branches from the jurisdictions to be connected, with the majority of those being from Los Angeles County. There are 69 branches more that might have finalized their connections.

Cole reported that the State Library has a new consultant working on the project, CTC Technology & Energy. The company was working with the State library on the strategic direction and implementation of the project.

Cole stated that the project was having a positive impact around the state. The State Library was still getting really positive feedback from the public libraries once they had been connected for 12 months. There are, as the Board had been previously told, some challenges which made it hard for some libraries to connect and the broadband team was actively strategizing to overcome the challenges. A lot of the libraries with difficulties connecting were in rural communities so they were still continuing to look for ways to address those issues.

Member Murguia clarified that the proposed budget talked about another $3 million to support the program. Natalie Cole stated that was correct. The money would go to help new libraries connect and to increase the capacity of libraries that were already on board. Member Martinez asked about the 338 that were not yet connected or that have chosen not to connect to the high speed broadband network. She wondered what they had in terms of connections. Cole said that those libraries did have internet access, it was just not as fast of a connection. She stated that some libraries want to connect but had challenges that prevent it, such as geographical or topographical challenges. In the rural part of the state it was very hard for libraries to get connected. Cole also said that some libraries already had contracts with other service providers so that was a case of waiting
until those contracts expired since it was not always easy to get out of a contract. Some
libraries had internet service that they were currently happy with but that could always
change. Cole said at this point it was a case-by-case basis and different libraries had
different reasons for not participating. They wanted the money and program to continue
so that when libraries are ready they can accommodate them.

Member Ibanez said that based on their past discussions on the broadband issue he
wanted to confirm there was some priority or ranking to include underserved communities.
Natalie Cole said the underserved communities are being included and they were working
closely with any library that wanted to participate.

**Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Program Grant**

**Program Report**

Natalie Cole reported that the Libraries Illuminated project was connected to the
Broadband project because the 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.

Since the last Board meeting 45 library jurisdictions submitted applications to
participate in the project and we awarded funds to 38 jurisdictions. Project funds will be
used to support a whole variety of technologies in city, county and special district
libraries in rural, suburban, and urban communities. The project team made sure to
award funds to libraries that would support new programs in underserved communities.

The State Library held a webinar with Public Library Association’s Project Outcome
to train participating libraries on how to use the Project Outcome tools to evaluate the
impact of the programs they offered with their technologies. Cole stated that they had
wanted to use the assessment tools to determine if the new technology was used and to
document the impact.

Natalie Cole reported that the project was connected to Broadband but was also
connected to the Value of Libraries Project because by using Project Outcome they can
use project data to show the impact libraries could have by having those new
technologies. Libraries submitted their first progress reports in March which showed
they had started buying a lot of new technologies. A lot of the purchases were not the
new cutting edge technologies that had been anticipated at the start of the project, but it
did illustrate the need that libraries had for more technologies. Libraries also reported that they had started planning their programs which included robotics, resumes, job searching and business start-up support, coding camps and classes, research programs, homework help, senior outreach, gaming, tax preparation assistance, etc.

Cole reported that the program required libraries to work with partners and they had seen a variety of partnerships be strengthened and new partnerships had been created. There had also already been a cash match of $222,470 and in-kind contributions of $155,696 to the project and that was just in the very early stages.

President Bernardo asked if they expected all $1 million of the one-time funding to be disbursed. Cole replied that most of the money had been awarded but some had been held back because they knew that some libraries might come back and say they had other unanticipated needs.

Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report

Natalie Cole reported that the goal of the project was to create an impact study and online clearinghouse cataloging the economic and social value of libraries. Cole stated they were focusing on public libraries because of the timeline and funding.

So far two sets of resources had been made available in an online clearinghouse. Those resources did really focus on academic research. The first set demonstrated the financial value and return on investment of public libraries. The second set demonstrated the different types of value that libraries provide. The categories for that data were the social value to vulnerable populations, personal economic development for users, the value of services provided by libraries during times of crisis response and how they contribute to community resilience, the opportunity for users to enhance their personal learning and knowledge development, and the development of social capital in communities. What the project team was looking at doing was providing some sort of infographic or visual demonstration of all that information to make it easy to access.

Cole reported they had also worked with their British colleagues and participated in their summit for the Libraries Unlimited organization and the University of Exeter. England was doing a very similar project so they had been sharing information and research.
Natalie Cole stated that they were at the point when they felt the project would speed up a little bit. The plan was to connect what had been found with the library data with published data in other fields. So if they said that libraries provide learning opportunities and were a trusted space, they would also look at data from other fields to show why it is important to have learning opportunities or trusted spaces in the community. We knew that libraries did these things and now just needed to look at why that is important.

Cole said they would also be drawing on the data from some of the other projects to show what was happening in California. The Library Development Services Bureau had developed a set of outcome statements and surveys to evaluate that outcomes of the LSTA funded projects. They were going to use the data from those projects to tie into this project and show the impacts of what LDS had been doing. They were also going to pull in the data from all other statewide initiatives and projects including early learning, summer learning, mental health, services to rural communities, technology in libraries, and more.

The project team also wanted to do some kind of public opinion survey, probably working with Sacramento State so they know that Californian’s value and they know what Californian’s value about their libraries. The goal would be to connect all the things that libraries were doing, all the information about the value of what libraries are doing and connect that with the information on what people want and value. The goal was to publish the data in peer reviewed and professional journals to make it accessible.

Cole reported that an advisory group would also be convened to provide input on the optimum way to use, make available, and raise awareness of the data collected e.g. via online distribution, in a series of reports, via a PSA, and/or through a convening of stakeholders to raise awareness. Member Williams asked what the timeline would be on all the studies and data connections up to convening an advisory group. Natalie Cole stated that she thought it would be six to nine months. She had been in discussions with Greg about seeking, with Board approval to extend the end date of the project to make the post of the data on projects which had a July to June timeline. The hope would be to establish the advisory group in the fall of this year. Williams said that school libraries had done these kinds of studies with similar, great data and it still was not helping so, to
her it would be about the advisory group and making those next steps and getting political and getting the data out there to the people.

Cole stated that she agreed and that was why they wanted to make sure that everything they did had a very solid foundation and solid information. Williams said it would be nice to be able to put stories along with the information and Cole stated that they had stories and images as well. Member Martinez clarified that the one-time funding for this project only carried through the convening of the advisory group but did not include any plan of action that group might develop. Cole confirmed that was the case.

California eBook Platform with Library Owned Content Program Report

Paula McKinnon with Califa reported that the allocated funds were to connect more California libraries to the enki library ebook platform. Enki was started in 2013 and was meant to be a support platform for libraries. Many libraries purchase ebooks through Overdrive or 3M and a lot of those are best sellers. The enki library was trying to find materials that maybe the libraries were not able to curate on their own because the entire budget is going toward best sellers.

They had been able to purchase some different kind of publishers and story shares. There is a new publisher in Philadelphia that they curate original stories that are middle and high school students who had difficulty reading. So rather than those students having to read stories that are below their age level, these were stories for their age level but the reading level was lower. They had been able to purchase 4000 new titles for enki, which brought the collection up to 77,000 titles. The database was really over a million copies so it was quite extensive.

McKinnon also reported that they had connected 24 new jurisdictions, which brought total connections up to 109 jurisdictions. There were 7 more in the que that were getting set-up. So the program was contributing a lot to libraries and adding a very large collection that supports the collection they already had.

Califa was also looking to buy materials that were always available, so when you were talking about connecting 180 jurisdictions in California you don’t want to have hold queues so some titles can be purchased with licenses that made them always available so no one had to wait in line. McKinnon said that they did still have some funds
available to purchase new content and Califa had just recently purchased the California University Press Collection which contained some really good non-fiction and research materials. Califa has also worked at building out the children’s collection, there were not a lot of children’s works purchased early on because children were not reading eBooks, it was mostly adults. So they have worked on purchasing graphic novels and picture books titles as well.

Member Williams asked if the enki books were single use. Paula McKinnon said that some of them were, it depended on the licensing model for the publisher but they were trying to actively purchase more always available titles. Califa was finding that through some third party vendors that were negotiating with the publishers for different purchasing models they were able to get things that were normally one copy, one user as always available. Williams stated that she loved the idea of the collection for struggling readers and was wondering how a public library might get the word out about that enki collection to their local special education programs in schools. McKinnon said that there was a google group that all participating libraries were added to and all new collections were noticed on there.

Member Martinez asked how much the grant was for and McKinnon told her it was for $200,000 to enhance the collection and $100,000 to connect additional library jurisdictions to enki.

Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader Program Report

Paula McKinnon reported that SimplyE was a discovery and E-reader application. There were six libraries that were selected for to be connected under the grant. One of the libraries was the Black Gold Cooperative which included six libraries so the total jurisdictions that were connected were 11. All 11 are now connected in the app. SimplyE allows libraries to stream all of their purchased eBook collections into a single app so patrons are not siloed into the Overdrive app, they are able to see whatever the library purchased in real time. The app was created using IMLS funding and ti was just last year that New York Public in Brooklyn launched the app and there had been efforts by other states to get their public libraries connected.

Member Murguia asked how complicated it was for new jurisdictions to get the app. McKinnon stated that Califa was going to offer it as a subscription service so they would
be making enki available to libraries that wanted to pay for it annually. Once all of the libraries being connected through the grant have made it publically available to their patrons Califa has a queue of about 25 libraries that have said they are interested in connecting. Murguia asked what they thought the subscription rate would be. McKinnon said that because everything was an unknown they would start out with a flat $3000 subscription per jurisdiction. That would get the jurisdictions the SimplyE app which is the patron facing side. The other part of the process was Califa connecting each jurisdictions who collection on the back side.

Member Williams asked if SimplyE was similar to Hoopla. Paula McKinnon said that it was not. Hoopla was kind of on-demand, so if an item was available in the collection a patrons could use it. SimplyE was an app like the Overdrive app except that it was not limited to one vendor’s collection. So a library could have SimplyE, Hoopla, Overdrive, 3M, etc. the difference was that SimplyE drew all the collections together. Williams clarified that if she was a patron of a participating library she could have one app and find all available eBooks there. McKinnon confirmed.

Innovation Lab Grant Program Update

Diane Satchwell presented an infographic that surveyed all 18 participating libraries. In which 78% of participants have already planned their programs and are making good progress. An advisory group that was created met, reviewed applications, and awarded funds based on their projects. The projects are all different and they tried to break it up by types. There are projects around workforce development and some on education. These projects are serving their communities and creating extensive partnerships a lot of the libraries have really reached out to their communities and local vendors. Under education they have created mobile labs that go out into the community and some have partnered with schools where the lab stays at the school. Under workforce development they are using the broadband connection to do a lot more, such as applications on line and programs where they are video steaming different projects. The funding for this project was $200,000 and it’s been a phenomenal return on investment. They haven’t yet captured the in-kind, but they will have it for the next board meeting. Member Williams asked if program was repeatable and Mrs. Satchwell replied yes and
furthermore one of the pieces of the application process has questions regarding sustainability. This project has been used out in the community. They are using virtual reality at local events, such as flea markets and the sustainability factor is there. In Alhambra they had a space that already had some technology pieces and this project enhanced what they already had. They also partnered with the Los Angeles Dodgers who helped them promote the project.

Zip Books Grant Program Report

Janet Coles provided a brief report to go over in which she describes a two part zip book program. The program is a combination of federally funded project with 30 libraries and state funded program. As of 2017 the state program had 12 libraries that launched their services before November 2017, and 12 more libraries came on board in spring 2018, with a mix of libraries from rural to urban including some large libraries. The North Net System Coordinator Jacquelyn Brinkley and the Zip Books coordinator Brett Lear are currently working on bringing another wave of libraries on board focusing on municipal libraries. New promotional materials were printed and distributed to the new participating libraries. The new libraries are happy with the project and Janet Coles provided testimonial from some of the participating libraries. The project is on track to bring 35 libraries on board by 07/01/2018 as outlined in the original project. It is also expected to meet its target of new libraries hitting 40,000 Zip book transactions by the end of the project. Member Murguia asked if there was a subscription fee for participating libraries and Janet Coles replied there wasn't any fee. Janet Coles commented that they are looking at some sustainability models in hopes that libraries will see the cost benefit and patron service benefit and start to dedicate some of their book budgets to this method of procuring and community based collection. Janet Coles is not confident that without continued support from the federal/state funding the program will continue in the same way it has. State Librarian Lucas commented that the governor’s budget has carried this project for at least one more year.

CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION

BUDGET AND PLANNING
Approve final CLSA Budget for FY 2017/2018

Monica Rivas reported that in the previous meeting we didn’t have a chance to bring to the board the final budget allocation for fiscal year 2017/2018 and at this time we should take a motion to approve the final numbers.

It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the Final 2017/2018 California Library Services Act budget as directed in the Governor’s 2017/2018 budget, totaling $3,630,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.

CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2018/19

Monica Rivas presented the Board with the Preliminary Budget for fiscal year 2018/2019 for the amount of $3,680,000 pending any changes. Before a vote was taken to approve the preliminary budget a representative from the Southern California Library Cooperative asked if it was possible to be granted an extension on the submittal date for their Plans of Service and expedite their official letters. An extension was requested on the basis that the system executive board meetings have a full agenda and that they meet in May, which makes it a tight time line since the Plans of Service are due in June.

It was brought to the attention of the board that the Plans of Service are very time consuming and if an extension could be granted until 07/01/2018 that would be fantastic. Monica Rivas pointed out that the system receive no such letter but instead an email that provides the systems with the documents to complete their Plans of Service and that typically an email goes out right before or right after the Board meets and furthermore that the email would be going out that day. As for the extension Monica Rivas stated that when extensions have been requested, they have always been granted within reason and therefore had no problem with granting an extension until 07/01/2018. Because the next board meeting wasn’t scheduled until October it allowed for sufficient time to gather and process the documentation. If the board meeting would have been scheduled for September as they usual are it would have created an issue. Member Christmas suggested that we permanently extend dead line for the submission of the Plans of Service to July and presented a motion for a vote. There was some discussion before the vote that the Plans of Service had taken longer to be delivered
since there were some changes and additional questions were added. Concerns were
brought up that if we extended the due date to July 01, what would happen if the
systems asked for an extension past that date. Monica Rivas made the comment that if
we permanently moved the due date to July 01, if an extension was requested, it would
be hard to grant and at the same time complete the documentation needed. Carol Frost
informed the board that they typically met in May and review the plans of service, and
that at times the entire executive counsel only meets once per year. There was further
discussion on feasibility of permanently moving due date and the complications it may
cause. Annly Roman provided a point of clarification that the regulations stated that due
date for the Plans of Service is June 01, so unless it was changed it in the regulations,
we couldn’t make a motion to amend.
Member Christmas removed his motion and it was agreed that Monica Rivas would
grant the systems an extension until July 01 for the Plans of Service.

_It was moved (Christmas) and withdrawn (Christmas) that the
California Library Services Board approves extending the deadline for
Cooperative Library Systems to submit their plans of services from
June 1 to June 30._

The board proceeded with the motion to approve the Preliminary Budget for fiscal

_It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Tauler) and carried
unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts,
contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2018/2019
California Library Services Act budget as directed in the Governor’s
proposed 2018/2019 budget, totaling $3,630,000 for allocation to
Cooperative Library Systems._

**RESOURCE SHARING**

**CLSA System-Level programs**

Monica Rivas informed the board that the Plans of Service tell us what the systems
plan to do with their funding and the Annual Reports reflect what they actually did with
the funding. Typically physical delivery continues to be the number one priority,
although the board has suggested that they do more with e-resources and resource
sharing. The systems have begun to do a lot more with digital material such as e-books,
Hoopla, Link+, Zinio, Overdrive and Enki. The review of the Annual Report shows the
systems are doing their due diligence in using their funds in an efficient way. Exhibit A is a synopsis of how each system is using their C&D funds. Diane Satchwell commented that she thought it was great that both Annly and Monica reached out to the system coordinators and had a long conversation on working together on the reports, because the systems struggle sometimes to make sure they align with what they are asked to report on since they all do things a bit differently when it comes to the reporting. Additional comments from the audience focused on proving more definitions and instructions for clarity on the Plans of Service and that this would also help them out when there’s turnover of their staff.

**CLSA REPORTING**

Annly Roman pointed out that at the last board meeting we discussed CLSA reporting and trying to look at a way to encourage uniformity among the systems in their reporting. The State Library is looking at what information their currently reporting, and what new information might be useful to the board and the state library. A meeting was held with the systems were we discussed new information we would like to see, the issues the systems are having with the current reporting in terms with turnover, the systems reporting things differently, and general issues with the forms. A discussion was had that moving forward a uniform reporting form would be great, but nothing concrete was agreed upon on yet. In the scheduled Plans of Service for this year the state library is asking for new information just to see how they are reporting things and how the funds are going out, so we can determine what will work for effective reporting as well what information they are tracking that they can provide. We don’t want to create a new form where we ask for information that they don’t have. It also gives them an opportunity to come back and say we have additional information to share, we don’t want to limit them by not including information they would think of to provide. The systems will be proving their audit reports with their Plans of Service in order for us to see the overall health of the system and also for transparency. We will meet again to review the information that was provided, look at a new format of reporting, and to make sure as we are developing a new form we create something that works for everyone.

President Bernardo asked if anyone was helping to develop the forms such as the Department of Finance or the state auditor’s office. Annly Roman replied that we
haven’t looked that far into it; we want to develop the base form with the State Library accounting department and the systems. Monica Rivas added that it is crucial that we involve the systems when we create the forms so that we make the process easy for all involved. Member Williams asked if the new reports will streamline the activities for the systems and make it easier for them to speak the same language. Monica Rivas replied that the new reports will make it easier to report the data since the reports haven’t been updated in a very long time. Annly Roman added that the hope is that these new forms are clearer and easier to use.

D. CLSA REGULATIONS

Annly Roman updated the board on the status of the regulations. At this point the regulations have been filed with the office of administrative law and are in the middle of the public comment period which will end on Friday after this meeting. The State Library has received some public comments in form of letters from the systems that are included in the board packet. There was also a suggestion from the Department of Finance in section 20125 regarding speakers. The Department of Finance recommended in the interest of transparency that the word “will” not be changed to “may” in the sentence “members of the public or the state library staff will “. In same section A of 20125 they recommend that the stricken sentence that says, “No person other than the person having the floor and members of the State Board shall be permitted to enter the discussion”, not be removed. President Bernardo informed the board that a further discussion would be held during the regulatory meeting and this piece was just an update. Annly Roman reminded the board that if any changes we made we would have to submit new paperwork to the Office of Administrative Law and have an additional public comment period of 15 days. If someone came in those 15 days and requested an additional public hearing, then we would have to hold another public hearing when the board meets next time. Otherwise we should be able to move forward as long as there are no other comments requesting changes during those 15 days, we should hopefully get the regulations finalized and approved during this calendar year.

E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
Annly Roman reviews document 9 specifically SCA 3 which is a bill the board supported last year that was sponsored by the California Library Association. This bill didn’t pass last year and was held over, mainly because there was an early vote in the year on a tax related issue that several moderate democrats voted for. Because of the legislative climate and the elections legislators were hesitant to go up again on a tax related bill. Due the fact that there are several vacancies in the legislature this bill is very unlikely to pass, the board express interest to send a letter of continued support which they did. The bill is unlikely to pass this year because of the vacancies.

The next measures AB2523, SB830, and SB947 are all included because they are of a similar topic of a bill the board supported last year AB390. AB390 deals with the model school library curriculum. The bill did go all the way through the legislative process but was vetoed by the governor as he felt it was unnecessary. These three bills are hitting on a similar topic. AB2523 deals with considering content standards on digital literacy in terms of computer science. SB830 is a reintroduced bill from last year that would require a model curriculum by January 01, 2023 for media literacy in kindergarten through 12 grades. SB947 states that by December 01, 2019 the Board of Education’s superintendent of public instruction would identify best practices and recommendations for digital citizenship, internet safety, and media literacy. These measures were brought forward since they are of similar topic and we wanted to determine if the board had any interest in them. We do have letter from Member Williams were the School Library Association is in support of a couple of these bills and there’s also a letter where they ask the Department of Education to update the model school library curriculum standards.

Member Murguia inquires if CLA has taken a position on these measures and Annly Roman informs her that they have not. Member Williams elaborates on the letter to the Board of Education were they discuss the model school library standards that where created 10 years ago and how they need be re-updated to include information literacy and digital citizenship upgrades. Member Christmas asks if approved would the drafted letters show how these measure connect with libraries and how students can pursue information resources. Member Williams replies and asks the board if at the very least they would consider drafting a letter in support of updating the standards. Member
Martinez asks if there’s any budget implication in any of the bills being discussed. Anny Roman states that these bills are in the appropriation committee that would imply there’s a fiscal implication, she’s not sure what the set cost are for each one, but they do have fiscal attachments because they are in the appropriations committee.

Member Williams would like the support of the board in a form of a letter for both SB947 and SB830. Member Tauler suggest that the board support SB947 because it’s in line with the discussion they had on the importance of literacy in all forms. Member Ibanez thinks the board should write letters in support of both since they apply to digital literacy. Motions where made as follows:

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez, Tauler) and carried with a vote of seven ayes (Bernardo, Ibanez, Maghsoudi, Murguia, Williams, Tauler), one nay (Christmas), and one abstention (Martinez) that the California Library Services Board directs State Library staff to draft and send a letter of support for SB 830 on behalf of the California Library Services Board.

It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and failed with a vote of six ayes (Bernardo, Ibanez, Maghsoudi, Murguia, Williams, Tauler), two nays (Christmas, Martinez), and one abstention (Huguenin) that the California Library Services Board directs State Library staff to draft and send a letter of support for SB 947 on behalf of the California Library Services Board.

It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried with a vote of seven ayes (Bernardo, Huguenin, Ibanez, Maghsoudi, Murguia, Williams, Tauler), one nay (Christmas), and one abstention (Martinez) that the California Library Services Board directs State Library staff to draft a letter to the Department of Education of support of renewing the Model School Library Standards.

President Bernardo discussed the last items in the legislative update which are some draft letters in support of CLSA funding for local libraries in this upcoming budget to the Senate Budget Review Committee and letter of support for IMLS funding. Anny Roman advised the board they can choose to send letters in support; they can choose only support certain sections or do nothing. State Librarian Lucas speaks to what was proposed in the governor’s budget to be spent on libraries, which is 9.5 million. State Librarian Lucas informs the board that the legislative analyst is urging the legislature not to approve any of it. Their recommendation is to reject all proposals. State Librarian
Lucas believes that their recommendation isn’t fatal, but isn’t ideal either. State Librarian Lucas states the bigger the chorus of voices taking a divergent view than the legislature analyst, the more improved the odds are of lawmakers bucking their recommendations and approving the proposed expenditures. Member Murguia questions if we should be asking for more money than is proposed, that we certainly want the amount that’s in the budget but it seems that we have an opportunity to ask for more funds. Member Murguia asks if we should be working with the senate budgets committee or certain legislatures to add more money. Member Christmas is in favor of both letters supporting the budget and the IMLS letter but in order to write the letter in support the board should offer areas where the budget can be increased at a state level.

Annly Roman states that October would be a good time to start a discussion on asking for increases for next fiscal year because the governor will be coming out with his proposed budget in January. State Librarian Lucas points out that some of the issues discussed at the strategic meeting may lead to a strategic use for more funding that could be put together by next October and put in in the hands of the new administration that's going to be looking for good ideas on investments that should be made in public libraries. Member Murguia suggest the State Library come up with proposal of where those investments should be made.

Member Martinez asks if the State Library had input in the proposed budget for 9.5 million dollars. State Librarian Lucas replied that they did and that this particular plan was created through conversations with the California Library Association, and CENIC the folks that operate broadband. Both parties met at the table and brought forth their priorities and together came up with 9.5 million. The Department of Finance also recommended that the budget be kept under 10 million dollars, that they would entertain something up to 10 million dollars. Carol White added that the California Library Legislative Advocacy Committee worked closely with State Librarian Lucas and the California Library Association president to come up with the letter, in order to represent the collaborative work between all of the public libraries and the state library. Mrs. White is concerned that the analyst office just completely rejected wholesale all the recommendations and so it would mean a lot in the spirit of advocacy to support this initiative. There are so many competing priorities since we are such a diverse state and
you can see that in the plans of service. A letter of support from the board would be appreciated. Individual libraries will also be writing letters to the department of finance.

Member Tauler states she’s in support of the letters and believes we should have further discussion in October with the recommendation of the State Library. Annly Roman recommends that the letters be sent to chairs, CC the members of the subcommittees, Holy Mitchel, and CC the members of the regular budget committee. Diane Satchwell advises the board that she will be attending National Library Legislative Day in DC and would be happy to make copies and carry the letters. Motion was made as follows:

*It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board directs State Library Staff to send the draft letter (See Exhibit B) in support of the Governor’s proposed 2018/2019 spending on library programs and the draft letter (See Exhibit C) in support of continued Federal IMLS funding included in the Board packet and work on a plan to increase state funding for the October meeting.*

F. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2018/19

President Bernardo thanked Rebecca Wendt for doing a good job in facilitating the discussion and keeping the board on task. Annly Roman advised the audience that the board held a strategic planning session to take a look at their mission and their value statement to try to set some goals in order to strategically move forward and achieve those goals. A document we created with the motions based on changes that the board made to the mission and to the value statement, as well as to goals that underline the actions to be taken to reach those goals as determined by the board. The motions made are open for discussion in order to take action. The first point of the discussion was the mission statement that read as follows:

“The Mission of the California Library Services Board is to foster lifelong learning by ensuring that all Californians have free and convenient access to all library resources and services regardless of their age or ethnicity, or any geographical, financial, or administrative restraints.” When asked if there were any comments from the audience it was pointed out that, “It’s great to be inclusive, but there are several designations that aren’t included, so the statement could be more inclusive by being more general or by
being more specific”. Member Williams ask if it would be a good idea to relook at the mission statement in order to address the concerns that were brought up. Member Murguia suggested striking out everything from regardless on to read, “The Mission of the California Library Services Board is to foster lifelong learning by ensuring that all Californians have free and convenient access to all library resources and services”. A motion was made to amend mission statement with Member Murguia suggestion and the results were as follows:

*It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the following mission statement:*

*The mission of the California Library Services Board is to foster lifelong learning by ensuring that all Californians have free and convenient access to all library resources and services.*

Annly Roman read the values statement and accompanying clarifying statements that reads as follows:

“The California Library Services Board values literacy, cooperation, diversity, service to the underserved, and access.”

- **Literacy:** Promote the importance of reading and the skills needed by individuals to participate fully in society
- **Cooperation:** Encourage the sharing of resources and collaboration between libraries and other government agencies, organizations, and diverse community groups.
- **Diversity:** Support programs and services that reflect the multicultural and diverse population of California.
- **Service to the Underserved:** Strengthen equitable distribution of resources and services to any population segment, regardless of economic status and other circumstances, whose needs are not adequately met by traditional library service patterns.
- **Access:** Affirm the principles of equitable access to resources across library systems through local control, local financing, and resource sharing.

When asked if there were any comments from the audience it was suggested to remove from the diversity section the word multicultural to just read, “Support programs and services that reflect the diverse population of California”. Member Martinez also
suggested we change under cooperation the word “between” to “among”, because we
are talking about more than two. A motion to consider value statement and
accompanying clarifying statements with the suggested corrections was made and the
results were as follows:

*It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Ibanez) and carried unanimously
that the California Library Services Board adopts the following values
statement and accompanying clarifying statements.*

*The California Library Services Board values literacy, cooperation,
diversity, service to the underserved, and access.*

- **Literacy**: Promote the importance of reading and the skills
  needed by individuals to participate fully in society.
- **Cooperation**: Encourage the sharing of resources and
  collaboration among libraries and other government agencies,
  organizations, and diverse community groups.
- **Diversity**: Support programs and services that reflect the
  diverse population of California.
- **Service to the underserved**: Strengthen equitable distribution of
  resources and services to any population segment, regardless
  of economic status and other circumstances, whose needs are
  not adequately met by traditional library services patterns.
- **Access**: Affirm the principles of equitable access to resource
  across library systems through local control, local financing,
  and resource sharing.

Annly Roman read the Goals and subsequent actions to help accomplish those goals
and they read as follows:

- **Education**
  - Legislation Tracking (California State Library) and report
  - Lightening talks – Board members or experts in field
  - Develop protocols for sharing information

- **Advocacy (Money for a program)**
  - Meet with Legislators
  - Write Letters
  - Work with other organizations (Example: California Library Association)
  - Determine best mode of advocacy
With no added corrections from the audience a motion was made adopt and the results were as follows:

*It was moved, seconded (Williams/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library services Board adopts the following goals and subsequent actions to help accomplish those goals.*

- **Education**
  - Legislation Tracking (California State Library) and report
  - Lightening talks – Board members or experts in field
  - Develop protocols for sharing information

- **Advocacy (Money for a program)**
  - Meet with Legislators
  - Write Letters
  - Work with other organizations (Example: California Library Association)
  - Determine best mode of advocacy

G. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment brought forward.

H. **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

There was no comment from the board.

I. **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business brought forward.

J. **AGENDA BUILDING**

Member Murguia would like to see a discussion regarding the budget, advocacy and asking the library lobbyists to come talk to the board in October. Member Williams would like to discuss at the next meeting the sharing of information protocols and brainstorming advocacy steps. Member from the audience suggested that the nine library systems do a presentation for the board on how the library systems work.

K. **ADJOURNMENT**

President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services Board meeting at 2:03PM.