



California
STATE LIBRARY
FOUNDED 1849
PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE. SHAPING OUR FUTURE

Library of California Board Meeting February 16, 2012

For further information contact:

Sandy Habbestad

California State Library

P.O. Box 942837

Sacramento, CA 94237-0001

(916) 653-7532

shabbestad@library.ca.gov

<http://www.library.ca.gov/loc/board/agendas/agendas.html>

February 16, 2012

9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

LoC Board Business Meeting

LSTA Advisory Council on Libraries Meeting

Immediately following Board business meeting

California State Library

900 N Street, Room 501

Sacramento, CA

A. BOARD OPENING

1. Welcome and Introductions

Welcome and introduction of Board members, staff, and audience

2. Adoption of Agenda

Consider agenda as presented or amended

3. Approval of August 2011 Board Minutes – Document 1

Consider minutes as presented or amended

B. REPORTS TO THE BOARD

- 1. Board President's Report**
Report on activities since last Board meeting
 - 2. Board Vice-President's Report**
Report on activities since last Board meeting
 - 3. Chief Executive Officer's Report**
Report on activities since last Board meeting
-

C. CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION

BUDGET AND PLANNING

1. Update on state budget process for CLSA
2. Update on CLSA legislation - *Document 2*

RESOURCE SHARING

- 1. Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs – Document 3**
Update on current transaction levels
 - 2. CLSA System Reference Program – Document 4**
Review and discussion of System Annual Reports, FY 2010/11
 - 3. CLSA System Communications and Delivery – Document 5**
Review and discussion of System Annual Reports, FY 2010/11
 - 4. CLSA System Advisory Board (SAB) Program – Document 6**
Review and discussion of System Annual Reports, FY 2010/11
-

D. LEGISLATIVE

Update on state and federal legislative issues

E. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment on any item or issue that is under the purview of the Library of California Board and is not on the agenda.

F. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS

Board member or officer comment on any item or issue that is under the purview of the Library of California Board and is not on the agenda.

G. AGENDA BUILDING

Agenda items for subsequent Board meetings.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn the meeting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

DRAFT

Library of California Board Meeting
August 11, 2011

California State Library
900 N Street, Room 501
Sacramento, California

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

President Anne Bernardo convened the Library of California Board meeting on August 11, 2011 at 9:00 a.m., and welcomed Board Members, staff and audience members to Sacramento and called for introductions.

Board Members Present: Anne Bernardo, Victoria Fong, Jane F. Lowenthal, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Elizabeth Murguia, and Judy Zollman.

Not Present: Conchita Battle and Tyrone Cannon.

California State Library Staff Present: State Librarian Stacey A. Aldrich, Gerry Maginnity, Sandy Habbestad, Rush Brandis, Jacquie Brinkley, Suzanne Flint, Darla Gunning, and Carla Lehn.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was moved, seconded (Fong/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the August 11, 2011 meeting as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved, seconded (Fong/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board approves the draft minutes of the August 12, 2010 meeting as corrected.

ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2012

President Bernardo called on Members Maghsoudi and Zollman to report the slate of Board officers for 2012. The following actions were taken by the Board.

It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board elects Anne Bernardo as President of the Library of California Board for the year 2012.

It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the Library of California Board for the year 2012.

1 **LIBRARY OF CALIFORNIA BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE**

2 President Bernardo directed attention to next year's Board meeting schedule. February 16th is
3 proposed for Budget and Planning, if needed, and August 16th for regular CLSA business and the
4 meeting of the LSTA Advisory Council. Member Lowenthal asked to read an addendum,
5 arguing for a change of date for August. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that a Board
6 meeting be held while legislators were in session so that Board members could make visits while
7 in Sacramento. The Board would be polled for a late August or September 2012 date.

8
9 **RESOLUTIONS**

10 Member Lowenthal read the proposed Board Resolution for Penny Kastanis.

11
12 **It was moved, seconded (Fong/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the**
13 **Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution**
14 **2011-01 for Penny Kastanis. (See Attachment A)**

15
16 Member Fong read a proposed Board Resolution for John Kallenberg.

17
18 **It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that**
19 **the Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution**
20 **2011-02 for John Kallenberg. (See Attachment B)**

21
22 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

23 **Board Vice-President's Report**

24 President Bernardo reported on activities during the last year. She served as liaison to the
25 CLA Legislative and Advocacy Committee, which has been very informative and diligent in
26 calls for action. Members were thanked who attended and were involved in advocacy efforts
27 during last year's CLA Snapshot Day, Legislative Day, Day in the District, and the CLA Annual
28 Conference. Additionally, Bernardo has been involved in publicizing 120 years of County Law
29 Libraries. She has been keeping up with the Calix postings and has tried to forward those of most
30 interest to members of the Board. She also has been doing Google alerts on Library news stories
31 from around the nation.

32 Bernardo reported that on September 16, 2010, the State Board of Education adopted the
33 School Libraries Standards for California Public Schools.

34 Bernardo wished to recognize and congratulate CSL retirees for their years of service,
35 including Ira Bray, Bessie Condos, Richard Hall, Kathy Low and Linda Springer.

1 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

2 State Librarian of California, Stacey A. Aldrich, gave the following report:

3 **State Library Organization**

4 The State Library budget is flat this year. The Governor has been supportive of the
5 organization as a whole; however, the library has received its first budget exercise and must
6 return \$342,000 in general fund monies and another \$67,000 in special funds. If the library's
7 proposed budget reduction plan is approved, the CSL will be released from the hiring freeze. We
8 have had a number of retirements this year; the various sections of the library will be looking to
9 fill some vacated positions. Library Development Services (LDS) will be hiring a new person, in
10 addition to Darla Gunning, who recently has taken Ira Bray's position in LDS to handle
11 statistics, digitization and other duties as assigned. She had been the head of Technical Services
12 before moving to LDS.

13 **Renovation Project**

14 Currently, the State Library has two buildings undergoing renovation. The Library and
15 Courts Stanley Mosk Building is still under construction but making headway. The unattractive
16 reference desk has been removed from the circulation room to expose a beautiful floor mosaic.
17 The original light wells are being restored, which allows the two statues, *Inspiration* and
18 *Wisdom*, to be bathed in natural sunlight. It is hoped that this room can be turned into a high-
19 tech, Wi-Fi, sit-down-and-do-some-work center. We are hoping to turn the grand reading room
20 into an amazing visitor space. Photographs of the library from the 1920s are being examined in
21 order to lay out the furniture in the same manner as it was back then, with exhibits of materials
22 the library contains. The building is scheduled for completion at the end of December 2012.
23 Library staff and collections should be moving back into the building by early spring of 2013.

24 The other building project is the Sutro Library in San Francisco, which has been a ten-year
25 project in partnership with San Francisco State University. The University has renovated their J.
26 Paul Leonard Library and the Sutro Library will now become integrated with them, taking the
27 two upper floors, levels five and six. That building is slated to be done in early 2012, with a
28 moving date in spring of next year. This will be a much nicer space for the Sutro collection,
29 which contains a first edition portfolio from Shakespeare from 1624, as well as one of the finest
30 genealogy collections in the nation.

31

1 An unfortunate side of both spaces is that they have smaller areas to hold the collections. In
2 order to open up the light wells in the Library & Courts building, the heating and cooling
3 systems must go in the stack area, losing about 18% of the space for the collection. The library
4 is considering how best to cope with this lack of space, with the possibility of some offsite
5 storage. The Sutro Library will have some additional space in that it will have the new onsite
6 robotic Library Retrieval System (LRS), consisting of many rows of stacked bins accessed by a
7 robot.

8 **Gates Foundation**

9 Two years ago the State Library received a Gates Foundation grant for *Opportunity Online*.
10 This grant was designed to assist libraries to upgrade their online connectivity bandwidth to at
11 least 1.5 megabytes per second or greater. Seventy libraries who met the conditions of the grant
12 were upgraded. Currently, in this second grant year, broadband training is being implemented for
13 library directors, regular staff, and IT staff. Training for the directors consists of what needs
14 attention, how to articulate why more bandwidth is needed and what is received with more
15 bandwidth. For staff, similar training will be conducted, but not as focused on policy, but rather
16 on the idea of what broadband is and how it works. And for the IT staff, training will focus on
17 how they can better manage their resources to get the most out of the connectivity. In some
18 areas, how networks have been configured has led to loss of full capacity.

19 **Libraries as Conveners**

20 In the spring of this year, CSL convened a training session titled, *Libraries as Conveners*,
21 which was more of a piloted training because no material really exists on the topic. The training
22 was held in Sacramento, where approximately fifty people met to discuss the issues of how to
23 bring communities into the library if an issue or problem arises within the community so the
24 library can be seen as a place to meet and have conversations to make positive change in their
25 community. *Libraries as Conveners* is still experimental, with concerns about political
26 implications, but progress is being made, with some libraries really beginning to step out into
27 their communities.

28 **Digital Literacy**

29 The State Library continues to work with the *Digital Literacy Plan*, although it has been
30 hitting some ebbs and flows due to recent changes in leadership. CSL originally committed to
31 supporting two things: 1) creating a tool to determine what people need to know, to find out
32 whether they are “digitally illiterate,” and 2) discovering a tool to find out what skills are

1 actually needed. In addition, this year the Library is looking to create a *Digital Literacy Family*
2 *Program* that could be “in a box,” because family literacy programs have been found to be very
3 successful. Adding the digital component to that would engage the community in a different
4 way. CSL is also talking with Sunne McPeak, CETF, about using their *School at Home* project,
5 which has a *Laptops to Families* program coupled with training for laptop users before the laptop
6 can be taken home, as a model for the library program.

7 **Sustainability Conference**

8 In March, the State Library invited California Public Library Directors to a *Sustainability*
9 *Conference*. Due to all the funding changes that have been happening across the state, it was
10 thought to be a good time to do three things: 1) bring public library directors together to
11 strengthen the network of leaders in the state; 2) talk about what are the common values and
12 goals of the 183 library jurisdictions, in order to begin advocating in California with one voice;
13 and 3) build some action plans towards the future. The result was a taskforce formed to carefully
14 scrutinize and discuss the California Library Services Act (CLSA) and whether it is really the
15 right thing to support California libraries for the 21st century.

16 Also during the *Sustainability Conference*, two marketing professionals were invited to come
17 in and do some training with the directors around the topic *What's Our Message?* We will
18 continue working with them and another small taskforce to talk about what could be the message
19 for California libraries.

20 **Siskiyou County Library Update**

21 The Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors was going to close all of their libraries, with
22 6,000 square miles served by only eleven library branches. LDS Bureau Chief Gerry Maginnity
23 and State Librarian Aldrich travelled to Siskiyou to present them with alternatives to save their
24 libraries. Through grant funding support, Joan Frye Williams and George Needham went into the
25 community and spoke with people, then determined a way forward for them to continue to have
26 library services but at reduced cost. The model they came up with was to turn the main branch at
27 Yreka into the center of a library hub. The libraries were presented with a menu of opportunities
28 for services from which to choose and what level of services they could afford. So, if they
29 wanted a full-blown library, it cost “x”; if they just wanted a place to check out books, it cost
30 “y.” Siskiyou County has implemented a new, open-source, integrated library system catalog,
31 which should help to keep costs down. Also, they will be installing self-checking machines to
32 reduce the number of necessary staff. The new model has been very successful. Siskiyou County

1 and the Board of Supervisors are pleased to be a potential model for how other communities
2 might find a way forward. Jon Torkelson temporarily left LDS to serve as Interim Director for
3 about six months, during this period of reorganization. The State Library appreciates that he
4 offered to take the time to help Siskiyou, but is now looking forward to having him back as one
5 of the library's part-time consultants. Gerry recently helped with interviewing candidates for a
6 new library director, so they should have one in place soon.

7 **Gates Foundation Benchmark Project**

8 The first new item to report is that the State Library has been working on a couple of new
9 projects. *The Gates Foundation Benchmark Project*, supporting public access technology, has
10 been a huge project for CSL this year. The Gates Foundation originally began supporting
11 libraries by providing them with computers. Then they moved from supporting libraries with
12 computers to assisting them with broadband connectivity. Their next step, which they decided is
13 very important, is advocacy, ensuring that leadership has the opportunity and the language
14 necessary to articulate the value of sustainable technology access in the public library. Like the
15 movie *Ben Hur*, the *Benchmark Project* has a cast of thousands, with people from many different
16 library organizations from all around the nation. They have been working together to develop a
17 tool for libraries to use for good conversations in their communities about why they need public
18 access to technology. California is one of three designated pilot states, along with Texas and
19 Oklahoma. California received a \$50,000 grant to do forums in the state to gather information
20 about what it will take to induce libraries in California to adopt benchmarks and what would be
21 helpful for them in order to use these benchmarks. Consultants K.G. Ouye and Pauline Mingram
22 worked with CSL to conduct two forums. Aldrich returned yesterday from a meeting in which
23 the derived data was used to inform the process, resulting in a 3-page first draft of benchmarks. It
24 is designed with three areas: 1) organizational management, 2) those engaged in the community
25 and decision makers, and 3) demonstrated value of services provided. We are trying to figure out
26 what are the measurements that actually determine that value. The benchmarks are still being
27 reviewed but are due for completion in September.

28 There are two libraries in California scheduled to begin the *Benchmark Pilot Program* in
29 September: Sacramento Public Library and Salinas Public Library. Training for the pilot
30 program libraries will begin in September.

31

1 The data gathered from the benchmark forums is helping to inform the State Library how
2 best to write and apply for another grant from The Gates Foundation. They will provide the
3 support to implement the *Benchmark Program* at other libraries in California besides the pilot
4 sites. This has been a very big project occupying a considerable amount of Aldrich's attention.

5 **Digital Inclusion Forum**

6 The second new item to report is the *Digital Inclusion Forum*, sponsored by the *Institute of*
7 *Museum and Library Services (IMLS)*. It was mandated in the *National Broadband Plan* to
8 include a digital inclusion framework, or guidelines for communities, not just libraries, in
9 thinking about digital connectivity. California has been selected as one of four states to have this
10 *Digital Inclusion Forum* to solicit feedback on the framework that has been designed. The
11 meeting for California will be held in Los Angeles on September 12th and 13th, with former State
12 Librarian Susan Hildreth visiting in her capacity as Director of IMLS. The guest list was selected
13 on the basis of very strict IMLS protocols. A challenge presents itself because we have two
14 similar programs, *IMLS's Digital Inclusion Framework* and the *Gates Foundation Benchmarks*.
15 The Gates Benchmark program was started before IMLS's National Broadband Plan came out.
16 An attempt is being made to find meaningful ways to articulate these two programs so that they
17 are not confusing to our libraries in California.

18 **e-Books**

19 Aldrich has been working with other state libraries at the national level through **Chief**
20 **Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA)** as part of a small taskforce concerning e-books.
21 The group put together a study last year around how libraries should start thinking about e-
22 books. It has been a groundbreaking document, with seven different scenarios, which has opened
23 up some very good conversations at all levels. Numerous groups are working on the future of
24 e-books, what they will look like and how they will be accessed. Linda Crowe has headed up a
25 group for the American Library Association (ALA) called Equal Access to Electronic Resources.
26 Other groups include Digital Public Library, which is coming out of the east coast academic
27 environment, and Internet Archive. Another one, Unglued, will have people vote for books they
28 would like to be free to the public, and then they will work with the publishers to figure out the
29 cost. People will then be able to donate in order to make the book available for free, that is, to
30 make it become "unglued."

1 The e-book field is wild and chaotic at the moment, but libraries are focusing on copyrights
2 and access issues. With respect to electronic books for libraries, two big things are needed. First,
3 libraries need platform-neutral content; they cannot have a single content for one device. Many
4 devices like tablets and i-Pads will be used by the public, with more new devices coming out all
5 the time, so the one content for one device scenario makes it more difficult to create a borrowing
6 model. A second major need is for models to be found that work for publishers, authors, and
7 libraries. Libraries do not want to prevent publishers and authors from making money, but they
8 are concerned that people have access to publications. Publishers who will not allow electronic
9 content to libraries deny access to entire populations of users.

10 Another issue for libraries is the difference between renting and owning electronic content.
11 Already, libraries have begun renting content, but if a community that uses rented content should
12 run out of money and cease to pay the rent, then all of that content will be lost to the library and
13 the community will lose access to those electronic resources. Libraries should be able to own
14 content. Currently, there is a conversation about Overdrive, one of the major e-book vendors, and
15 Kansas State Library, which has severed the contract between them. Kansas City Public Library
16 signed a document stating that it owned its electronic content, but Overdrive disputes that, saying
17 the content is just rented. Overdrive's dominance in the market place is going to be challenged
18 by 3-M's Cloud Library, Barnes and Noble and perhaps others. Clearly, the e-book market is
19 going to be flooded with other vendor choices soon.

20 Aldrich was very excited to announce that CSL recently signed a statewide contract with
21 Bookflix e-books for kids, a vendor of Scholastic. Open to everyone, the children's content
22 should be accessible onsite from any California Public Library or remotely online through a
23 library website. Bookflix offers fiction and non-fiction, centered on many engaging topics. It is a
24 great literacy tool; e-books can be read to the user, the reader can read along with them, or they
25 can be read directly by the reader. Although Internet-based and readable on an i-Pad, for
26 example, Bookflix's e-books are not downloadable to devices. Access to Bookflix is about a
27 penny per person per year. CSL is supporting it for two years throughout the state with federal
28 funds, but will be deriving a pricing model to see about continuing it. Aldrich thanked Linda
29 Crowe and Heather Teysko from Califa for managing the huge Bookflix project.

30 **Democracy in the 21st Century**

31 The California Council for the Humanities received a grant for a project on the theme of
32 democracy: *What is a Democracy in the 21st Century?* California libraries are a partner in the

1 project and CSL will be supporting libraries to do particular book discussions surrounding the
2 topic of democracy. Accompanying these discussions will be a traveling exhibition that relates to
3 democracy.

4 **Stanford Demographic Study**

5 Lastly, the State Library is working with Stanford Center for Longevity to do a demographic
6 study in the state of California. They are compiling data so that libraries can make good
7 decisions about the future of their populations and what kinds of services to provide. Stanford is
8 analyzing historic content for trends that each community should consider to prepare for their
9 future; whether the community has an aging population or a younger population changes the
10 focus about what services to provide. We hope to get 183 unique reports. Some of the data will
11 be at the county level because it is unavailable at the local level. CSL will be offering training for
12 libraries on how to think about demographic information and how it relates to serving local
13 populations. The CSL contact for this study is Suzanne Flint in LDS.

14 **Questions and Answers**

15 Member McGinity asked whether any studies had been done about overall library usage,
16 such as who uses libraries and what do they do. Aldrich replied that national studies had been
17 done, of which California had been included. For example, the recent study by the Gates
18 Foundation and IMLS included California, with perhaps some breakouts of data specifically on
19 California. But no single study has been done on California. A couple of years ago, CSL and
20 Rosario Garza, SCLC, worked with the Zogby Polling organization to poll Californians on how
21 they find and use information. Telephone calls were made and website links established to
22 receive answers to polling questions. That data probably has not changed too much since then,
23 but nothing surprising was really learned. It was confirmed that people begin with Google search
24 to find information; they prefer to look on their own before resorting to a librarian. A lot about
25 the usage behaviors of patrons was learned, but not a lot about the library. Maybe the time has
26 come to do a new study on both.

27 Member Lowenthal asked whether the question had been proposed as to why people do their
28 own research. She has found that many people do not believe they need a librarian or a library;
29 Aldrich responded that that particular question had not been asked. Her sense from her reading
30 and conversations, however, was that people today are self-service oriented, and feel that is good
31 enough for them. In general, many traditional reference questions, like the height of Mount
32 Kilimanjaro, are very easy to find for oneself on the web. By the time people come to a librarian

1 for help, they have looked extensively on their own. So, they come with an expectation that
2 librarians should know things that are not accessible on the web. It is the more detailed research
3 questions that are the main kinds of reference assistance being requested today. At this level it
4 becomes apparent how limited the availability of detailed information is on the Internet. Studies
5 are showing that researchers are relying more on the web and not diving deeper into their matter,
6 and that important detail is being missed. The challenge for libraries as contact creators is how
7 we can make more information more accessible.

8 Member Fong asked whether Opportunity Online Broadband training for Library Directors
9 included training for a new generation of librarians through Library Schools. Aldrich clarified
10 that it is a program to assist existing Library Directors to articulate broadband capacity issues
11 and why more of it would be needed. Broadband connectivity is not only about electronic access
12 to the world, but the ability of libraries to push out an increasing volume of content such as
13 video, photographs, online exhibits, etc. Although the training is open to anyone, relevant people
14 are being targeted for invitation.

15 There is a wider educational issue here. Offering organizational development as part of a
16 library science curriculum has been an issue with some library schools, who do not believe
17 teaching library organization management is within their province. Aldrich believes that is not
18 right. The informational side that library schools provide is good and necessary, but the
19 organizational side is too. Conversations with library schools about this issue are ongoing.

20 In connection with the broadband discussion, Member Fong inquired as to whether the State
21 Librarian was in contact with the private commercial companies who offer broadband. Aldrich
22 replied that she had not contacted them for the training. An emerging problem, however,
23 following the recent push to get and increase broadband capability, is that the telco rules in the
24 state of California are beginning to create access issues for libraries. For example, in one small
25 community, Madera Public Library would have to pay \$1600 dollars per month for a mere T1
26 line, which refers to a specific type of copper or fiber optic telephone line that can carry more
27 data than traditional telephone lines. If the T1 line is being used for telephone conversations, it
28 plugs into the office's phone system and can carry up to 24 digitized voice channels. If the T1
29 line is carrying data it plugs into the network's router and can carry data at a rate of 1.544
30 megabits per second. However, other areas in the state may receive a gigabyte (1 gigabyte =
31 1000 megabytes) of data carrying capacity for \$200. Connectivity and broadband capacity are
32 huge issues and challenges for libraries as more content goes digital and is made available to the

1 public. Perhaps data compression strategies may form part of any connectivity solution, but the
2 “pipes” must be big to handle what libraries are planning to do. The State Library is working
3 with CENIC, the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California, who included CSL
4 in their broadband grant to connect some libraries onto the “fiber backbone.” However, some
5 challenging unintended consequences have ensued. When a library that was supported by
6 Sacramento Public Library’s connectivity got a boost to its connectivity, Sacramento Public then
7 had to boost its own connectivity to that library, as well. A domino effect was produced.

8 Member Fong admired the Family Digital Literacy Program, but wondered who paid for
9 high-speed internet access after a family receives a free laptop. Aldrich admitted that providing
10 internet access had been a challenge. However, a new Comcast program just announced allows
11 \$10 per month internet access to families who qualify for the School Lunch program.

12 Member Fong asked about the tension between the two programs, *IMLS’s Digital Inclusion*
13 *Framework* and the *Gates Foundation Benchmarks*. Aldrich replied that they are two different
14 frameworks. The Gates Foundation is creating tools to enable a conversation about broadband
15 connectivity, while the IMLS tool is about having a conversation in the community. Meshing the
16 two together will be challenging and it is unclear what it will look like. The role of the State
17 Library is to provide opportunities, but communities must decide what works better for them.
18 Maybe *IMLS’s Digital Inclusion Framework* works better for some libraries, perhaps *Gates*
19 *Foundation Benchmarks* for others. But the Gates Benchmarks are important at the statewide
20 level because what is being learned from the locals could really be used to articulate trends at the
21 statewide level. Aldrich would not like to see exclusive use of one framework over the other, as
22 the statewide conversation is better facilitated using apples to apples.

23 24 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

25 **CLSA Baseline Budget**

26 Habbestad reported that in the Governor’s signed budget, in the CLSA appropriation
27 included \$8.5 million dollars to fund the statewide mandated programs through the Cooperative
28 Systems, Interlibrary Library Loan and Direct Loan programs. Staff looked at various scenarios
29 to distribute the \$8.5 million. We wanted to fund the Systems at a level so that they would
30 remain viable to their Public Library members and possibly keep their doors open. We also
31 looked at what the percentage cuts would mean for the public library resource sharing. It was
32 decided to use the previous year’s System allocation and reduce the baseline by 15%, which

1 would fund System service at a little over \$2.3 million. This amount represents about 27% of the
2 total \$8.5 million appropriated. The balance of almost \$6.2 million would then fund the
3 Interlibrary Loan and the Direct Loan programs at a level that would provide some
4 reimbursement for the sharing of resources to non-resident borrowers. Staff is recommending
5 that the Board adopt the 2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget as presented in the documentation to
6 this agenda item.

7 Member Murguia asked for the reasoning behind the 40% reductions to TBR versus 15%
8 reduction for the Cooperative Library Systems. Aldrich explained that the Systems were asked to
9 report what zero percent reduction and 50% reduction would look like. Considering the
10 importance of the regional Systems, in their capacity of administering products and in creating
11 resource sharing, there viability is highly desirable. If they were to sustain cuts that were too
12 great, some of them would fail. Libraries win either way, whether they receive assistance directly
13 or via the regional Systems. But the latter approach allows for economies of scale to the
14 individual libraries.

15 TBR is not funding, but rather reimbursement, so it is like icing on the cake for the library
16 jurisdictions. For the smaller library systems, the reimbursements makes very little difference, as
17 the amounts may be negligible. But for the larger systems, it can make a difference. Santa Clara
18 County Library was receiving a million dollars before it decided not to participate. The next
19 largest amount going to a library was \$400,000. Although there is a huge reimbursement range,
20 libraries do not depend on TBR. TBR has been very poorly funded for many years, so much so
21 that it may be considered a mere token.

22 Member Fong commented that TBR isn't just icing to her local library, Belvedere/Tiburon,
23 where they have a great collection and great local support. They look at their substantial TBR
24 return as an investment in their book collection, but never as a budget breaker. Aldrich added
25 that had TBR been more of a dependency or a budget breaker, a different budget decision
26 probably would have been made.

27 The following action was taken by the Board.

28 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the Library of*
29 *California Board adopts the 2011/12 CLSA Budget as displayed in the chart entitled*
30 *"2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget Recommendation" and that the aforementioned chart be*
31 *included in the minutes of this meeting. (See Attachment C)*
32

33
34

1 **CLSA System Plans of Service**

2 Habbestad reported that CLSA Plans of Service were received from each of the eight
3 Cooperative Systems. This year the cooperatives were asked to provide only a preliminary plan
4 of service instead of the full budget packet because of the uncertainty of the state budget. Exhibit
5 A in the packet is a compilation of those plans. The Systems were asked to provide three
6 scenarios based on the different funding levels. A summary of the plans indicate that all Systems
7 have delivery to their members as one of their top priorities. Each System will provide some
8 level of second level reference, either through System's staff or by contracting with another
9 System for the service. Most Systems will fund database subscriptions for their libraries. One
10 System has stated that they have issued staff furloughs. At least two systems have already laid-
11 off administrative and reference staff. If the trigger bill is enacted to eliminate the CLSA funds, it
12 is most likely that 49-99 will shut down. The Inland Library System would last about one year
13 and then shut down. NorthNet would last six months and then shut down.

14 Member Bernardo asked whether LSTA funding would be lost if the trigger is pulled and
15 \$8.5 million is cut from the budget. In response, Aldrich first set the context for how budget
16 decisions are reached, explaining the federal grant cycle. Every year the State Library receives an
17 LSTA grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services that is good for two years. Each
18 year the new grant funding is received and a report is made on the previous year's grant.
19 Normally, \$16.4 million is received, but this year it was down to \$15.4 million. The State of
20 California authorizes \$19 million each year, because the State Library always has two pockets of
21 money for the two grant cycles, the new incoming grant amount as well as the previous year's
22 grant. The \$19 million is often misleading, giving the appearance of more funding than was
23 actually received.

24 With that new money, CSL is always reporting on old grant funding, which actually
25 determines the future grant. Reports must include state funding that supported the two-year grant
26 cycle, which covers three state fiscal years. CSL must pro-rate the funding received over three,
27 nine and twelve months. When the state of California makes cuts in budget years, and the money
28 is not available, it then begins to effect how CSL reports. The first report to be impacted if the
29 library is not funded would be in 2012, when it would have to report that it could not meet
30 maintenance of effort. It was estimated that it would be about a 19% drop in funding.
31 Traditionally, the federal IMLS has reduced grant funding by the same percentage that the state

1 of California reduced its funding. The other option would be to request a waiver. If IMLS
2 granted a waiver, they would give full funding.

3 The worst case scenario would be reported in 2013, were the library not to receive state
4 funding in each of the next two years. Funding would drop 83% in 2014/15. Of course, CSL
5 would be asking for a waiver for each year that the maintenance of effort is not met. The long-
6 term issue is: what is the state of California putting toward libraries? Although the trigger
7 language is tied to this year's budget only, and once the funding is reduced or eliminated, it is
8 very hard to get it back.

9 Another concern is that although CSL currently has federal funding, it is holding off on
10 grants while waiting to see what will happen with state funding. CSL may need to try different
11 kinds of grants to keep things going. However, we do not want to get caught in the trap of
12 backfilling all of these grant programs with LSTA funds, because in the long term we do not
13 have that money. Nor is it known how much money there will be from the federal government in
14 next year's budget. It could drop even lower, below \$15 million.

15 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
16 *Library of California Board approves the CLSA Preliminary System Plans of*
17 *Service for the eight CLSA Cooperative Library Systems submitted for fiscal year*
18 *2011/12, and after knowing the final outcome of the state budget, request Systems*
19 *to submit revised plans and budgets that reflect the programs and services provided*
20 *with the funding available from CLSA.*

21 22 RESOURCE SHARING

23 **CLSA Consolidations and Affiliations**

24 Habbestad reported that the City of Camarillo broke away from the Ventura County Library
25 system in January 2011. A copy of the ordinance creating the municipal library and a copy of the
26 city council's resolution are included in the packet. The Camarillo Library is requesting
27 affiliation with Southern California Library Cooperative with the effective date of July 1, 2011.
28 The SCLC Administrative Council approved the request for membership contingent upon the
29 adoption of this motion. Last year the Board approved the change in membership from Ventura
30 County Library, from Black Gold to SCLC. As well, three other library jurisdictions in Ventura
31 County have joined SCLC. Santa Paula Library District is currently the only library jurisdiction
32 in Ventura County still remaining a member of Black Gold. Staff is recommending that the
33 Board approve the affiliation of Camarillo Public Library with SCLC.

34 Member Lowenthal asked what would be the consequence of saying "no" to this proposal.
35 She was worried about privatization of public libraries and the possible unintended consequences

1 of decisions like this one. She explained that some cities, municipalities and counties across
2 California have decided that they cannot afford to have libraries, so they have been choosing to
3 hire private management companies to run libraries like a business. Camarillo and Santa Clarita
4 have already done that.

5 Aldrich responded with an alternate view of what Member Lowenthal stated about
6 privatization. What is being done is not privatization of libraries, but rather the outsourcing of
7 management. Privatization would mean that a community is not paying for a library at all. In
8 such a case, library users would have to pay for their own service. In some communities that
9 wanted their own city library, they pulled away and began outsourcing. Then, when the library
10 was well-established, the community took on the management of it. Calabasas City Library is a
11 successful example of this approach. The State Library is unable to evaluate how local libraries
12 manage themselves. There are state laws and rules with which libraries must comply. Rather,
13 Aldrich's chief concern is with the difference of having a library versus not having one at all. If
14 outsourcing the management of a library is the only way to ensure its existence, then that is the
15 way to go.

16 If the Board were not to approve the affiliation of Camarillo Public Library with the Southern
17 California Library Cooperative, then the people of Camarillo would be unduly punished.
18 Because of a decision made by their City Council, they would be denied access to the basic
19 resources that are available to a library system. Aldrich does not recommend disapproval.

20 Rosario Garza reminded the Board that Camarillo has been an associate member of SCLC
21 since January 2011. She also pointed out that due to the way systems are structured, it is not the
22 public library that joins a System, but the city, as the governing jurisdiction, that joins. It was the
23 City of Camarillo that joined SCLC, not Camarillo Public Library. The following action was
24 taken by the Board.

25 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the*
26 *Library of California Board approves the affiliation of the Camarillo Public*
27 *Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative; and further moved to*
28 *accept the request to waive the September 1, 2010 filing deadline for 2011/12*
29 *affiliations so that this request becomes effective July 1, 2011.*

30
31 Habbestad reported on the motion to approve the affiliation of the Santa Clarita Public
32 Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative. The City of Santa Clarita broke away
33 from the Los Angeles County Library System in August 2010, creating an independent
34 municipal library. They have requested and been accepted as a member of SCLC, contingent

1 upon approval of this motion. The documentation for this affiliation request is provided in the
2 exhibits to this agenda item.

3 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Zollman) and carried unanimously that the*
4 *Library of California Board approves the affiliation of the Santa Clarita Public*
5 *Library with the Southern California Library Cooperative; and further moved to*
6 *accept the request to waive the September 1, 2010 filing deadline for 2011/12*
7 *affiliations so that this request becomes effective July 1, 2011.*
8

9 Habbestad reported of the withdrawal of the Santa Clara County Library system from the
10 Pacific Library Partnership (PLP). The Santa Clara County Board approved an \$80 annual non-
11 resident library card fee, and by doing so, is no longer eligible to participate as a CLSA System
12 member. This action was in response to reductions, potential elimination of state funding, and an
13 increase in demand for library services from non-residents. Santa Clara County Library has, by
14 far, exceeded other library jurisdictions in the amount reimbursed through TBR funds, receiving
15 annually over \$1.2 million in Direct Loan payments. In comparison, the next highest library
16 reimbursement averages about \$400,000.

17 Linda Crowe, CEO of PLP, added that there was more to Santa Clara's decisions than just
18 the state funding reductions. It was also the funding difficulties of nearby San Jose Public
19 Library, which at the time was planning to reduce open hours to three and a half days per week.
20 That did not happen. However, anticipating a surge of patrons from San Jose Public Library,
21 Santa Clara County made what may have been a precipitous decision to charge non-resident fees
22 and withdraw from PLP. The effect has been that patrons are now using their local libraries
23 more rather than Santa Clara County. Previously, people were using libraries in the region
24 interchangeably, before Santa Clara began charging; however, the other libraries in the
25 surrounding communities continue to serve patrons from Santa Clara County and other libraries.
26 A long-term issue for Aldrich is whether making it harder for people to use public libraries will
27 result in loss of support. Aldrich stated that Santa Clara did not seem to be worried about
28 diminished service due to the loss of \$1.2 million.

29 Member McGinity asked a question about funding. Once Santa Clara County Library pulled
30 out of the System, which was effective on July 1st of 2011, should they decide to come back,
31 would they still lose all of the state money for the year? Linda Crowe responded in the
32 affirmative. However, they could apply for re-admittance for the following year. Aldrich pointed
33 out that forfeited funds are redistributed to the other public library systems. Unfortunately, loss
34 of funding adversely impacts libraries affiliated with Santa Clara County.

1 **CLSA Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs**

2 Habbestad reported on the annual cost study survey results for the Transaction Based
3 Reimbursement (TBR) Program and reviewed the rates proposed for FY 2011/12. The following
4 action was taken by the Board.

5 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
6 *Library of California Board adopts, subject to the concurrence of the State*
7 *Department of Finance, reimbursement rates for the 2011/12 fiscal year as*
8 *follows: for CLSA interlibrary loans, a reimbursement rate of \$6.60 per eligible*
9 *transaction; for CLSA direct loans, a reimbursement rate of \$1.09 per eligible*
10 *transaction; and that the Chief Executive Officer inform all participants of the*
11 *2011/12 reimbursement rates as soon as Department of Finance concurrence is*
12 *obtained.*

13
14 Habbestad presented the motion for consideration for prorating the CLSA loan
15 reimbursement programs for 2011/12. TBR participants were reimbursed at 25.2% of the total
16 amount claimed for FY 2010/11; the total cost of the program was over \$40 million. Current
17 projections indicate that the total cost for FY 2011/12 may decrease from the previous year. The
18 major reason for the decrease is the withdrawal of Santa Clara County from the System, which
19 will decrease reimbursable Direct Loans by over 2 million transactions. Payments to libraries
20 will begin after January 1, 2012, as directed in the State Budget Act of 2011.

21 Member McGinity questioned the cost survey and asked what the cost driver was to the
22 seemingly erratic cost fluctuations reported from year to year. Habbestad responded that the
23 survey mainly gathered data about the staffing levels and salaries of staff that do the tasks
24 associated with providing an interlibrary loan and direct loan transaction. Only the handling costs
25 are included in calculating the reimbursement rate, not the delivery of the item. Unfortunately,
26 the survey used to capture data from participants is dated and in need of revision. Aldrich added
27 that this was part of the whole discussion about CLSA and how monies are being used. The
28 taskforce that is reviewing CLSA will be considering whether this is the right way to distribute
29 the money to help libraries the most. Member McGinity asked that a revised formula be devised
30 for a more accurate report. Aldrich responded that we could discuss with the Systems the best
31 way to survey libraries to get a sense of the costs associated with loaning materials to non-
32 residents. However, it is very difficult to get accurate detail even with standard forms and
33 definitions. It was agreed that this topic should be further analyzed and revisited by the Board in
34 a year. The following action was taken by the Board.

35 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the*
36 *Library of California Board directs its Chief Executive Officer to withhold 90%*

1 *from all CLSA ILL and Direct Loan Program reimbursement payments*
2 *throughout the 2011/12 fiscal year and that, after determining the full State cost of*
3 *the TBR programs, directs the CEO to prorate the final payment equitably if*
4 *insufficient funds remain in the program appropriation. It was further moved to*
5 *authorize the CEO to make a one-time adjustment in the prorata percentage in*
6 *order to pay all participants equitably if actual transaction data increases at a rate*
7 *that would not pay each participant equitably.*
8

9 Habbestad reported that transaction levels continue to be at some of their highest, with over
10 36 million Direct Loans and 3.6 million Interlibrary Loans made to non-resident borrowers last
11 year. Staff is recommending the Board authorize its CEO to submit a Budget Change Proposal
12 (BCP) for FY 2012/13 if she deemed it appropriate, given the state fiscal climate.

13 Member Murguia asked if this BCP request was being considered amongst other requests for
14 additional funding. Aldrich replied that traditionally BCPs have been submitted for TBR and
15 PLF. However, this year it is likely that the only BCPs will be for maintaining the offsite storage
16 for the Sutro and Stanley Mosk libraries and preparing for the move. President Bernardo added
17 that this motion provides the authority to submit the BCP, if appropriate.

18 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that the*
19 *Library of California Board gives its Chief Executive Officer the authority to seek*
20 *additional 2012/13 local assistance funding through the BCP process.*
21

22 **CLSA System Reference**

23 Habbested report on the annual approval of System population and membership figures
24 required in order to calculate the System Reference Program allocations. She reminded the
25 Board of the revised policy allowing two or more cooperative systems to consolidate and retain
26 the same funding level by adding together the allocations for each of the consolidated systems.
27 Changes in the population this year include the two new library jurisdictions, Camarillo and
28 Santa Clarita libraries, joining SCLC; and the withdrawal of Santa Clara County Library from
29 PLP (Pacific Library Partnership). The following action was taken by the Board.

30 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the*
31 *Library of California Board approves the System Population and Membership*
32 *figures for use in the allocation of CLSA System Reference Program funds for the*
33 *fiscal year 2011/12.*
34

35 **System Annual Report Summaries from FY 2009/10**

36 Habbestad presented a summary of System Annual Reports in the packet exhibits for each of
37 the cooperative systems for FY 2009/10 and the achievements of the performance objectives set

1 for System Reference, Communications and Delivery, and Advisory Boards. System Annual
2 Reports for FY 2010/11 are due at the State Library on September 1, 2011 and will appear in the
3 next Board meeting packet.

4 In responding to Member Fong's question regarding System Reference, Aldrich explained
5 that System Reference in libraries has been dropping exponentially across the board. The
6 Systems have taken second-level reference questions forwarded from local libraries not equipped
7 to handle the question. But those questions have been declining, so now consideration is being
8 given to how funding may be better utilized elsewhere.

9 Member McGinity inquired about the dramatic shift in reference. Aldrich responded that
10 fewer staff is needed for reference at the System level due to falling demand. At the local level,
11 libraries are re-purposing the kind of activities they are doing. Some libraries are taking
12 professional staff away from the public desk in order to attend to more in-depth research
13 questions, or providing community outreach, or work on specific programs like homework help
14 and workforce development. Basic reference questions may now be handled by library para-
15 professionals for the most part.

16 Rosario Garza, SCLC, stated that Pasadena Public Library recently re-purposed their
17 reference librarian's group. After several months of study, it was found that few in-depth
18 reference questions were being asked by patrons. Rather, the questions were about the location of
19 restrooms, or the photocopier and other inquiries of that sort. So, a new service model was
20 enacted, moving to a single service point that replaced what used to be the circulation desk.
21 Now, when a genuine reference question is asked, a reference specialist comes out to assist the
22 patron individually. What has been found is that reference service has become quicker and more
23 efficient and staff has been freed up to work on special projects, such as assisting local
24 government in serving Pasadena residents.

25 A recent study has shown that SCLC experienced a 23% reduction in reference questions in
26 the fiscal year that just ended from the previous fiscal year. In the last ten years, questions
27 submitted to SCLC from System member libraries have gone down 82%. This indicates that the
28 reference model needs to change. And that is why SCLC is working with the State Library on the
29 redesign of CLSA.

30 Member Lowenthal asked about the online *Ask A Librarian* reference tool. Garza responded
31 that SCLC stopped supporting it two years ago because the cost per question for the *Ask Now*
32 project was extremely high and was found not to be a good use of LSTA money; however, some

1 individual libraries continued to use it on their own. The County Law Library group continues to
2 take part in the *Ask Now* project.

3
4 **LEGISLATIVE**

5 President Bernardo moved on to federal legislative issues and referred to the packet summary
6 review of legislative positions that the Board had taken over the years on various issues. Aldrich
7 referred to a handout listing current federal legislative bills and issues monitored by ALA. She
8 remarked that copyright, internet neutrality and assuring access were issues being followed with
9 particular interest. Of most concern at the federal level was that The Institute of Museum and
10 Library Services (IMLS) continue to be funded, as it is California's source of LSTA grant
11 monies. There are several proposed options to deal with the deficit by different members of the
12 House and Senate that are considering reducing the amount of federal funds that come down to
13 libraries. Directors of State Library Agencies are following this closely and looking for whom to
14 tap to ensure continued funding.

15 Nationally, there has been a huge rise in the use of libraries in all states, but a precipitous
16 decline in the amount of funding they are receiving. There is also a trend toward the formation of
17 new organizations that seek to do what libraries already do, such as: Work Force Development,
18 Health Information, Early Learning, Early Literacy, etc.

19 Aldrich reported that the good news was that LSTA was re-authorized, but that every
20 institution was up for scrutiny, especially the arts. The National Endowment for the Arts and the
21 National Endowment for the Humanities had been targeted and severely cut. IMLS not only
22 provided LSTA funding, but also the Laura Bush 21st Century grants, which are used for library
23 development. Some grant funding for digitization had also been provided. There has been talk of
24 removing everything but LSTA, while cutting it deeply.

25 Member Murguia asked if there were identifiable House and Senate advocates for libraries, a
26 national leader for whom this cause is a passion. Aldrich answered that most California
27 representatives, like Doris Matsui, were very supportive of libraries. However, while Boxer and
28 Feinstein were supportive, libraries were not high on their priority list. Senator Harry Reid had
29 been quite supportive. Member Lowenthal stated that there were several who had advocated for
30 LSTA, but they were not in California. She noted that calls to legislators often garnered verbal
31 support of libraries, but not a commitment to funding support.

1 President Bernardo next moved on to state legislative issues. She stated that she sat on the
2 CLA Legislative Advocacy Committee as Board Liaison this past year, while Member
3 Maghsoudi had been involved as well, in her capacity as President of CLA. President Bernardo
4 directed members' attention to a table listing legislation that CLA had been following for the
5 2011-12 session. Aldrich called attention to SB 445, the California Public Records Act, insuring
6 the privacy of patron electronic records, not just circulation records, in libraries.

7 Member Maghsoudi referred to AB 438, outsourcing library management, stating that CLA
8 chose to take a close watch position on this bill. It was difficult to take a pro or con position
9 because of the many jurisdictions with divergent stances represented on the CLA Advocacy
10 Committee. Many local jurisdictions were strongly opposed to this library management bill.
11 Initially, the bill required a vote from local citizens before a city could outsource the
12 management of their library. Then it changed to allowing the city to outsource by jumping
13 through multiple hoops. Local control is the essential issue, and it was not just about libraries but
14 all local government service. Some librarians were very concerned about outsourcing, while
15 others were concerned about local control, that is, the local jurisdiction being able to decide what
16 would work for their community.

17 Member Murguia asked about companies providing library management services. Aldrich
18 replied that there is just one company, Library Systems & Services (LSSI). So far, they have
19 provided service to sixteen libraries nationwide. In California, five public libraries utilize their
20 service: Camarillo, Moorpark, Riverside County, Santa Clarita, and Shasta.

21 22 **BOARD FOCUS**

23 Aldrich updated the Board with an overview of the results of the CLSA Taskforce, which
24 came out of the two-day Sustainability Conference with Public Library Directors in March 2011.
25 Aldrich stated that the conference was attended by directors from very rural libraries small to
26 very large urban libraries, and by representatives from the cooperative systems. Member
27 Maghsoudi attended as a Board representative and as the director of Whittier Public Library.

28 Members were referred to the document in their packet: CLSA Taskforce Update; which
29 focused on three things: 1) What are we trying to accomplish with CLSA? 2) What are the pieces
30 that we can let go of now? and 3) Are there possible models for the future of CLSA? One of the
31 conversations was about whether CLSA should be modified and salvaged or completely
32 eliminated and a fresh beginning made.

1 The first consideration was what new elements should be added to future CLSA resource
2 sharing. Some changes the taskforce wished to include were: 1) connectivity and delivery, both
3 physical and digital; 2) incentives for sharing local resources; 3) ensuring that patrons have equal
4 borrowing access throughout the state, no matter where they live in California, which links to the
5 taskforce's goal statement: *We believe that California libraries exist to connect, collect, share*
6 *and preserve resources so that all residents can access information, ideas, knowledge, and each*
7 *other*; and 4) Digitization, how the electronic world affects how materials are moved and shared,
8 an issue not addressed in the current CLSA.

9 The taskforce reviewed, page by page, the CLSA law and regulations to insure that they were
10 understood before changes were suggested. There are several current structures in CLSA that
11 could be easily changed to improve CLSA. For example, the System Advisory Boards and are no
12 longer needed. System Reference is no longer as crucial of a service as it once was and it could
13 be deleted. Also, the Consolidations and Affiliations program requires the borders of the library
14 be contiguous as a requirement for a library to belong to one of the eight Regional Library
15 Systems. Why must Systems with libraries that may have similar service needs share borders in
16 order to affiliate with one another? In response to a member requesting an example, Rosario
17 Garza responded that if the City of Rancho Cucamonga wished to join SCLC for services, SCLC
18 would need to get an exception to the contiguous borders requirement from the LoC Board. That
19 is because Rancho Cucamonga is several cities removed from the nearest SCLC library. Aldrich
20 provided the example of ebooks as a type of service that might be shared. Or any leveraged
21 content that one System has that a library jurisdiction would like to share.

22 Aldrich next pointed out that there was no funding for Special Services Programs, as was
23 provided for in the CLSA regulations. LSTA funding has actually supported many Special
24 Service Programs. So, it was possible that this provision could be eliminated.

25 Definitions of residency were found to be no longer workable and relevant and needed to be
26 updated.

27 References to LSCA, the predecessor to LSTA, were still present and needed to be changed
28 and standardized.

29 The taskforce also discussed The Library of California Act (LoC). The original intent was to
30 implement LoC and replace CLSA. However, LoC was funded for three years only, resulting in
31 little for the LoC Board to manage other than CLSA programs. There has been good consensus
32 from the library community to repeal the LoC Act and focus energies on one law, an updated

1 CLSA. If that were to happen, the LoC Board would revert to the California Library Services
2 Board (CLSB), with whatever changes were decided to be made to CLSA.

3 The next part considered by the CLSA Taskforce, possible models for the future, was the
4 more difficult one. It was agreed that Regional Library Systems are still needed to help deploy
5 services. But they are also needed to represent the interests of the regions. It is very difficult in a
6 state the size of California for CSL to represent the entire state. But what a new model of the
7 Regional Library Systems could look like, including management and responsibilities, is still to
8 be decided.

9 How can funding be used to support a new model? If System-wide reference is no longer
10 considered viable, maybe that funding needs to go toward internet connectivity. Or maybe that
11 funding is better utilized for more types of delivery, not necessarily physical delivery, but print-
12 on-demand, electronic delivery, or digitization of information. An attempt is being made to
13 broaden the scope of what the Regional Systems could be doing.

14 The taskforce was divided into four groups, which resulted in four pictures being drawn of
15 what CLSA could look like. A webinar is planned for August or September in order to update
16 California Public Library Directors about the results of the CLSA Taskforce, as well as to get
17 their feedback on it. More about CLSA will be provided at the California Library Association
18 Conference in Pasadena in November of this year. An update was given to Senator Carol Liu's
19 office and a meeting is scheduled to discuss next steps, what the Senator's expectations are, and
20 how she can help us.

21 Aldrich is also seeking CLSA feedback from all of the LoC Board members. Is the network of
22 libraries in California being supported in the manner in which it needs to be supported? Member
23 Lowenthal asked who was on the taskforce. Aldrich replied that a small cross-section of
24 representative rural and urban libraries was selected. She explained the need to use a small
25 group, such as the taskforce, and then use the "pebble effect" where the taskforce takes the
26 information to the larger group (library directors), and then information flows back. Too large of
27 a group makes it difficult to accomplish anything.

28 Aldrich stated that she is concerned about the sustainability of the general fund for any of the
29 local assistance programs, so she is looking at the possibilities of revenue generating as a means
30 of funding CLSA beyond the general fund. One suggestion from a graduate from the Eureka
31 leadership program this year, was that California Drivers' licenses could be used as a library card
32 for a small fee. For instance, for two dollars, with 16 million drivers in California, there is a lot

1 of potential revenue. The costs of libraries have increased with things like connectivity,
2 computers, and the electricity to manage connectivity. So there are additional costs to
3 communities in ensuring access. Trying to think entrepreneurially, another suggestion for
4 enhancing revenue might be that the Regional Library Systems could digitize for communities
5 and not just for libraries, raising funds from those communities and thereby returning money
6 back into the System.

7 Member Murguia remarked that local libraries were funded in many different ways. They
8 often had difficult time raising revenue. She cited a recent election with two sales tax proposals
9 to fund the library in Crescent City, that lost by fifty votes due to a two-thirds majority
10 requirement. Whatever is done, Aldrich stated that a tax for libraries required that taxpayers see
11 what good their money was doing, what difference was being made, what access was being
12 provided. With the exception of roads, fire and police, libraries are one of the most visible
13 examples of the benefits of government service. Member Murguia humorously interjected that
14 libraries are certainly more popular than jails. To which Aldrich retorted that more libraries
15 would probably mean more literate people and fewer jails.

16 Aldrich stated that development of very robust CLSA services should be flexible enough to
17 allow for change in ten years time, should that become necessary with new things to do. How
18 money is managed and spent must not be unduly locked in place, as it is now. Perhaps services
19 should not be written into law in a too detailed manner, but rather emphasis should be placed on
20 library service outcomes and patron access.

21 Member McGinity asked when a bill would be ready. Aldrich said that the small changes
22 probably could be made soon. Larger issues would take longer, as a near consensus must be
23 achieved in California in order to ensure success. The LoC Act took nearly fifteen years to
24 complete! After getting input and feedback and playing out some scenarios in order to think
25 through the implications, including intended and unintended consequences, it would take about a
26 year or a year and a half to complete.

27 Member McGinity asked what would be needed from the LoC Board. Would Board approval
28 be sought at next summer's meeting? Would a draft proposal be prepared for the February Board
29 meeting? Aldrich responded that Board input definitely would be desirable. Realizing that not all
30 members could attend, it would be helpful if one or two members were at future CLSA
31 discussion meetings. In actually changing the law, as the main supporter of CLSA, the California
32 Library Association (CLA) would be involved. Member Maghsoudi would be attending the

1 meetings as President of CLA. Information could be sent out to Board Members for feedback.
2 Board approval would be necessary to move this project forward.

3 Member Fong approved of the effort to change CLSA; however, she cautioned against
4 throwing away the original intent of the LoC that included all types of libraries, and which was
5 fifteen years in the making. Maybe a broader structure could be established that would allow
6 greater flexibility. Reverting to CLSA would mark a return to support of public libraries only.

7 Member Fong recommended similarly that the Reference system be retained and supported,
8 keeping open the possibility of another kind of Reference, perhaps a second Internet Reference
9 system that has not yet been conceived and may be designated in other words. Much time, effort
10 and money had gone into getting the legislation to build and support LoC, so perhaps CLSA
11 should be built upon and modified to allow greater openness and flexibility.

12 Aldrich responded that the goal was not to make CLSA only for public libraries, but to
13 enhance it more broadly. From personal observations and conversations around the state of
14 California, mention of the unfunded LoC has elicited an expression on peoples' faces as though
15 they had just sucked upon a sour tart. For them, the unsupported regulations have been like the
16 proverbial albatross around the neck. If there is going to be change, it would be better to focus on
17 having one act in place to make sure resource sharing functions well. Once the format is down,
18 then the focus could shift to the other players and partners to invite to this effort. One of the
19 challenges as librarians is that we were not evolved to work cross-purposely.

20 Aldrich reported that the taskforce discussed how CLSA and LoC were very bureaucratic and
21 written with process and not actual benefit in mind. Rather, the focus should be on the benefit to
22 the people who are being served. But how that is done should be very flexible. Member Fong
23 commented that she would like to see just that. She has grown weary of an emphasis on
24 infrastructure. She wanted to ensure that a comparison of CLSA and LoC was made in order to
25 retain and enlarge necessary structures. Aldrich answered that Habbestad actually did make a
26 comparison to find similarities and differences, so those results are being considered during this
27 process. It was thought that the resulting document had been previously supplied to the Board,
28 but Board Members expressed a wish to have it again.

29 Member Fong pointed out that there was no state funding for special service programs now,
30 and many program components had not been funded in the past. But it appeared that soon the
31 LSTA federal programs may not be funded either. Libraries could not count upon that funding.
32 She suggested that libraries may want to consider charging for library cards.

1 Aldrich responded that no matter what is done, the fewer barriers erected by libraries, the
2 better would be the use of libraries by patrons. More barriers resulted in fewer library patrons.

3 Member Maghsoudi stated that the taskforce had gone through the LSTA legal document line
4 by line and page by page. She expressed her view that it most definitely needed a complete
5 overhaul. Otherwise, it would limit the functionality of the State Library as well as the libraries
6 across California, libraries trying to work together. LoC came about due to resource sharing, but
7 it is not guidelines that are needed.

8 Aldrich apologized for not communicating more with the LoC Board last year. A better effort
9 will be made to do so around topical areas this year. We would like to use the Board's time well,
10 to better utilize its expertise and to engage what is of interest to the Board.

11 Member Maghsoudi encouraged other members to attend the CLSA webinars. It would be
12 interesting to hear first hand what those who are practicing librarians have to say about this
13 information.

14 With respect to the changes that are being made, Member Fong would like to get a sense of
15 the standards for libraries and library services of the future. In the past, there were guidelines for
16 what a good library should have in place. Aldrich stated that this always makes for an interesting
17 discussion. Some states have minimum standards for what makes a good library. In California,
18 that would be an interesting challenge. Often the State Library receives inquiries for direction on
19 troublesome issues. Because of the way they are set up, County Libraries are more amenable to
20 assistance from the State. But municipal and city libraries do not allow much flexibility to help.
21 The CLSA discussion was more focused on standards for the Regional Systems, which have
22 functioned quite differently from one another up to now, so that the State Library might better
23 assist them.

24 Member Fong, referring to Aldrich's aforementioned ripple-effect, stated that if more were
25 known about what makes a good library, she could go back to her neighbors and constituents and
26 advocate for specific library improvements. Concrete standards assist in garnering support and
27 donations. Aldrich responded by referencing the Gates Foundation Benchmarks as being a very
28 good starting point for library standards. The challenge is that every library community is
29 different. Some communities may have a high number of PhDs per capita with wealth, where the
30 desire is for electronic content and wi-fi. Other areas may have no free access to the internet
31 except for the library and the patrons may have rudimentary computer skills and are doing job
32 development. It is very difficult to find a common standard. Member Maghsoudi did not think a

1 standard could be established successfully. Wide disparities of wealth make that impossible.
2 Aldrich found that the four funding models with Joint Powers Authority, City, County, and
3 Special Districts also show the difficulty in establishing a standard for libraries.

4 Aldrich next called the Board's attention to copies of the e-book study before them. Provided
5 by the consulting company Pinpoint Logic, it is about conversation and seven different scenarios
6 for libraries to think about. Hundreds of people were interviewed in all sectors of the e-book
7 world: librarians, e-book creators, device creators and contact providers. Another study that will
8 be sent to Board members is the Price-Waterhouse Report on e-books, probably one of the better
9 overviews on what is happening with e-books at this moment. Member Maghsoudi stated that
10 3-M is producing there own Cloud e-book, with two public libraries, Pasadena and Glendale,
11 deciding to use it.

12

13 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

14 Vera Skop, Coordinator, Serra Cooperative Library System, questioned if regulations were
15 necessary if there is no longer any state funding, and wondered if this was part of the taskforce
16 discussions. Aldrich responded that even without funding, the Act is still in place, although a bit
17 dormant. Nonetheless, it would be a good time to make improvements and show examples of
18 how it is working better with the changes. Some LSTA projects have been funded as pilot
19 programs to demonstrate whether a new proposal can work in the CLSA realm. However, if all
20 funding were to be lost, going back to every library charging for service, it would be a very
21 challenging uphill battle to recover state funded resource sharing programs.

22 Annette Milliron DeBacker, Executive Director, NorthNet Library System, asked if Plans of
23 Service are to be redone now that the Board has adopted a baseline budget; or do we wait until
24 January to see if funding remains in the state budget? Habbestad responded that if there is
25 funding, the baseline budget part must be redone. Whether services will change depends upon
26 the amount of funding. Aldrich pointed out that there is a possibility that funding may not be cut
27 entirely, but only portions may be taken. So, there may be another reduction, or funding could be
28 lost altogether.

29

30 **BOARD COMMENTS**

31

1 Member Maghsoudi began by stating that usage at her local library, Whittier Public, had
2 increased considerably. Her library was fortunate to be in a community that was very supportive.
3 As an example that people still value libraries, she reported that over 3,000 people came to the
4 Summer Reading Program celebration. During the summer, more than 25,000 books had been
5 read from two locations. Whittier was beginning an expansion and remodel of a branch library,
6 which indicates the level of support the local council and community provides. She encouraged
7 other librarians to continue their work.

8 Member Zollman welcomed new Board Member Gregory McGinity. She reported that in
9 Oakland this past year, fourteen out of eighteen libraries were going to close; but the community
10 rallied by finding lawyers, picketing, marching and being arrested for violating public space, all
11 in support of libraries. All of the libraries are open now, although some are at reduced levels of
12 service. Working with Oakland school children in very poor communities, Member Zollman was
13 pleased that they still had this resource open to them.

14 Member Fong welcomed Member McGinity, expressed appreciation for his good questions,
15 and looked forward to working together. Like Member Maghsoudi, she was fortunate to be in a
16 community very supportive of libraries. She looked forward, with hope, to the legislative
17 changes that were being considered even though the lack of funding was depressing. She thanked
18 CSL staff for the information that had been prepared for the meeting.

19 Member Murguia welcomed Member McGinity to the Board and congratulated the esteemed
20 new officers of the Board. She was very interested in the rewrite of CLSA and looked forward to
21 engaging with it over the next several months. As public resources contract at every level, it
22 becomes more important to ensure that the Systems are as efficient and responsive as they can
23 be. During these hard economic times, there has been a huge increase in library usage in her
24 community. As a private fundraiser for the public library in Del Norte County where she lives,
25 she has seen that there is still interest from the community to respond and donate funds to the
26 library foundation in support of her local library. Libraries have not become isolated and
27 obsolete, although they do face challenges to survive. She looks forward to being more engaged
28 during this next year.

29 Member Lowenthal began by thanking the community for being present and helping the
30 Board to better understand what is happening in the field. She thanked CSL staff for preparing
31 the information to aid in the Board's understanding. She also thanked President Bernardo and
32 Member Maghsoudi for taking on their additional leadership roles. She offered her assistance

1 and involvement in the matters discussed today. She went on to welcome Member McGinity and
2 having learned of his background and passion for children's education, acknowledged his great
3 value to the LoC Board. To close her comments on a cheerful note, Member Lowenthal stated in
4 March of this year, the City of Los Angeles had Proposition L on the ballot, which would
5 increase the library's diminishing service hours and book budget. Fortunately, the measure
6 passed with a 63% super majority vote securing Los Angeles Public Library's funding for years
7 to come, with enough money to restore service to 2008/2009 levels.

8 Member McGinity thanked the Board members for their welcoming remarks. He was very
9 glad to be a part of this esteemed body and looks forward to contributing over time. He thanked
10 Maginnity and Habbestad for the orientation session yesterday and Aldrich for their conversation
11 today. He asked if the State Librarian has complete discretion over the use of LSTA funds, or
12 does this Board or some peer group provide review to assist in its use? Or do people send grant
13 applications for your review and final decision? Aldrich responded that many years ago the
14 Board, in its role as LSTA Advisory Council, reviewed each individual grant. Now it functions
15 in a more advisory role with respect to LSTA. The State Library shares information with the
16 Advisory Council who provides input to ensure that the State Library is paying attention to other
17 areas where money could be invested.

18 President Bernardo thanked everyone for attending the Board meeting. She appreciated the
19 dedication to libraries and work done in the field. The California Library News Report frequently
20 contains good stories about California libraries. She was very proud of the library profession,
21 especially considering the tremendous work that librarians do under the challenging conditions.
22 President Bernardo welcomed Member McGinity and acknowledged the hard work of the State
23 Librarian and her staff.

24 25 ADGENDA BUILDING 26

27 President Bernardo next invited the Board to prepare an agenda for the next Board meeting in
28 February 2012. Aldrich advanced CLSA and the budget for consideration. Member Maghsoudi
29 took this opportunity to invite anyone interested to attend the CLA Conference in Pasadena on
30 November 11-13. A special package has been arranged for Board members and Trustees at a
31 very nominal fee of \$75. You get to listen to legislative updates, attend a luncheon recognizing
32 Senator Liu, and go to an award reception recognizing programs and individuals throughout the

1 state for their contributions to libraries. The CLA website has registration information. President
2 Bernardo concluded that the CLSA legislation and budget were on the agenda for February.

3
4 **ADJOURNMENT**

5
6 President Bernardo had a request to adjourn the meeting in the memory of John Kallenberg,
7 who passed away on July 4, 2011.

8
9 **It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Zolman) and carried unanimously that the**
10 **Library of California Board adjourn the meeting in the memory of John**
11 **Kallenberg.**

12
13 President Bernardo adjourned the Library of California Board meeting at 12:50 p.m. in
14 memory of John Kallenberg.

Library of California Board Resolution 2011-01

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board desires to recognize Penny G. Kastanis for her distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of her term of service as a Member of the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to honor Penny for her outstanding public service representing the Public-at-Large since her appointment by former Governor Gray Davis on January 14, 2003; and

WHEREAS, Penny has advocated for libraries, and especially school libraries, at the state and federal level on behalf of the Board and the greater library community, and extended her knowledge and expertise in education and school library services to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to honor Penny for her distinguished service to the Library of California Board as its President from 2008-2010; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that Penny was on the Executive Planning Committee for the Sierra Valley Library Network from 1998-2001, and helped to frame the programs of the Library of California, enacted in 1998; and

WHEREAS, Penny has served as Executive Director for the California School Library Association (CSLA), and was named the recipient of CSLA's Honorary Membership Award in 2000, a lifetime achievement award given to an outstanding retiree for distinguished contributions to the profession and organization over a sustained period of time; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that Penny is a member of many other professional organizations, namely the American Library Association; International Reading Association; and the California Reading Association, where she served as Chair of Authors Presentations at the State Conference in 2000; and as President of the Sacramento Area Reading Association in 2000 and 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to recognize Penny's outstanding contributions to school libraries, to education, and to the people of the State of California to learn and obtain information through our libraries.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

PENNY G. KASTANIS

*for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 11 August 2011*

Library of California Board Resolution 2011-02

WHEREAS, on July 4, 2011, the Library of California Board, California State Library and the library community was saddened by the sudden loss of one of its dedicated colleagues, John Kallenberg; and

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board wishes to express its heart-felt sympathy to his wife Ruth, and their family; and

WHEREAS, the Board, staff, and library colleagues throughout California and beyond will always remember John as an intelligent and gracious professional who spent most of his career as Director of the Fresno County Library system, and the System Coordinator for the San Joaquin Valley Library System, until his retirement in 2003; and

WHEREAS, John continued to provide outstanding public service to libraries when he was first appointed to the California Library Services Board by former Governor George Deukmejian in 1990, and his subsequent reappointments in 1994 by former Governor Pete Wilson, and in 1998 under new legislation, to the Library of California Board; John's final reappointment came in 2003 by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger prior to his retirement; and

WHEREAS, during his tenure on the State Board, John served with distinction as its President from 1996-1998, and again in 2003; served as the Board's Vice-President in the proceeding four years, from 1992-1995; and chaired numerous committees; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that John was a very active member of many library organizations, including the California Library Association, where he served as its President in 1987; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

JOHN K. KALLENBERG

*for his distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 11 August 2011*

2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget Recommendation			
Program	2010/11 CLSA Baseline Budget	Proposed 2011/12 CLSA Baseline Budget	Percentage Reduction
Transaction Based Reimbursement	\$10,182,000	\$6,182,900	39.3%
Cooperative Library Systems	\$2,726,000	\$2,317,100	15.0%
Total	\$12,908,000	\$8,500,000	34.1%

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC LIBRARY SUMMIT

A REPORT ON SUMMIT PROCEEDINGS

STACEY A. ALDRICH
STATE LIBRARIAN OF CALIFORNIA **Summary**

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY
JANUARY 17, 2012

On January 17, 2012, Stacey A. Aldrich, California State Librarian, hosted the Public Library Summit at the Tsakopoulos Library Galleria, Sacramento, California. The summit was attended by 130 library jurisdiction directors, assistant directors, regional directors, and California Library Association representatives.

This summit was a continuation of the progress made during the March 2011 Sustainability Summit. The purpose of this follow-on summit was to build consensus for proactive strategies that would have a continuing positive impact on public libraries and on the people of California (See Summit Agenda at Enclosure 1). The three key summit tasks were:

- Receive an update on the library message project and provide feedback to the project consultants.
- Discuss and approve task force recommended modifications to the 2011 California Library Services Act.
- Develop a prioritized list of areas for which the State of California should provide funding support.

This report documents the proceedings of the summit.

Library Messaging Project

Joe Rodriguez and Jane Gardner, Harbour DNA, presented an update on the Library Messaging Project. The Library Messaging Project presentation is a companion document to this report in PDF format. The purpose of the Library Messaging Project is to craft a compelling message that all librarians can use to speak with one voice.



Jane Gardner & Joe Rodriguez

Research

Joe and Jane gathered research data using the following topics to structure their interviews with 20 library stakeholders.

- Key roles libraries play
- How to communicate the library value
- Key stakeholders to reach
- Examples that bring the message to life

Learnings

The interviews revealed the stakeholders' perceptions about and awareness of public libraries which in turn validated both the need for a fresh library message as well as the need to bring stakeholders into the library. Two concepts that emerged from the research were:

- As a potential long-term vision: "Libraries as a community gathering place for head and heart"
- As a personal benefit for all audiences: "Libraries as a starting place for whatever you need to do next"

Discussion and Comments

Following the library message presentation, Joe and Jane invited the participants to offer their feedback. Below are some of the points discussed and comments made.

- Include "family" in the "starting" message.
- We all could do a better job of creating consistency across library systems so that people can move from place to place as they start things and find the same level of help.
- Gathering and literacy aren't actually delivered by library.
- We should seek partners such as public schools.
- The library is truly neutral ground, and stakeholders recognize this neutral ground as a valuable part of community in a manner that isn't recognized in churches and municipal buildings.
- Using the library community room should count as using the library.
- The focus of the message seems limiting; we should broaden the scope.
- People use the library without realizing they are library users.
- The idea that today is the first day of the rest of your life fits with the theme of the library as a place to start.
- A person as educated and skillful as John Kenneth Galbraith uses the library to learn new computer skills.
- The library "start message" works both for individuals and for the State.
- The library-messaging campaign should use different languages so it is entirely inclusive.
- Referring to the library as an institution does not work; we need something more relevant and local.
- Rational thought, inspiration, and personal benefit should go into the development and refinement of the message.
- Small library districts need to be able to leverage the message created at the state level.

Over lunch, a number of people spoke to Jane and Joe about the following:

- Keep in mind that places like Imperial County have very low literacy.
- ALA, library services for children and advocacy support.
- An example of the library as a starting place is in Alpine County where people who had no high-speed internet built their plan for a new restaurant at the library.
- Rural libraries tend to get pushed aside: keep them in mind.
- Important to engage people; go beyond serving them. Get them to offer their services in the library then become supporters.
- Be careful about funding agencies who conclude we don't need more funding because we are only talking about what we already do.
- Three important areas that libraries are working on:
 - eLearning
 - technology infrastructure
 - universal borrowing
- Community is a dicey word in some areas of the state
- A starting place example--A little boy brought in a bird that fell out of the nest and asked us to help identify it and where to take it.
- Your next success begins at the library.
- The evolution visual of bent-over ancestor to erect homo sapien--Libraries have evolved well.
- Computer learning center at our library is staffed with volunteers.
- A starting place example--Esmeralda, a farm worker who took literacy classes at the library and ultimately became a medical clerk, got out of the fields.
- Brought in a former real estate agent to run the literacy center--she was a dynamo at bringing people in and finding volunteers.
- Libraries are doing pretty much what they did 100 years ago--collecting, preserving, and connecting. Another area is creating--recording the local tradition.

Next Step

As a next step, Stacey will contact the library messaging task force about the path forward for continuing the work on the library messaging project.

California Library Services Act

In 1977 the California Library Services Act (CLSA) was passed by the legislature and signed into law by then Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. This legislation was designed to ensure equal access to information for all Californians through public libraries. The specific measures for sharing resources were designed before the internet and new technologies for sharing information. A CLSA task force was formed to examine the current CLSA legislation to consider changes that would support efficiencies in the 21st Century.

As a first step in this long-term process, the task force has identified some initial, non-controversial modifications to the law. (The current CLSA may be seen at <http://www.library.ca.gov/publications/laws.html>. The Simple Guide to the CSLA is below under "Enclosure 2"). These modifications were provided to the participants in advance of the summit for their review and consideration. Following are the modifications as presented by the task force with key concerns and recommendations by summit participants. Modifications 1 to 7 were suggested by the task force. Modifications 8 and 9 were offered during the summit.

1. California Library Services Act

Article 5, Section 18747. System administrative council and advisory board

Article 5, Section 18749. Terms of members of advisory board

Article 5, Section 18750. Duties of advisory boards.

Each Cooperative Library System is required to use funding for a System Advisory Board. This is not necessary because they already have boards in place that provide the guidance and oversight needed.

Concerns: None.

Participant Recommendation: Concur with task force--delete these sections.

2. California Library Services Act

Article 5, Section 18741. Reference allowance.

Originally, a key service of Cooperative Library Systems was to provide second-level reference. This meant that if a library did not have the resources to answer a patron's question, the system would provide the support. Today, this service is no longer needed as a major function. The number of questions that the systems are answering is dropping rapidly each year. The internet and online resources have changed the needs of libraries. The funding required to support this service could be better used to leverage more resources for the member libraries of a Cooperative Library System

Concerns: Some smaller or poorly resourced libraries are still using second-level reference. With the removal of second-level reference, these libraries would have to adopt alternative means to accomplish the same outcome.

Participant Recommendation: Concur with task force-- delete this article.

3. California Library Services Act

Article 4, Section 18732. Consolidation of libraries.

Article 5, Section 18751. Grants to newly consolidated systems.

In order for public libraries or systems to consolidate, their borders must be contiguous. This requirement is restrictive of future advancement and evolution of Cooperative Systems. It may be more efficient in the future for libraries to be able to align with systems or the services offered by systems that best meet their community needs.

Concerns: There are potentially negative consequences--e.g., "jumping ship"--for poorly funded libraries and possibly for larger libraries. More importantly, the main concern is on what constitutes a library "system."

Participant Recommendation: Table the modification pending more discussion and investigation. Clarify or define what constitutes a "system."

4. California Library Services Act

Article 5, Section 18730. Special Services Programs.

Article 5, Section 18742, System Special Service Programs

The state board may award funds for Special Service Programs to public libraries or on a system-wide basis. There is no state funding for this particular section. The State Library has been supporting programs through Federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funding.

Concerns: None.

Participant Recommendation: Concur with task force--delete these sections.

5. Residency Definition

There was considerable task force discussion around the definitions of residency. The task force believes the definitions of residency need to be modified and updated.

Concerns: Summit participants shared the task force's angst about the difficulty of defining residency. The following two suggestions were offered:

- First, define the outcome desired and then define residency to meet the outcome.
- Research other agencies to learn how they define residency.

Participant Recommendation: Table the modification pending more discussion and investigation.

6. Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA)

CLSA, Article 3, Section 18725. State Advisory Council on Libraries.

In the CLSA, there are references to LSCA funding which is now LSTA. It needs to be changed to match the federal program or make it broad enough for any future changes.

Concerns: None.

Participant Recommendation: Concur with task force--change LSCA to match federal program.

7. Library of California Act

Education Code, Title 1, Division 1, Part 11, Chapter 4.5, Articles 1-8, Sections 18800-18870.

The Library of California Act (LOC) was enacted in 1998. It was designed to eventually replace the California Library Services Act once all of the program elements of it were implemented. LOC was funded maybe two years. It has never received the funding required to implement. Changes in technology and relationships have made LOC outdated. We have good consensus from the library community to repeal LOC and focus energies on updated CLSA.

Concerns: Since the CLSA was enacted in 1977, and the LOC was enacted in 1998, ensure there is a background story that justifies the change.

Participant Recommendation: Concur with task force--delete LOC Act.

8. Modify Requirements for Lending Outside of Library Jurisdiction

Article 6, Section 20204, Paragraph (d)

This modification was suggest during the summit and was not included in the CLSA task force recommendations. The current language of Paragraph (d) reads: "All materials normally loaned by a participating public library are available for loan to non-residents under the same rule and policies applied to local residents."

Change the language to read: "All materials normally loaned by a participating public library are available for loan to non-residents under the rules and policies set by the California Library Services Board (or by the California State Library)."

Concerns: There was considerable resistance to adopting this modification. The concern is that the "standard of minimum" must take into consideration those library systems that offer lower standards to their own residents and should be able to offer that lower standard to non-residents.

Participant Recommendation: Table the modification pending more discussion and investigation.

9. Modify/Merge Universal Borrowing and Equal Access

This modification was suggested during the summit and was not included in the CLSA task force recommendations. Consolidate the terms “universal borrowing” and “equal access” into a single term with a definition that includes the concepts of both universal borrowing and equal access.

Concerns: A significant group of participants were concerned that the distinction or meaning of universal borrowing and/or equal access would be lost if combined into one term. The task force assured participants that this is not the case.

Participant Recommendation: Task force should proceed with developing the new term and definition.

Update: In looking at the language and analyzing the ramifications of making this change, the State Library legal counsel has recommended that there needs to be further discussion and investigation before we continue with the merging of the concepts. As a reminder, to participate in Equal Access a library must share resources with patrons from the libraries that belong to the cooperative system that they participate in. To participate in Universal Borrowing, a library must share resources with patrons from ALL library jurisdictions in California. It is possible to participate in Equal Access and not Universal Borrowing, and we do have a few libraries that are in this category. The modification or merging of the terms has larger implications that we want to make sure we address.

State Funding for Libraries

The third and final task of the summit was to develop a prioritized list of topics for which the State of California should provide funding support. Participants were provided an opportunity to recommend a topic and invite other participants to join them in a discussion to build a convincing case for the topic. The discussion was structured around these three questions:

What specifically should the state fund for public libraries?

Why is this important to the state?

Who will benefit from this funding?

Each topic was presented to all participants. The participants then prioritized the list of ten topics by selecting their top three topics based on the following criteria.

“What state-funded topic will have the greatest positive impact on California public libraries?”

Below are the topics in priority of order. The number to the left of the topic title represents the relative prioritization vote. Some topics were consolidated in which case the additional topics are in parentheses. The bullet information reflects what was recorded on the flip charts. There has been some minor editing to improve readability.

55 ½ - Digitize California Libraries Content

What:

- Start with local history, local stories, unique preservation/access
- Libraries as publishers
- Accessibility for all Californians (example-visual disabilities)
- Workforce development
- Easy win--visible results
- Make all content we have available and accessibility to all

Why:

- Sharing is easier virtually than by van; preserves precious content

Who:

- All Californians
- Those with challenges in accessing resources, whether physically or geographically

54 - Technology Infrastructure (Economic and Social Equalizer; Basic Digital Literacy)

What:

- Fiber, broadband access
- Must be statewide
- Minimum standards
- The "HUB"

Why:

- Vital to citizens
- Equal access
- Competitive edge
- Efficiencies
- Economic development (small business)

Who:

- Small business
- Education
- Job seekers
- Health care
- Tourism
- All, etc., etc.

50 - Literacy (Digital Literacy, English to Speakers of Other Languages, and Every Child Starts School Ready to Read)

What:

- Libraries serve all members of the family--all ages
- Literacy for all as the starting point
- Direct effect on economic development
- Learner-centered

Why:

- Economic stability of the state
- Prepared workforce
- Crime prevention and literacy
- Informed voters/democracy
- Great equalizer
- Increases the value and competitiveness of the state and country
- Break the cycle of illiteracy

Who:

- The population that may not fit into traditional educational institutions

48 - Resource Sharing (Inter-Library Loan, Direct Loan, Transaction Based Reimbursements)

What:

- Direct loan payment, expand resource sharing beyond TBR

Why:

- Open access to all
- Levels the playing field
- Equity
- Share information resources among all Californians
- Stimulates resource sharing and partnerships
- Value added—leverages local and state resources

Who:

- All

37 - Statewide Open Source, ILS

What:

- Local hardware
- Templates for digital archive information
- Some staff developers
- Module development
- Build existing capacity
- Infrastructure to make sure economies of scale apply
- State can also leverage local funds

Why:

- Staff can be allocated to more local needs
- Allows for seamless access
- Simplifies procedures
- Helps meet long-term vision
- Facilitates resource sharing
- Makes economic sense

Who:

- All Californians, especially taxpayers

33 - People Infrastructure for Resource Sharing

What:

- People and administration to develop and manage programs at regional level
- People connectivity
- Administrative structure
- Staffing
- Accountability

Why:

- 183 diverse library jurisdictions need to be grouped into smaller geographic sub-areas
- Need a structure to develop and manage programs at a regional level (not state or local)
- Without administrative infrastructure, investment in technology, content, etc., will not be as effective
- Libraries need a coordinating level lower than the state level to successfully manage programs and to ensure individual libraries' voices are heard and needs met

Who:

Nothing noted on flip charts

25 - Professional Development (Leadership Development, Training, Continuing Education)

What:

- Statewide Infopeople-type continuing education and leadership development

Why:

- Efficient use of resources
- Helps libraries deliver benefits of state-funded programs for libraries
- Provides library staff with skills and tools to service California residents
- Enhances sustainability by facilitating creative thinking
- Furthers local ability to implement state library technology initiatives
- Facilitates equal access to information for all Californians
- Leads to job skills, business climate, civic engagement
- Efficient use of resources

Who:

- Library staff
- Community members whom libraries serve

21 - Standard Minimum Complement of Databases for All Public Libraries

What:

- All California libraries should have a core group of electronic information databases

Why:

- Local libraries cannot afford proprietary databases even under consortia pricing schemes

Who:

- Everybody
- Students
- Seniors
- Businesses
- Healthy and sick
- Tall and short

20 ½ - Lead Role as e-Content Providers

What:

- Cut out middleman, take control

Why:

- Stay relevant to next generation (born digital)
- Control content versus vendors--makes us less vulnerable
- Revenue source
- Start leading, stop catching up

Who: Nothing noted on flip charts

7 - Innovation

What:

- New services
- New methodologies
- Pilot projects
- Research/surveys
- Facilitating collaborations/partnerships

Why:

- Move forward
- Respond to a changing environment
- Maximize effort
- Discover best practices
- Makes California look good
- Efficient use of resources
- Equal access

Who:

- Library users
- Library systems and districts
- Taxpayer (ultimately saves money)
- Community gets improved service
- Profession

Thank You

I am grateful to many people for making this event possible, informative and efficient in an incredibly short amount of time.

Thank you...

- Harry Christiansen for facilitating a very packed and productive meeting.
- Jackie Stetson, Francisca Goldsmith, Gini Ambrosini, Stanley Strauss, Chuck Oshea, and Eileen Oshea with Infopeople for coordinating the event.
- Rivkah Sass and the Sacramento Public Library for providing a great space.
- Joe Rodriguez and Jane Gardner for your tremendous creativity, thoughts, and efforts around messaging for public libraries

I am grateful to all who were able to participate and have a rich conversation to continue to build our future. Thank you for taking the time to come together!

Enclosure 1: Summit Agenda

Outcome

Build consensus for proactive strategies that will have a continuing positive impact on public libraries and on the people of California.

Tuesday, January 17

9:00 Lite Breakfast Social

Purpose: Check in, meet and greet associates, and enjoy refreshments.
(*Self-select seating*)

9:30 Welcome

Purpose: Review the purpose of the summit and the three tasks we will undertake.

Library Message Update

Purpose: Stakeholders receive an update on the "Library Message" project.
(This task was chartered during the March 2011 Sustainability Summit.)

California Library Services Act (CLSA)

Purpose: Approve or amend Task Force recommended modifications to the 2011 CLSA. (This task was chartered during the March 2011 Sustainability Summit.)

Lunch

California Library Services Act (Continued)

State Funding for Libraries

Purpose: Develop a prioritized list of areas/things for which the State of California should provide funding support.

Summit Closing

Purpose: Review the day's accomplishments and the next steps.

4:30 Adjourn

Enclosure 2: Simple Guide to the CLSA

In 1977 the California Library Services Act (CLSA) was passed by the legislature and signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown. What follows is a synopsis of CLSA and is meant to be a brief outline to the scope of CLSA. For more depth, please consult the Act itself. The full text can be found on the State Library's website at <http://www.library.ca.gov/publications/laws.html>.

CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

(Education Code Title 1, Division 1, Part 11, Chapter 4, Articles 1-6, Section 18700-18767)

ARTICLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

This Article of the Act provides an excellent background into the mind set of the library community and legislature in the 1970's that set the stage for CLSA. What follows are some brief excerpts.

Sec. 18701. Legislative finding.

"The Legislature finds and declares that it is in the interest of the people of the state to insure that all people have free and convenient access to all library resources and services that might enrich their lives, regardless of where they live or of the tax base of their local government."

Sec. 18702. Legislative intent.

"It is the intent of the Legislature to provide all residents with the opportunity to obtain from their public libraries needed materials and informational services by facilitating access to the resources of all libraries in this state."

Sec. 18703. Legislative policy.

"In adopting this chapter, the Legislature declares that its policy shall be:

(a) To reaffirm the principle of local control of the government and administration of public libraries, and to affirm that the provisions of this chapter apply only to libraries authorized by their jurisdictions to apply to participate in the programs authorized by this act."

The above excerpt from Section 18703 demonstrates something that was very important for the times. CLSA was not "mandatory". Libraries could choose to "participate."

ARTICLE 2. DEFINITIONS

Sec. 18710. Definitions.

There are 19 definitions here that no library can do without!

Here are the three that set the stage for TBR:

“(e) ‘Equal access’ means the right of the residents of jurisdictions that are members of a cooperative library system to use on an equal basis with one another the services and loan privileges of any and all other members of the same system.”

.....
“(g) ‘Interlibrary loan’ means the lending of a book or other item from one library to another as the result of a user request for the item.”

.....
“(s) ‘Universal borrowing’ means the extension by a public library of its direct loan privileges to the eligible borrowers of all other public libraries.”

ARTICLE 3. ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 18720 - 18724. California Library Services Board.

These sections establish the authority and duties of the Board. The name was changed to “Library of California Board” in 1999.

Sec. 18725. State Advisory Council on Libraries.

“The state board shall serve as the State Advisory Council on Libraries for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the federal Library Services and Construction Act.”

LSCA is now LSTA.

Sec. 18726. State Librarian as Chief Executive Officer.

Outlines the role of the State Librarian in regards to the Board.

ARTICLE 4. LOCAL PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

Sec. 18731. Universal borrowing.

“Any California public library may participate in universal borrowing. Public libraries participating in universal borrowing may not exclude the residents of any jurisdiction maintaining a public library. Public libraries that incur a net imbalance shall be reimbursed for the handling costs of the net loans according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724.”

ARTICLE 5. LIBRARY SYSTEM SERVICES

This Article of the Act outlines the role and functions of cooperative library systems.

Sec. 18740. Eligible systems.

Sec. 18741. Reference allowance.

Sec. 18742. System Special Service Programs.

Sec. 18743. Equal access.

"Each member library of a system shall provide equal access to all residents of the area served by the system. Member libraries that incur a net imbalance shall be reimbursed through the system for the handling costs of the net loans according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724."

Sec. 18744. Interlibrary loan reimbursement.

"Each member library of a system shall be reimbursed through the system to cover handling costs, excluding communication and delivery costs, of each interlibrary loan between member libraries of the system according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724."

Sec. 18745. System communications and delivery.

"Each system shall annually apply to the state board for funds for intra system communications and delivery."

Sec. 18747. System administrative council and advisory board.

"(a) Each system shall establish an administrative council whose membership consists of the head librarians of each jurisdiction in the system.

(b) Each system shall establish an advisory board consisting of as many members as there are member jurisdictions of the system."

ARTICLE 6. STATEWIDE SERVICES

This Article of the Act outlines various statewide components. Two components were never funded: statewide reference centers and statewide communication and delivery. One component, the statewide bibliographic data base was not funded after 2004.

The most important section in Article 6 is perhaps the following:

Sec. 18765. Interlibrary loan reimbursement.

"Each California library eligible to be reimbursed under this section for participation in the statewide interlibrary loan program shall be reimbursed according to the allocation formula developed pursuant to subdivision (f) of Section 18724 to cover the handling costs of each interlibrary loan....."

For Additional Information Contact

Stacey A. Aldrich

State Librarian

California State Library

900 N Street, Suite 351

Sacramento, CA 95814

O: 916.654.0188

E: saldrich@library.ca.gov

Proposed 2012 Legislative Changes to Laws Affecting California Public Libraries

The California Library Services Act (CLSA), Education Code Section 18700, et seq., was enacted in 1977. CLSA was designed to enhance equal access to library materials for all Californians through the State's public libraries. CLSA provisions related to public library resource sharing were designed before the advent of the Internet and other information sharing technologies. A task force of public librarians in the California Library Association has identified the necessary changes to existing law that will enhance and support public library efficiency in the 21st Century.

ELIMINATE COOPERATIVE LIBRARY SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARDS

Cooperative Library Systems consist of two or more public library jurisdictions that agree to share library resources among the patrons of each participating library. Education Code Sections 18747(b), 18749, and 18750 provide that each Cooperative Library System shall establish and fund a Cooperative Library System Advisory Board. Under existing law, the necessary oversight and guidance for the System is provided by the System Administrative Council (Education Code Section 18747(a)), which consists of the head librarians of each public library jurisdiction in the System. Cooperative Library System Advisory Boards are therefore an unnecessary expense and layer of administration that should be eliminated.

Proposed legislation: Repeal Education Code Sections 18747(b), 18749, and 18750.

ELIMINATE LIBRARY SYSTEM REFERENCE SERVICES

Education Code Section 18741 provides for State funding of reference service support to libraries by Cooperative Library Systems. The service was designed to respond to library patron reference questions referred to the System by a patron's public library in cases when a patron's library could not answer his or her reference question. Library system reference services use has declined dramatically in recent years with the increase in Internet use and the corresponding increasing availability of online information resources which have all but eliminated the need for this type of service.

Proposed legislation: Repeal Education Code Section 18741.

ELIMINATE LIBRARY SYSTEM SPECIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Education Code Section 18742 provides that a Cooperative Library System may apply to the California Library Services Board for funds for special services programs on a system-wide basis. Special services programs are projects establishing or improving service to the underserved of all ages. There is no State funding for this program. System special services programs have been funded by the California State Library using federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds. With no State funding available,

and with an alternative source of funding, this provision serves no purpose and should be eliminated.

Proposed legislation: Repeal Education code Section 18742.

ELIMINATE THE LIBRARY OF CALIFORNIA ACT

The Library of California Act (Chapter 948, Statutes of 1998, Education Code Section 18800 et seq.) was an ambitious attempt to enhance free and convenient access to all of California's library resources and services for all Californians. An elaborate and expensive program of library resource and information sharing was envisioned whereby the State would compensate individual libraries for services provided to patrons of other libraries throughout the State in efforts to make the resources of the State's public libraries, school libraries, and private libraries available to all Californians. In order to fully implement the many extensive resource and information sharing programs embodied in the Act it was estimated that full implementation of the Act would cost an additional \$60 million annually in General Fund appropriations.

Now, 14 years on, virtually none of the Library of California's ambitious resource and information sharing programs have been funded or implemented. The California Library Association, sponsor of the legislation that created the Library of California Act, and most librarians realize that there never will be General Fund dollars to implement the programs embodied in the Library of California Act. In addition, the methods and standards set forth for resource sharing were written before the development of new technologies and the explosion of online content. Efficiencies that can be obtained through these advances are not realized in the Act. The intent of the Library of California Act was to replace the California Library Services Act once it was fully implemented. With dated standards and processes, and the prospect for funding its programs non-existent, the Act should be repealed. The California Library Services Act with some revisions can accomplish and support equal access for all Californians.

Proposed legislation: Repeal Education Section 18800, et seq., The Library of California Act.

AMEND EDUCATION CODE SECTION 18720

If the Library of California Act is repealed (see above) the California Library Services Act (Education Code Section 19700, et seq.) will remain as the State's principal statute related to ensuring free and convenient access to public library services. Of primary importance, the governance of the CLSA should continue without interruption. Continuation should be accomplished by transferring the duties of the current members of the Library of California Board to the California Library Services Board. This may be accomplished by amending Education Code Section 18720 concurrently with the repeal of the Library of California Act as follows:

Proposed legislation: Amend Education 18720 by adding subsection (e) as follows:

Members of the Library of California Board appointed pursuant to former Education Code Section 18820 shall continue to serve as members of the California Services Board in their respective appointments until the expiration of their terms.

AMEND EDUCATION CODE SECTION 18725

Education Code Section 18725 refers to the federal Library Services and Construction Act. The current reference should be to the federal Library Services and Technology Act.

Proposed legislation: Amend Education Code Section 18725 by replacing the reference to "Library Services and Construction Act" with "Library Services and Technology Act."

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA Interlibrary Loan, Universal Borrowing, Equal Access Programs

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

Since July 1, 1978, CLSA has supported three programs specifically designed to encourage the sharing of publicly funded library materials throughout the state of California. The Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan (Equal Access & Universal Borrowing) programs have provided partial reimbursements of the increased costs realized when local public and specified non-public libraries extend loan services beyond their normal clientele. This program has greatly increased the individual public library user's access to library resources.

CURRENT STATUS: This program is facing a loss of state funding for a second consecutive year.

To recap the current budget year process, the Governor's proposed budget released in January 2011 for FY 2011/12 zeroed all funding for the TBR Program, a \$10,182,000 reduction (an additional \$2.726 million was reduced, which funded Cooperative Systems). The California Library Association began lobbying efforts in the Senate and Assembly to restore the budget appropriation, resulting in \$8.5 million to CLSA Programs in the May Revision of the budget. At the August 2011 meeting, the Board approved the TBR budget as \$6,182,900, with the remaining (\$2,317,100) to fund Cooperative Library Systems. When the State Budget Act of 2011 was released at the end of June 2011, the \$8.5 million remained intact; however, the funds were attached to SB 121, the Trigger Bill, which could be pulled by the Governor if state revenue forecasts did not reach targeted levels. In December 2011, the Governor pulled the Trigger Bill, eliminating funding for all CLSA programs.

Staff is continuing to collect quarterly TBR data from participating public and non-public libraries so we have up-to-date statistics to provide the Department of Finance (DoF) should funding be restored in future years. First and second quarter Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan transactions data has been submitted. Below are the projected totals for the year and the potential cost to the program, based on rates approved by DoF for FY 2010/11.

Interlibrary Loan	3,446,277	x	\$6.35	\$21,883,859
Direct Loan	11,571,800	x	\$1.17	<u>\$13,539,006</u>
Total needed to fund at 100% of projected transaction levels				\$35,422,865

For fiscal year 2012/13, the Governor did not restore CLSA funding in his proposed budget.

RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE: Updates on actual and revised projections of Interlibrary and Direct Loan program levels.

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA System Reference

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

CURRENT STATUS: The CLSA System Reference Program continues to support regional reference services in the eight (8) CLSA Cooperative Library Systems.

Summary of 2010/11 System Annual Reports

Service Component: General Improvement of Local Reference Service

Exhibit A displays in summary form the performance objectives set by each System for this service component and the reported level of achievement of these objectives. In general Systems provided assistance to member libraries in the following areas: staff training, reference materials development and purchase, and specialized resource identification and location. Overall the achievement of these individually set performance objectives is impressive.

Service Component: Improvement of Reference Service to the Underserved

Exhibit B displays the performance objectives set by each System for the underserved component and the reported achievement levels. Training for member library staff in their targeted populations and subscriptions to online databases were reported as the most common among the eight regions.

Service Component: Interlibrary Reference

In 2010/11 all Systems were able to meet the performance objectives of answering 90% of the questions referred to the System level, and all Systems met the objective of answering 70% within 10 working days (see Exhibit C).

Expenditures: Exhibit D displays CLSA and local funds expended in support of the System Reference Program in 2010/11. Overall, 78% of the total budgeted for System Reference was expended from CLSA funds, and 22% was expended from local funds. See Exhibit E for a summary of local member contributions to the Reference program.

A policy adopted by the Board in August 1985 authorized the charging of System administrative indirect costs against the CLSA System Reference, Communications and Delivery and System Advisory Board program allocations, whereby up to 25% of each service program baseline may be used for Planning, Coordination & Evaluation (PC&E). Exhibit F displays administrative expenditures for the three system-level programs for fiscal year 2010/11.

Staff Liaison: Sandy Habbestad

Doc.#15744

**SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS OF LOCAL REFERENCE SERVICES - FY 2010/11
(CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 20155)
CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORTS**

System	Performance Objectives	Achievement of Performance Objectives
BLACK GOLD	<p>a. Survey staff to determine which types of online or webinar style workshops would work for their current needs.</p> <p>b. Continue to enhance the plan for encouraging use of online database products. Since Black Gold members share many of the same databases, they can combine resources to promote the databases throughout the cooperative. An increase in database usage has been seen in the past several years and Black Gold would like to continue that trend through the current year.</p>	<p>a. Objective modified. An informal survey of Reference Committee members was conducted rather than a full survey of all staff, as originally intended. Because of staff shortages at member libraries, the committee did not feel it was likely staff would be allowed to attend many trainings. All libraries' staff reported difficulty in getting away from the library to attend training and requested webinar training. In addition, recorded webinar training is preferred so it may be viewed at a time convenient to staff members. Areas of interest for training topics included: OverDrive purchasing, OverDrive technical support, Collections HQ, general eBook training, Reference for paraprofessionals and technology trends.</p> <p>b. Objective not met. The only database supported was NoveList. Learning mid-year that state funding to systems was in jeopardy, the administrative council agreed to cancel subscription databases and not continue to promote services they would no longer have.</p>
49/99	<p>a. SCLC will meet the turn-around requirements to provide the information requested in a timely manner. Responses will be relayed to the submitting library's staff.</p> <p>b. 100% of System member public libraries will answer reference requests using System-provided electronic resources and relay the responses to their patrons.</p> <p>c. Reference staff of four or more System member public libraries will</p>	<p>a. Objective met. SCLC met the turn-around requirements and responses were relayed to submitting library staff.</p> <p>b. Objective met. The System purchased a subscription to several databases. All six public library members were issued passwords. Access was available both within the physical library buildings and remotely to all users. The databases are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infotrac Custom 1000 Journals (Gale) • Health & Wellness Resource Center (Gale) • Student Resource Center Gold (Gale) <p>c. Objective partially met. Staff members from three member libraries</p>

<p>49-99 (cont'd)</p>	<p>participate in training sessions to improve their ability to provide reference services to their patrons.</p>	<p>attended training on <i>Fully Engaged Customers Services</i> offered through the Rural Library Initiative. An Infopeople Technology Petting Zoo was hosted by Amador County Library and made available to other members—14 staff members attended. Members also had access to screen casts done by SCLC staff, which are short videos on specific reference weblibliography topics, available through the SCLC website.</p> <p>Reduced staffing and budgets precluded attendance by staff from other 49-99 System libraries.</p>
<p>INLAND</p>	<p>a. Work with all committees and the Administrative Council to determine training needs.</p> <p>b. Identify and schedule appropriate training sessions, utilizing local staff, Infopeople, vendors and other practitioners.</p> <p>c. Raise awareness of and provide mechanism for accessing free resources available from non-public ILS/SIRCULS libraries.</p> <p>d. Redesign the System webpage to make it a useful reference for members.</p> <p>e. Schedule vendor presentations for staff evaluations of databases/products.</p> <p>f. Negotiate consortia database contracts for members.</p> <p>g. Identify grants and submit proposals for products and services to enhance reference activities.</p>	<p>Objective a-g met. In addition, Inland supported the needs of children and teens by providing the following professional development opportunities for staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Young Adult Services planned and presented the all-new Summer Reading Program workshop. The Children’s and Young Adult committees attended the Children’s Literature Council’s workshop, “Old Passions, New Technologies: Children’s and YA Literature in a Web 2.0 World.” • The annual Performer’s Showcase was held in January at the Victoria Gardens Cultural Center. • The Children’s Committee selected Infopeople’s “Clap! Shake! Sing! Creating Musical Story Time to Encourage Emergent Literacy.” • Riverside County Library presented “El Dia de Los Ninos” workshop for all Inland member library staff. <p>Inland also funded two databases: one to help students fins scholarships, college, and career information; and the other was the mango Languages database.</p>
<p>NORTHNET</p>	<p>a. System staff will provide access to reference-training workshops or hold round table discussions that meet the specific needs of individual member libraries and have these in conjunction with the Information Services Committee of Interest meetings when appropriate.</p> <p>b. System staff will coordinate workshops or round tables for all members on appropriate subjects. These could include arranging for Infopeople, OCLC, Staff Development, CORE Reference Fundamentals online, online database, virtual reference, government (such as census), or any other such workshops to be held in the three regions.</p> <p>c. System staff can provide one-on-one brush-up training for individual member librarians for online databases at System headquarters or</p>	<p>a. Objective met. Three training workshops were held on use of a job and computer skill module put in place for NorthNet. Average attendance was 20.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Nine training workshops were held in the region with a total attendance of 135.</p> <p>c. Objective met. One librarian took advantage of this training.</p>

<p>NORTHNET (cont'd)</p>	<p>virtually.</p> <p>d. Member librarians will be invited to attend online workshops to learn about reference tools available.</p> <p>e. System staff will keep track of subject and language requirements for reference questions and report back to member libraries in order to improve local collection development.</p> <p>f. Each sub-region will select two representatives to serve on the NorthNet Library System Information Services Community of Interest. The Community will maintain a balance of urban and rural libraries. The groups will meet in some form at least semi-annually to discuss matters of mutual concern, share information, and participate in mini-workshops or round table discussions. Terms of service will be two years, with staggered start dates.</p> <p>g. Publications will be produced or considered for revision. System staff will publish a monthly calendar of meetings and training events on the webpage, with paper copies distributed as requested. The union list, System Directory of Reference Librarian, will be revised as needed.</p>	<p>d. Objective met. Members were informed of workshops available for free online through Infopeople and other providers. Additionally, System members were invited to attend online conferences at the NorthNet office. A few nearby libraries took advantage of the “free” connection.</p> <p>e. Objective met. Language requirements were discussed with individual librarians and some directors.</p> <p>f. Objective met. A collection development group met online each month for eight months to develop a collection for 27 member libraries to develop the collection and protocol for selection. Most libraries sent members to three workshops to learn how to use then show patrons how to use a job and computer skills online module: two of the workshops were held in rural districts.</p> <p>g. Objective met. The Directory of Member Libraries was updated and made available electronically. A monthly calendar of meetings and training events was published on the System site.</p>
-------------------------------------	---	---

**PACIFIC
LIBRARY
PARTNERSHIP
(PLP)**

- a. A contractual arrangement with SCLC will provide PLP members with second-level reference questions. By outsourcing this service, System staff can focus on providing its services online to support members' information services, outreach and programming.
- b. The member library committees, which focus on meeting the information needs of adults, teens, non-English speakers, and the disabled, will continue meetings to exchange information, sponsor staff training workshops and events for the public, recommend acquisitions, discuss shared problems and successes, and promote interlibrary cooperation. Some of these meetings will take place using *MegaMeeting* (virtual conferencing software), and some will be joint meetings with other committees. Committees will post their trainings and regional events on the PLP calendar. The committees will evaluate their charges, programs, and activities on a regular basis and determine the best strategies for operations in an expanded system environment.

The committees' work is facilitated by the System website and web-based software, such as listservs and *eVanced* for committee training and public events. The *eVanced* links are now incorporated on the PLP calendar. The committee members will market and promote their services to current and prospective library users through initiatives such as community reads and Free2 – www.wearefree2.org, and the Big Box program – www.bigboxprogram.org. The System will publicize these events and services to member library staff through various social media sites to facilitate resource sharing.

- a. Objective met. PLP continued its contract with SCLC to provide assistance for second-level reference questions.
- b. Objective met. Some of the joint committee meetings were PLP Children's Committees Retreat and MOBAC Committee for Adult Reference with SPLAMBA. The BALIS Adult and E-Services and MOBAC Adult and Children's Committees evaluated their charges, programs, and activities annually.

Many of the committee members marketed and promoted their services to current and prospective library users through initiatives, such as eight member libraries' community reads, e.g. Silicon Valley Reads and PLS' One Book One Community. In June 2010, the PLP Reference Center e-newsletter, *Search*, was replaced by *PLP Publincs*, which now focuses on PLP services for its members.

Because of budget cuts, staff ceased the maintenance of the PLP Reference Center's website, Twitter posts, and blog. PLP's e-newsletterPro software, which is more powerful and flexible than the Constant Contact and email marketing tool included in the Plan of Service, was upgraded and redeployed instead.

The PLP Staff Development Committee sponsored two workshops for member staff:

- *Future of Libraries*, September 2010: e-book trends and challenges, post-Dewey classification, free cloud computing tools for libraries, and innovations in library social networking.
- *Can't We All Just Get Along? Managing Conflict with Co-Workers and Customers*, April 2011

MOBAC Committees sponsored staff trainings by member library staff:

- Reference Committee: *e-books, Altarama RefChatter, and the Future of Reference*, October 2010; and *Jing and the Camatasia Relay*, March 2011
- Technical Committee: *Mobile Apps Technology*, December 2010

<p>SJVLS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. At least 15 local staff members will receive one-on-one training related to the answers of referred questions. b. Improve <u>News & Clues</u> newsletter by expanding content and increasing frequency. The reference portion will continue to contain purchase suggestions and articles on effective use of local and Web-based resources. <u>News & Clues</u> will be published on the system website. c. Directory of regional libraries belonging to the Heartland Regional Library Network will be available on the web. d. The Reference Committee will hold reference source review sessions to facilitate information exchange and cooperative purchasing at each of its regularly scheduled meetings. e. The Reference Committee will coordinate identification of online database needs and coordinate evaluation and recommendation of databases for system-wide purchase. f. The Reference Committee, working with the Collection Development Committee, will identify online reference works for system purchase. g. The Reference Committee will facilitate at least one training session on a system-purchased database. h. Internet access is available to all branches. A System home page is maintained and SJVLS staff assists member libraries with development and maintenance of their own web sites. i. Locally produced databases to answer common questions, such as the sheet music/song book index, the vertical file index, and the index of antiques and collectibles magazines will be available on the Web. 	<p>During the course of FY 2010-2011, SJVLS made a number of significant organizational changes that impacted some of these goals. Because many members had limited funds for travel, the Administrative Council disbanded a number of committees—this included the Reference Committee. Some of their functions were shifted to the new Electronic Resources Committee. Other functions were eliminated. At the same time, toward the end of the year, the remaining reference librarian position was eliminated from SJVLS. Services continue through a Senior Library Assistant, and other professional staff in the system office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective not met. Training continues to be underprovided due to the limited travel funding. SJVLS members are looking for ways to use Infopeople and other web-based training to address these funding limitations. b. Objective met. A fiftieth anniversary edition of <u>News & Clues</u> was published, but it was the last issue. It was decided to discontinue this publication since so much of its purpose has been eliminated through Internet resources and other tools. c. Objective met. The web pages for the SJVLS and Heartland Regional Library Network were kept up to date. The SJVLS Web site (http://www.sjvls.org) provides links to tools developed to aid local libraries which includes song and antiques indexes and Ben's Almanac and web-based access to materials from the vertical files of SJVIS. d.-g. Objectives partially met. The Electronic Resources Committee now coordinates identification of online database needs and coordinates evaluation and recommendation of databases for system-wide purchase. Their mandate has been expanded to include mobile devices, eBooks, and other new trends in the dissemination of information. However, it should be noted that budget reductions have forced the elimination of more than \$300,000 in system resources. h. Objectives met. SJVLS continues to maintain the System homepage. Much of the effort this year was focused on the transition to Drupal from HTML. It is anticipated that the new System website will be completed in the fall of 2011. At that time, staff will then begin to transition other member libraries to the new Drupal server. i. Objective met. SJVLS continues to sustain some of the locally produced databases to answer common questions, specifically the sheet music/song
---------------------	---	---

<p>SJVLS (cont'd)</p>		<p>book index. The effectiveness of these resources will be evaluated in the future.</p> <p>While many of these changes have turned away from some of the more traditional aspects of second level reference service, SJVLS will continue to provide resources and look for new and effective means of supplementing member based reference services.</p>
<p>SERRA</p>	<p>a. Research Center staff will present orientation tours promoting reference services and explaining procedures, as requested by member libraries. Outreach, with emphasis on visits to member libraries by Serra Reference staff, will be held to promote system services, train staff, and get feedback from users.</p> <p>b. System staff will continue to improve the Serra web site with an emphasis on making it a reference tool for member libraries.</p> <p>c. Serra's Research Center will distribute information on resources and news via Serra's web site.</p> <p>d. Member libraries will send reference requests and receive answers electronically.</p> <p>e. Staff will be available five days per week via telephone, computer, and in person to consult on local libraries' questions.</p> <p>f. The Adult Services Committee shall meet regularly, with Serra staff attending and providing assistance and information as needed.</p> <p>g. System staff will work on reference refresher workshops for system library employees. Representative from appropriate organizations such as Califa will be present at meetings for updates as needed. Serra will continue to work with the San Diego County Public Law Library on organizing workshops for Serra libraries.</p> <p>h. Staff will answer virtual reference questions via email chat and texting, provide and will answer second-tier virtual reference questions by answering follow-up questions.</p>	<p>a. Objective met. Outreach programs were initiated and completed. Orientation visits to the Serra office and tours of the San Diego Public Library were given.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Serra redesigned and improved its website; information was continually updated. An interactive map of Serra libraries is available online. A web page for the IMLS Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program was continually updated with information about program requirements, events, online forms, and workshop resources.</p> <p>c. Objective met. System staff continued to compile and update the "Answers" database and maintained it online. "Answers" is a list of local, state and federal elected officials, population and cost of living data. Member library fines and fee schedules are updated regularly on the website.</p> <p>d. Objective met. 95% of the requests from member libraries were submitted electronically, and 5% by fax. Serra staff regularly trained and encouraged member library staff to submit their questions via the Serra web site.</p> <p>e. Objective met. Research Center staffing was available in person, via telephone and virtually during business hours, five days a week.</p> <p>f. Objective met. The Adult Services Committee held regular meetings, with Serra staff attending and providing assistance and information as needed.</p> <p>g. Objective met. Imperial Valley libraries held a three-day reference workshop in the summer of 2010 paid by LSTA funds. San Diego Public Law Library partnered with Serra to present a "What To Do If You Get a Legal Question" workshop in June 2011.</p> <p>h. Objective met. The Serra Resource Librarian answered virtual reference questions via AskNow on a weekly basis.</p> <p>In addition, Serra participated in a disaster response network for libraries in San Diego and Imperial Counties (SILDRN). SILDRN sponsors a web</p>

<p>SERRA (cont'd)</p>		<p>page and makes available stockpiles of disaster supplies in San Diego and Imperial County locations. The System Coordinator is a member of the Board.</p>
<p>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LIBRARY COOPERATIVE (SCLC)</p>	<p>a. SCLC will coordinate all workshops, information exchanges and guest/host programs as planned by individual SCLC interest groups.</p> <p>b. SCLC staff will record and make available online short (< 10 minutes) videos highlighting websites for selected subjects throughout the year. At least 12 videos will be recorded. Library staff will be able to view as their schedules allow.</p> <p>c. SCLC will continue to provide online training sessions for member library staff. The SCLC Reference Center will offer Internet classes for member library staff, either in computer labs in the various member libraries or as online workshops.</p> <p>The reference materials for the online classes are posted on the SCLC website for access by staff that are unable to attend.</p>	<p>a. Objectives met. The SCLC interest groups sponsored 8 continuing education programs. The Children's Services interest group sponsored a Performers Showcase with 121 attendees. The Young Adult interest group sponsored Programming on a Shoestring: A Young Adult Share Fair with 22 attendees. In addition, 6 structured exchanges were sponsored by the System interest groups. These structured exchanges, which are planned to include broad participation in the exchange of handbooks, policies, documents and written documentation, are considered one of the most useful of the interest group activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Audiovisual interest group had two structured exchanges: 1) E-books and a discussion on IT groups, and 2) The state budget and what that means for SCLC libraries. • The Children's Services interest group had two structured exchanges: 1) Performer's Resource directory, and 2) What's new and/or challenging about your summer reading program this year. • The Young Adult interest group had two structured exchanges: 1) Funding and Programming, and 2) Summer Reading Plans. <p>b. Objective met. SCLC staff recorded 13 five-to-ten minute instructional screencasts posted on YouTube that highlighted websites for selected subjects or instructions for using SCLC resources. A few included: At-Risk Teens in Crisis; Cash Aid and Employment; Sites for Seniors; Resources for Job Hunters; Finding Royalty-Free Monologues and Plays; and Rating schools. This format has been highly effective as a method for training, substantially increasing the number of staff trained. At the end of FY 2010/11, the screencasts have been viewed 1,593 times.</p> <p>c. Objective not met. Due to a reduction in staff, the SCLC Reference Center was unable to present any webinars for FY 2010/11. Instead, from December 2010 to June 2011, the Reference Center published an online newsletter, featuring SCLC Reference Center services, favorite reference resources, and news of interest to reference librarians. Also, the Reference Center published the popular <i>SCLC Tax Guide for 2010 Income Tax Returns</i>, which lists taxpayer assistance resources, sources for tax forms (including Internet sources), and other information to assist libraries during tax season. Member libraries receive this resource by email and it was available on the SCLC website.</p> <p>SCLC sponsored several workshops held in-person rather than online: Microsoft Word 2007 (2 sessions); Stress Management (2 sessions); Microsoft Excel; Technology Petting Zoo (3 sessions); and Coaching, Counseling and Mentoring.</p>

<p>SCLC (cont'd)</p>	<p>d. To promote and clarify the reference activities of the SCLC Reference Center to its member libraries, the Reference Center will offer a one-hour "Introduction to the SCLC Reference Center" presentation to the Reference staff of any requesting member library, and also available on the SCLC website. The SCLC Reference Center will offer tours of the Central Library of LAPL to highlight their unique reference sources that are available to all SCLC member libraries through the Reference Center.</p>	<p>d. Objective not met. Due to a reduction in staff, the SCLC Reference Center was unable to present a one-hour webinar for FY 2010/11 or offer tours of the LAPL-Central Library. However, staff produced a screencast posted on YouTube that provided instructions on how to use the online SCLC Reference Resources Directory, which has been viewed 106 times this fiscal year.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--

**SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS OF REFERENCE SERVICES TO THE UNDERSERVED - FY 2010/11
(CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 20155)
CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORTS**

System	Performance Objectives	Achievement of Performance Objectives
BLACK GOLD	<p>a. Attendees at workshops will be able to use what they learned to create programs that will attract teenaged participants</p> <p>b. Workshop attendees will be able to identify appropriate methods of working with low-level teen readers.</p>	<p>a. Objective met. The System held an Infopeople workshop, "Beyond the Bookshelf: Teen Programming" with 23 attendees.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Staff strengthen and broaden library teen programming and outreach repertoire. Program ideas were presented along with exercises, sample programs, policies, planning with teens, community partners, new funding sources, checklists, evaluation tools, and a bibliography. In addition ten staff of member libraries attended eight Infopeople workshops.</p>
49/99	<p>a. SCLC will provide responses within 10 business days as required by CLSA.</p> <p>b. 100% of member libraries will utilize system-provided electronic resources on behalf of geographically isolated patrons.</p> <p>c. At least four (4) member public libraries will participate in training opportunities.</p>	<p>a. Objective met. SCLC provided responses within 10 days, as required by CLSA.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Subscriptions to three databases were purchased and six public library members were issued passwords.</p> <p>c. Objective met. The Rural Library Initiative offered training on Fully Engaged Customer Service. Staff members from Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Amador Counties attended. Amador County Library hosted Infopeople's Technology Petting Zoo; 14 staff members attended, including 3 from Calaveras County.</p>
INLAND	<p>The underserved populations were determined to be the economically disadvantaged and unemployed, those over 65 years of age, those with limited English skills, the functionally illiterate and the geographically isolated.</p>	<p>Objective met. ILS sponsored Infopeople workshops "Helping Library Users Look for Work" and "Customer Friendly is More than an Attitude." The redesigned ILS webpage makes volunteer opportunities readily accessible for the baby boom generation looking for ways to be meaningfully engaged in their communities. The online language database assists those retirees who are traveling. ILS negotiated on behalf of its member to subscribe to the Mango Languages database, which includes ESL instructions in fourteen native languages. Access is available from library computers and remotely. ILS provided targeted training, updated its webpage, and provided online resources to its isolated member libraries. ILS members were able to participate in the Infopeople's E-Rate Simplified Workshop, which nine people attended. The ILS literacy committee launched the 1st Inland Library System W2W (Writer to Writer) Challenge in March 2011. Inland Library System sponsored the luncheon and the gift card prize for the winners and the Riverside County Library sponsored the publication</p>

Exhibit B

<p>INLAND (cont'd)</p>		<p>and printing of the books, which were the letters written by the adult learners participating in the W2W challenge. Hemet Library hosted the recognition event held on June 25th, 2011. The ILS literacy committee coordinated its biannual Professional Development workshop in May 2011 for the literacy programs in the Inland Empire. The workshop provides opportunities for coordinators and tutors to hear about new teaching strategies and also share resources and expertise.</p> <p>LSTA funds paid for staff training sessions to help library staff deal with library customers in difficult economic times. LSTA funding also provided a career/jobs database "Career Transitions" for all 102 library locations. Job seekers were able to access the database, look and apply for jobs, create resumes, even research new careers both in-house and remotely.</p>
<p>NORTHNET</p>	<p><u>ETHNIC MINORITIES</u></p> <p>a. System staff will continue to share collection development information and discuss appropriate topics related to the Northern California's ethnic communities with both the Information Services and Youth Services Committees of Practice.</p> <p>b. The System will include items of interest on ethnic minorities on the Information Services and Youth forums and the System web page.</p> <p>c. The System will continue to support Spanish language collection development through the distribution of resource lists for the purchase of books or media from the Guadalajara Book Fair, or from other appropriate Spanish language book fairs and venues.</p> <p><u>CHILDREN</u></p> <p>a. A database of special collections such as puppets, big books, flannel board stories, etc. will be created and posted on the NLS website. Pre-packaged puppet shows with all the supporting materials will be developed to support summer reading and holiday themes.</p> <p>b. Identify topics of interest, select and implement an annual Youth Services workshop in each region.</p> <p>c. System staff will communicate on ground and online training</p>	<p><u>ETHNIC MINORITIES</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. Information has continued to be shared on Spanish language collection development from Brodart and other vendors.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Appropriate items were passed along via listservs and individually.</p> <p>c. Objective met. The System encouraged participation at Northern California Spanish Language vendor fair. Lists were distributed upon request from vendors associated with the Guadalajara Book Fair.</p> <p><u>CHILDREN</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. A database of special collections including puppets, big books, flannel board stories and other story hour support materials was created and will soon be posted on the NLS website. Five pre-packaged puppet shows with all the supporting materials (book, puppets, props, script, costume for puppeteer, flannel board and display materials) were created.</p> <p>b. Objective met. The Youth Services Community of Practice listserv was used to identify and select a youth services training opportunity. In April the Infopeople workshop Clap! Shake! Play! Sing! was presented at the Napa City-County Library and at the Redding Branch of the Shasta Public Libraries.</p> <p>c. Objective met. Announcements of workshops and online training</p>

<p>NORTHNET (cont'd)</p>	<p>opportunities to Youth Services staff in constituent libraries.</p> <p><u>DISABLED</u></p> <p>a. Member libraries will continue to develop their collections to aid the disabled and their caregivers.</p> <p><u>GEOGRAPHICALLY ISOLATED</u></p> <p>a. All questions received from geographically isolated areas of the System service area will be answered at the System's Reference Center and other outside sources such as Virtual Reference Centers, First Source at LAPL, or contracted sources such as art and poetry experts.</p> <p>b. Access to more resources will be provided through access to library catalogs on CalCat and SuperSearch.</p> <p>c. Publicize online databases for virtual reference 24/7.</p>	<p>opportunities presented by Infopeople, the Association of Children's Librarians of Northern California (ACL), and other appropriate agencies were distributed via the Youth Services Community of Practice listserv.</p> <p><u>DISABLED</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. The Information Services Community of Interest was used to distribute information.</p> <p><u>GEOGRAPHICALLY ISOLATED</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. Continued effort was made to give special service including reference, delivery and discounted purchases of online databases with technical support as needed.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Additionally four public libraries in the North State region of NLS migrated to KOHA to form a shared ILS to improve resource sharing.</p> <p>c. Objective met. Libraries were encouraged to promote use of their online resources through adding widgets produced by the database vendors.</p>
<p>PACIFIC LIBRARY PARTNERSHIP (PLP)</p>	<p>Speakers of Limited English or English as a Second Language (ESL) and members of "emerging majority" ethnic groups.</p> <p>a. One of the System's periodical vendors, Gale/Cengage, has created a "location code" that allows foreign language speakers to use a search interface in their language for all of the periodical content to InfoTrac. Most PLP libraries subscribe to <i>InfoTrac</i>, including its Spanish-language product, <i>Informé</i>.</p> <p>b. The PLP information service committees will seek out and evaluate new databases which will help them fulfill their goal of providing databases that have a focus on the information needs of specific multicultural communities. Committee meetings will facilitate the sharing of information about these databases using technology that will create a virtual environment.</p> <p>c. The WebOPAC of many member libraries is Innovative Interfaces which enables searching for library materials in Spanish and Chinese. The choice of these language interfaces was determined by educational statistics identifying languages spoken in the home.</p>	<p>Speakers of Limited English or English as a Second Language (ESL) and members of "emerging majority" ethnic groups.</p> <p>a. Objective met. The PLP Information Services Committee provided oversight to the PLP WebOPAC, including the language interfaces and the ability to apply language limits to catalog searches.</p> <p>b. Objective met. The PLP System staff: 1) produced the staff directory which includes the listing of staff skills in languages other than English; and 2) worked with Califa and the member library committees to coordinate trials and quotes for databases and services to identify potential databases that targeted their multicultural communities. PLP member libraries were particularly interested in Mango Languages and Chinese-language newspapers and magazines.</p> <p>c. Objective met. PLP System staff assisted in coordinating with vendor PR departments, printers, etc., for brochures and with web software vendors to develop tools for training staff and facilitating communication with diverse populations. The Gale/Cengage databases, for which PLP assisted in coordinating for its members, has</p>

<p>PLP (cont'd)</p>	<p>Persons with Mobility Problems (disabled, older adults, etc.) or Hearing or Sight-Impaired PLP is working with the Bay Area Disability Services Librarians to develop a plan for marketing library services that are available remotely to persons with mobility issues and share it with all PLP libraries.</p> <p>Adults and Teens with Limited Reading Skills PLP libraries will continue to offer literacy tutoring for adults, and many will continue to participate in the Early Learning for Families (ELF) program. The libraries that have jail literacy programs will continue them.</p>	<p>a transliteration feature in several languages for search queries and results and the PLP-subsidized subscription includes its Spanish-language product, <i>Informé</i>. PLP System staff assisted in disseminating information about children's story hours in different languages.</p> <p>Persons with Mobility Problems (disabled, older adults, etc.) or Hearing or Sight-Impaired Objective partially met. PLP worked with the Bay Area Disability Services Librarians (BADSL) to share suggestions for service and access for persons with mobility issues. BADSL is a very active group which partners with agencies serving the disabled to publicize workshops for staff and the public and to train staff for accessible story hours. Budget cuts prevented the development of any formal plan for marketing library services that are available remotely to persons with mobility issues. However, PLP member libraries are aware of the means to make their websites ADA compliant.</p> <p>Adults and Teens with Limited Reading Skills Objective met. PLP libraries continued to offer literacy tutoring for adults, and many continued to participate in the Early Learning for Families (ELF) program, which is funded through LSTA. The libraries that have jail literacy programs continued them, finding grants and partnering with volunteer groups, school districts, and mental health services. Project Second Chance (PSC), the adult literacy program for Contra Costa County Library, was accredited by ProLiteracy, the largest nongovernmental organization of adult basic education and literacy programs in the world. Family Place Library Program grants were awarded to San Mateo County Library, Santa Clara City Library, and Sunnyvale Public Library.</p>
<p>SJVLS</p>	<p>a. Reference questions from patrons in geographically isolated areas will be answered according to the same performance objectives set for the System Interlibrary Reference component – that is, there will be no difference in time or quality of the answer because a patron is geographically isolated.</p> <p>b. Questions from non-English speaking and handicapped patrons will be answered in a language or format they require.</p> <p>c. Questions from members on the availability of community services in the System service area can be channeled through the San Joaquin Valley Information System (SJVIS).</p> <p>d. Local reference staff will be able to assist patrons in using tools available in the patron's native language.</p>	<p>a-d. Objective met. All referral services through SJVLS continue, and all member libraries continue to work to provide language skilled staff to assist the underserved populations.</p>

<p>SERRA</p>	<p>The underserved group identified for FY 2010/11 was the geographically isolated in rural areas, specifically in and near the Imperial Valley, including children and teens.</p> <p>a. Serra will offer reference services for staff of rural libraries.</p> <p>b. Serra staff and committees will assist in organizing reference training program for the staffs of rural libraries.</p> <p>c. Serra will provide a centralized interlibrary loan service for reference of materials using local funds.</p> <p>d. Contacts will be initiated with appropriate groups to explore possibilities for cooperation and the promotion of library and system services; Serra will participate in local library organizations.</p> <p>e. Delivery of reference materials in a timely manner will be maintained.</p> <p>f. Interlibrary loan fill rate of 90% and average turn around time of 7 days for Imperial Valley libraries.</p>	<p>a. Objective met. 12% of all reference questions came from the Imperial Valley libraries. Serra was able to expand their member libraries' resources and fully answer their clients' information needs using the extensive holdings of the San Diego Public Library, the resources at San Diego State and UCSD, and the Internet. The Serra website gave Imperial County members immediate and up to date contact information on elected government officials in every jurisdiction of the two counties, as well as member library information. Reference questions referred from children and teens were answered by Serra staff.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Imperial valley libraries held a 3 day reference workshop paid by LSTA funds as part of the Reference Re-Envisioned grant project. Local library directors provided training; all Imperial Valley staff was able to attend the sessions.</p> <p>c. Objective met. Serra provided an ILL service for reference materials using local funds.</p> <p>d. Objective met. Imperial Valley libraries participated in the Children's and Young Adult Services Committee's program funded partially by the SAB and developed by graduates of the State Library Eureka program: "The Fun Facts of Early Literacy: Communicating with Parents Through Storytimes."</p> <p>The Librarians for Diverse Communities (LDC) project funded by the IMLS Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program addressed the need for librarians who can serve the diverse and underserved populations of San Diego and Imperial Counties. Year two of the LDC project assisted 24 Serra support staff members with scholarships, technology stipends, mentors, networking and professional development opportunities. Students and mentors attended CLA, ALA midwinter and the annual ALA conferences.</p> <p>e. Objective met. Reference materials and answers to questions were delivered electronically, via fax or courier within 4 day average turn around time.</p> <p>f. Objective met. The fill rate for interlibrary loan to Imperial Valley was 90% with a 4 day average turn around time for physical delivery of materials to Imperial County.</p>
<p>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LIBRARY COOPERATIVE</p>	<p><u>SERVICE TO THE LIMITED & NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING</u></p> <p>a. Branch-specific resources are intended to assist local reference staff in providing more effective reference service to the limited and non-English populations in the service area by giving them a central resource to</p>	<p><u>SERVICE TO THE LIMITED & NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. The SCLC Reference Center keeps track of member library international language collections and staff fluency in the SCLC Reference Resources Directory. This System-specific resource is</p>

<p>SCLC (cont'd)</p>	<p>consult when they need to direct limited and non-English speakers to collections in their native languages or to staff who are fluent in their native languages.</p> <p>b. The SCLC Reference Center provides access to the resources of the International Languages Department collection of LAPL, as well as any relevant multilingual library finding tools, bibliographies, flyers, etc. that are produced by the International Languages staff at LAPL.</p> <p><u>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED</u> At least one video will be recorded that focuses on job/career resources available online that staff can use to assist their users. SCLC staff will become familiar with related resources so that they can assist member library staff in leading users to the right websites and other online resources.</p> <p><u>SERVICE TO CHILDREN</u></p> <p>a. The <i>SCLC Performers' Resource Directory</i> will be continuously updated by the Children's Services interest group members. The directory is a central resource that staff can consult to choose performers who will attract the under-served populations in their communities.</p> <p>b. At least one workshop on a topic relevant to the needs of Children's librarians/staff will be coordinated by SCLC staff working with the Children's Services interest group.</p> <p>c. Continued promotion of the SCLC Reference Center via website postings and at meetings of the SCLC Children's Services interest group will continue to increase use of the SCLC Reference Center by Children's Services reference staff so that children's information needs can be met, instilling understanding and appreciation of library services.</p> <p>d. At least two videos will be recorded and made available to all member libraries that focus on online reference resources useful to the children's services staff in SCLC member libraries.</p>	<p>intended to assist local reference staff in providing more effective service to the limited and non-English speaking population in the service area. In addition, a screencast on how to use the Directory, which was produced by the Reference Center and posted on YouTube, featured the language Collections and Staff Fluency sections.</p> <p>b. Objective met. SCLC continued to handle System requests for information that utilize the resources of the International Languages Department of LAPL, and made available throughout the System any multilingual library finding tools, bibliographies, flyers, etc., that were produced by the International Languages staff at LAPL.</p> <p><u>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED</u> Objective met: SCLC Reference produced three screencasts covering resources that address the economic needs of patrons during these difficult times. These included: Career Transitions Overview of the Gale database; Resources for Job Hunters, featuring the Los Angeles Public Library's Job Hunting Guide (collection of over 200 employment-related websites and resources); and Cash Aid and Employment Help, which included financial assistance resources available through CalWorks.</p> <p><u>SERVICE TO CHILDREN</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. The <i>Performers' Resource Directory</i> continues to be updated as new performers are identified. The <i>Directory</i> was posted on Google Docs. The entire <i>Directory</i> was reviewed and updated in February 2011.</p> <p>b. Objective met. The Children's Services interest group held their annual Performers Showcase, with over 100 in attendance.</p> <p>c. Objective met.</p> <p>d. Objective met. The SCLC Reference Center produced two screencasts of interest to children's service staff: Finding a Children's Author and How's My Kid's School Doing: Searching Dataquest to find API, AYP and SAT scores for California schools.</p>
--------------------------	---	---

<p>SCLC (cont'd)</p>	<p><u>SERVICE TO YOUNG ADULTS</u></p> <p>a. In conjunction with the SCLC Young Adult Services interest group, SCLC will conduct at least one workshop/information exchange to further the professional skills of staff involved in service to young adults, focusing on developing community partnerships. At least one webinar will be scheduled on a topic of interest to the YA staff, highlight websites and other online resources that will help the YA staff serve the information needs of that community.</p>	<p><u>SERVICE TO YOUNG ADULTS</u></p> <p>a. Objective met. The SCLC Young Adult Services interest group held a workshop YA Share Fair 2011. The SCLC Reference Center was unable to hold a webinar of interest to YA librarians, but instead produced a screencast on At-Risk Teens in Crisis, which was posted on YouTube. The screencast has been viewed 41 times this fiscal year.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

System Interlibrary Reference Program Objectives
 System Program Annual Report – FY 2010/11
 (California Administrative Code Section 20157)

- A. Answers shall be provided for 90% of all questions referred from member libraries.
 B. 70% of answers shall be returned to the originating member library within 10 working days of the question having been transmitted by that library into the system's reference referral structure.

System	# of Reference Questions	A - % Answered	B - % Answered Within 10 days	A - # of Questions Answered	B - # of Answers Returned Within 10 Working Days
BLACK GOLD	3	100%	100%	3	3
49-99	6	100%	100%	6	6
INLAND	339	99.9%	77.7%	337	262
NORTHNET	395	100%	99.3	395	392
PLP	373	100%	100%	373	373
SJVLS	241	95%	94%	229	215
SERRA	893	99%	98%	884	866
SCLC	754	98%	90%	739	665
TOTALS	3004	99%	95%	2966	2782

- (a) All systems were able to provide answers for 90% or more of all questions referred from member libraries. The average percentage of answers provided was 99 % or 2,966 questions were answered in total.
 (b) All systems were able to achieve 70% of the answers returned to the originating member library within 10 working days. The average percentage was 95% or 2,782 questions were returned to the originating member library within 10 working days.

Summary of System Reference Expenditures for FY 2010/11
 System Uniform Expenditures Report

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	\$ 41,645	\$ 185,393	227,038
49-99	49,634	3,171	52,805
INLAND	132,036	991	133,027
NORTHNET	250,891	1,141	252,032
PLP	250,000	0	250,000
SJVLS	82,560	92,629	175,189
SERRA	100,561	3,790	104,351
SCLC	331,057	71,784	402,841
TOTAL	\$1,238,384	\$ 358,899	\$1,597,283

**LOCAL MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAMS
FY 2010/11**

System	CLSA System Reference			CLSA System Communications and Delivery		
	Percent of CLSA Expenditures for Reference	Percent of Local Funds for Reference	Total Expenditures for Reference	Percent of CLSA Expenditure for Comm. & Delivery	Percent of Local Funds for Comm. & Delivery	Total Expenditures for Comm. & Delivery
BLACK GOLD	18%	82%	\$ 227,038	59%	41%	81,000
49-99	94%	6%	52,805	92%	8%	42,066
INLAND	99%	1%	133,027	100%	0%	97,236
NORTHNET	99.5%	0.5%	252,032	46%	54%	522,885
PLP	100%	0%	250,000	95%	5%	175,385
SJVLS	47%	53%	175,189	17%	83%	364,271
SERRA	96%	4%	104,351	72%	28%	85,707
SCLC	82%	18%	402,841	84%	16%	254,069
TOTAL PERCENT	78%	22%	100%	57%	43%	100%
TOTAL EXPEND.	\$ 1,238,384	\$ 358,899	\$ 1,597,283	\$ 926,118	\$ 696,501	\$1,622,619

2010/11 Expenditures:

	CLSA	Local	LSTA	Total
Administration	545,200 (17%)	2,629,326 ¹ (82%)	46,752 (1%)	3,221,278
Reference	1,238,384 (78%)	358,899 ² (22%)		1,597,283
Comm. & Delivery	926,118 (57%)	696,501 ³ (43%)		1,622,619
Advisory Boards	16,148 (97%)	551 ⁴ (3%)		16,699
Total	2,725,850 (42%)	3,685,277 (57%)	46,752 (1%)	\$6,457,879

¹All systems contributed local funds to support system administration.

²All but one system (PLP) used local funds to support Reference.

³All but one system (Inland) contributed local funds to support Communications and Delivery.

⁴Two systems (Black Gold and 49-99) used local funds to support the SAB program.

Summary of System Administration Expenditures for FY 2010/11
 System Uniform Expenditures Report

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	\$ 22,701	\$ 967,619	990,320
49-99	22,353	61,511	83,864
INLAND	57,719	56,570	114,289
NORTHNET	124,340	237,468	361,808
PLP	104,646	480,485	585,131
SJVLS	36,214	173,962	210,176
SERRA	41,007	52,506	93,513
SCLC	136,220	599,205	735,425
TOTAL	\$ 545,200	\$2,629,326	\$3,174,526

LSTA funds spent on System Administration NorthNet: \$42,224
 Serra: \$4,528

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA System Communications and Delivery Program

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

CURRENT STATUS: The CLSA System Communications and Delivery Program continues to support the sharing of resources among the members of California's eight (8) CLSA Cooperative Library Systems.

Summary of 2010/11 System Annual Reports

Performance Objectives: Under the policies adopted by the Board, each System is required to adopt two performance objectives for System Communications and Delivery in a format prescribed by the State Board. Additional performance objectives may be adopted by individual Systems to meet their own needs for management information and service improvement. Exhibit A displays performance objectives adopted by each System for the 2010/11 fiscal year and the degree of success in meeting each objective.

Workload: Exhibit B displays a summary of actual workload statistics for the 2010/11 fiscal year. Overall, statistics have decreased from the previous year—26% in the number of messages communicated and 11% in the number of items delivered.

Expenditures: Exhibit C displays CLSA and local funds expended in support of System Communications and Delivery (C&D) services in 2010/11. Overall, 57% of the total budgeted for System C&D was expended from CLSA funds, and 43% was expended from local funds. See Exhibit D for a summary of local member contributions to the C&D program.

Staff Liaison: Sandy Habbestad

**SUMMARY OF 2010/11 COMMUNICATIONS & DELIVERY PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORTS**

System	Performance Objectives	Achievement of Performance Objectives
BLACK GOLD	<p>a. 90% of intrasystem messages will be received by addressees within 24 hours (from time of sending message to receipt of message).</p> <p>b. 98% of items sent by intrasystem delivery will be delivered within 2 working days.</p>	<p>a. Objective met through local funding of communications. The electronic communications used by Black Gold member libraries to facilitate resource sharing were entirely funded by local monies. Black Gold's C&D allocation from CLSA supports only the delivery service essential to resource sharing. Black Gold has an internal web page for posting committee minutes and agendas, plus other information for library members. The internal website usage has increased with over 300 hits per month.</p> <p>Black Gold also relies on email distribution lists for communities to exchange information expediently.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Black Gold continues to contract with a courier service to provide full-route delivery. The number of items going into delivery has leveled off this year so delivery did not need expanding.</p>
49/99	<p>a. 90% of intrasystem messages will be received by addressees within 48 hours (time of origin to time of receipt).</p> <p>b. 90% of items sent by intrasystem delivery will be delivered within 3 working days.</p>	<p>a. Objective exceeded, due to email being the primary method of communication.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Lodi and Stockton-San Joaquin received deliveries three or more days per week. Other members received 1-2 days a week delivery.</p>
INLAND	<p>a. 95% of intrasystem messages will be received by addressees within 24 hours.</p> <p>b. 95% of items sent by intrasystem delivery will be delivered within 1 working day. Existing delivery stops and loads will take place annually to assure the best use of available resources.</p>	<p>a. Objective met.</p> <p>b. Objective met. Items were sent by System delivery and connecting member library branch delivery services whenever possible. A delivery connection between Inland and SCLC facilitated the movement of materials between Southern California libraries in Orange, Los Angeles, Ventura, Riverside, San Bernardino and Inyo counties.</p>

NORTHNET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 100% of intrasystem messages will be received by addressees within 24 hours (time of origin to time of receipt, next working day). b. 90% of items sent by intrasystem delivery will be received within 4 working days. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objectives met because all libraries have email, fax machines, and/or ability to scan documents. b. Objective met. All libraries have either access to System delivery, USPS, or UPS.
PUBLIC LIBRARY PARTNERSHIP (PLP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 96% of the intrasystem messages will be received within 24 hours. b. 95% of total items delivered will be received within 3 working days. c. 98% of labeled items for special rush handling will be delivered to the receiving library by noon of the working day following pick-up (PLS main library to main library). d. 50% of all items delivered to PLP will be delivered within 5 working days. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective met. b. Objective met. c. Objective met. d. Objective met.
SJVLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All System messages to be sent in the most cost effective manner to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow 80% of messages to be received within 4 hours and 100% of the reference and information messages to be received within 24 hours. 2. Allow 100% of planning, coordination, and evaluation messages to be received in a form and manner to expedite decision-making and the efficient use of staff time. b. To allow 100% of inter-system loans and other materials to be delivered within 3 working days to the member library headquarters. c. To allow member resources to be efficiently allocated in handling communication transactions for System activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a-c. For the most part, these objectives were met. We have some concerns about the three day delivery to headquarters libraries. While we are confident that we are meeting this goal much of the time, we are studying usage for further refinement in this area.
SERRA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 90% of intrasystem messages will be received by addressees within 24 hours (time of origin to time of receipt). b. 90% of items sent by intrasystem delivery will be delivered within 1 working day. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective met. 99% of intra-system messages were received within 24 hours. Fax, email, and phone messages were received immediately. 95% of items sent by intrasystem delivery were delivered within one working day. Those going to Imperial County from San Diego and vice versa, as well as to certain outlying branches of San Diego County, usually took two to three days longer. The smallest and most remote branches may occasionally require a week. b. Objective met. Serra contracted with a vendor for delivery 5 days a week between System libraries in San Diego County and the Serra offices at San Diego Public, San Diego State University and University of California San Diego received twice weekly delivery. Serra's own part time driver

<p>SERRA (cont'd)</p>		<p>provided twice a week delivery between member libraries in the Imperial Valley. A courier service provided twice weekly delivery between San Diego and Imperial counties. A total of 150,467 items were handled by all segments of Serra's delivery system.</p> <p>In addition, Serra headquarters applied for 2010/11 E-Rate funding and received an 80% discount of its telecommunications costs.</p> <p>Serra staff facilitated networking and cooperation among its members through five system committees. System staff supported the successful operation of the Serra committees by attending meetings, communicating opportunities for grants and training, updating committee information on the web page, and assisting with committee events such as workshops and conferences.</p> <p>The interactive map on the Serra website (www.serralibrary.org) facilitated communication between the various library systems and branches.</p> <p>The Serra Executive Committee and select committees met exclusively via teleconference, saving time and transportation costs.</p>
----------------------------------	--	---

**SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY
COOPERATIVE
(SCLC)**

Communications

- a. 90% of intrasystem messages will be received by addressees within 24 hours.
- b. 90% of all messages requiring a response will be answered within 2 working days.
- c. 500 reference-related messages will be transmitted between the SCLC Reference Center and the member libraries via facsimile.
- d. 15,000 reference-related messages will be transmitted between the SCLC Reference Center and the member libraries via email.

Delivery

- a. 75% of the items sent by intrasystem delivery will be delivered within 2 working days.
- b. The remaining 25% of the items sent by intrasystem delivery will be delivered within 4 working days.
- c. 78,000 items will be transported among member libraries by the System delivery vans.

Communications

- a-b. Objectives met. The majority of the messages were transmitted electronically.
- c-d. Objective not met. Approximately 250 messages were transmitted between the SCLC Reference Center and member libraries via fax; and approximately 14,100 messages were transmitted between the SCLC Reference Center and member libraries via email. The number of questions submitted to the Reference Center decreased by 23% from last year.

Delivery

- a-c. Objectives met. Delivery continued on an alternate day schedule per route, carrying over 125,996 items during the year.

System Communications & Delivery Program
2010/11 Service Methods and Workloads

	Actual Comm. Workload (Messages)	Telecommunications Systems Usage					Actual Delivery Workload (Items)	Delivery Systems Usage					Actual Miles Traveled By All Delivery Vehicles
		Elec. Mail	Voice Phone	Fax	Internet	Other		System Van	Contracted Delivery	US Mail	UPS	Other	
BLACK GOLD	623,021	NU	23%	0.02%	4%	73% ^(a)	1,521,707	NU	97%	2%	0.5%	0.5%	71,604
49-99	325	NU	17%	6%	77%	NU	333,835	NU	100%	NU	NU	NU	71,000
INLAND	5,200	NU	29%	4%	67%	NU	278,645	NU	94%	1%	5%	NU	94,500
NORTHNET	53,436	NU	1.4%	0.2%	98.4%	NU	6,347,286	NU	99.7%	0.2%	0.1%	NU	257,868
PLP	144,532	NU	5.7%	0.3%	NU	94% ^(b)	3,083,588	70%	28%	1%	NU	1%	72,000
SJVLS	859,135	29%	0.5%	0.05%	3%	67% ^(c)	1,156,870	98%	NU	1%	1%	NU	82,743
SERRA	21,575	NU	23%	6%	69%	2% ^(d)	150,567	NU	98%	1.5%	0.5%	NU	65,582
SCLC	207,310	NU	1.1%	0.2%	98.7%	NU	127,145	92%	7%	1%	NU	NU	76,765
TOTALS	1,914,534	13%	9%	0.1%	17%	61%	12,999,643	26.2%	72.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	792,062

NA - Not Available; or unable to det

NU - Not Used

^(a)Holds placed on member library automation

^(b)Telephone renewal system

^(c)Horizon ILL requests

^(d)UPS, US Mail

Exhibit C

Summary of Communications and Delivery Expenditures for FY 2010/11
System Uniform Expenditures Report

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	\$ 47,807	\$ 33,193	81,000
49-99	38,881	3,185	42,066
INLAND	97,236	0	97,236
NORTHNET	239,098	283,787	522,885
PLP	166,582	8,803	175,385
SJVLS	62,147	302,124	364,271
SERRA	61,541	24,166	85,707
SCLC	212,826	41,243	254,069
TOTAL	\$ 926,118	\$ 696,501	\$1,622,619

**LOCAL MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS TO CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAMS
FY 2010/11**

System	CLSA System Reference			CLSA System Communications and Delivery		
	Percent of CLSA Expenditures for Reference	Percent of Local Funds for Reference	Total Expenditures for Reference	Percent of CLSA Expenditure for Comm. & Delivery	Percent of Local Funds for Comm. & Delivery	Total Expenditures for Comm. & Delivery
BLACK GOLD	18%	82%	\$ 227,038	59%	41%	81,000
49-99	94%	6%	52,805	92%	8%	42,066
INLAND	99%	1%	133,027	100%	0%	97,236
NORTHNET	99.5%	0.5%	252,032	46%	54%	522,885
PLP	100%	0%	250,000	95%	5%	175,385
SJVLS	47%	53%	175,189	17%	83%	364,271
SERRA	96%	4%	104,351	72%	28%	85,707
SCLC	82%	18%	402,841	84%	16%	254,069
TOTAL PERCENT	78%	22%	100%	57%	43%	100%
TOTAL EXPEND.	\$ 1,238,384	\$ 358,899	\$ 1,597,283	\$ 926,118	\$ 696,501	\$1,622,619

2010/11 Expenditures:

	CLSA	Local	LSTA	Total
Administration	545,200 (17%)	2,629,326 ¹ (82%)	46,752 (1%)	3,221,278
Reference	1,238,384 (78%)	358,899 ² (22%)		1,597,283
Comm. & Delivery	926,118 (57%)	696,501 ³ (43%)		1,622,619
Advisory Boards	16,148 (97%)	551 ⁴ (3%)		16,699
Total	2,725,850 (42%)	3,685,277 (57%)	46,752 (1%)	\$6,457,879

¹All systems contributed local funds to support system administration.

²All but one system (PLP) used local funds to support Reference.

³All but one system (Inland) contributed local funds to support Communications and Delivery.

⁴Two systems (Black Gold and 49-99) used local funds to support the SAB program.

AGENDA ITEM: CLSA System Advisory Board

GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:

CURRENT STATUS: The System Advisory Board (SAB) Program makes available to Systems a means for directly incorporating citizen advice in planning and delivering System services. A policy adopted by the Board in August 1985 authorized the charging of System administrative indirect costs against the CLSA System Reference, Communications and Delivery and System Advisory Board program allocations, whereby up to 25% of each service program baseline may be used for Planning, Coordination & Evaluation (PC&E).

Summary of 2010/11 System Annual Reports

Exhibit A displays a summary of performance objectives adopted for the System Advisory Board programs in the eight Cooperative Library Systems and the reported levels of achievement. Many Systems adopted and achieved performance objectives aimed at increasing the exchange of information between the System Administrative Councils, the System Advisory Boards, and the member communities. Among the methods adopted by various Systems for achieving this were: attendance by SAB members at Administrative Council meetings, written SAB reports on System activities and services to appointing bodies, and presentations by SAB members to community groups.

Expenditures: Most System Advisory Boards continue to be hampered in their efforts to develop active Boards by the slowness of appointments by the governing bodies of member jurisdictions. Exhibit B displays CLSA and local funds expended in support of the System Advisory Board (SAB) Program in 2010/11.

Staff Liaison: Sandy Habbestad

Doc.#15746

**SUMMARY OF 2010/11 SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARD PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES
CLSA SYSTEM PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORTS**

System	Performance Objectives	Achievement of Performance Objectives
BLACK GOLD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Each member of the SAB will develop sufficient understanding of System services and funding to make brief presentations to community organizations. b. Each member will become familiar with the System Plan of Service. c. The SAB will continue library advocacy and public awareness activities in Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo counties. d. Encourage display of the photo essay exhibits at member libraries and other organizations upon request. e. Complete compilation of all four essays so all can be displayed at the same time. f. Explore the possibility and method to scan photos and verbiage comprising the four photo essays as a backup in case of damage or loss. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective met. All members are able to articulate System services. b. Objective met. The Plan of Service was reviewed and discussed at the April meeting. c. Objective met. Members attended various events throughout the year. d. Objective met. The essays were displayed at three locations and viewed by approximately 5,350 individuals. e. Objective met. Materials and display set were purchased so all four collections may be displayed at once. f. Objective met. The group discussed and began to scan one photo essay.
49/99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A majority of the SAB members will review and contribute to the annual System Plan of Service. b. The SAB will send a representative to at least one Administrative Council meeting and will inform the Council of community information needs if new information is available. c. SAB members will evaluate System services. d. SAB members will inform state legislators, local officials, and community groups about the needs of libraries when opportunities arise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective met. The Plan of Service was transmitted to the System Advisory Board and addressed at the May 2011 Administrative Council meeting. b-c. Objective not met. SAB members were unable to attend the Administrative Council meetings in 2010/11. d. Objective may have been met. This may have been done informally, but no reports were received.
INLAND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 100% of SB members will be able to articulate the function of ILS at opportunities in the local community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a-d. Objectives met.

<p>INLAND (cont'd)</p>	<p>b. SAB members will provide input from their respective communities at 35% of System Administrative Council meetings.</p> <p>c. SAB members were encouraged to attend at least 2 of the 5 ILS Administrative Council meetings to observe the workings of the Council and to contribute input from the local community.</p> <p>d. ILS partnered with the San Bernardino County Library event coordinator to plan and financially support the annual Friends of the Library/Trustee Conference that was held in May. SAB members were encouraged to advocate for their libraries and taught methods to determine community needs that could be addressed by the Administrative Council.</p>	
<p>NORTHNET</p>	<p>a. Explore ways with the California State Library that the SAB members can assist the Administrative Council in the evaluation, development and implementation of services.</p>	<p>a. Objective partially met. The SAB members were not able to find a date for a meeting with a quorum, even with the use of virtual meeting software. An electronic discussion list was set up for SAB members to facilitate their communication. Individual SAB members served on System committees, attended System meetings and local city council/board of supervisor meetings on behalf of their libraries, and met with local legislators.</p>
<p>PACIFIC LIBRARY PARTNERSHIP (PLP)</p>	<p>a. Meetings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An orientation will be held in the fall for SAB members. SABs will meet for the transition year, 2010/11. 2. Executive Committee members will be invited to attend each SAB meeting in their region. 3. SAB members will receive agendas and have the opportunity to attend Executive Committee meetings. 4. SAB will be included in the PLP annual meeting. <p>b. Meeting Content:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing discussion of SAB's role in the consolidated system. 2. An update on PLP activities is provided at each meeting. 3. Provide opportunities for ongoing self-education through topical meetings, including: Friends and foundations activities, and State legislative initiatives and legislation. 4. Time will be scheduled at each meeting for SAB members to ask 	<p>a. Meetings: Objectives 1-4 met.</p> <p>b. Meeting Content: Objectives 1-4 met.</p>

<p>PLP (cont'd)</p>	<p>questions and/or exchange information about System services.</p> <p>c. Presentations/Activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each SAB member will serve as public relations representative for local libraries. 2. 100% of SAB members will be able to understand PLP restructure well enough to give a brief report to the jurisdiction they represent. 3. Each SAB member will be expected to attend one workshop on public library services. 4. SAB members will be encouraged to attend the annual California Library Association conference. Partial funding will be provided as allowed by the System budget. <p>d. Legislative Activities: All SAB members are encouraged to attend CLA's Legislative Day or attend Day in the District to represent overall library issues.</p> <p>e. Planning and Evaluation: The current SAB structure will sunset on July 1, 2011. During the final year of transition the SABs from the individual systems will meet as a whole.</p>	<p>c. Presentations/Activities: Objectives 1-4 met.</p> <p>d. Legislative Activities: Objective met.</p> <p>e. Evaluation: Objective met.</p>
<p>SJVLS</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 100% of SAB members will be knowledgeable about System services. b. 100% of SAB members will be able to give a presentation regarding System services in their local jurisdiction. c. 100% of SAB members will be knowledgeable about CLSA services. d. 100% of SAB members will be knowledgeable about their local library services. e. SAB members will provide information whenever necessary to help the Administrative Council in evaluating and in providing improved services at the System level. f. Continue to distribute public awareness program materials and evaluate program effectiveness. 	<p>Objectives a-f were not met. SJVLS did not have sufficient SAB members to form a quorum during the fiscal year. One SAB member did not participate in the joint meeting where the CLSA budget was approved.</p>

<p>SERRA</p>	<p>a. The SAB will report at each meeting of the System Administrative Council to provide citizen input on service, activities and needs.</p> <p>b. The SAB will collaborate with at least one Serra committee on a specific project(s).</p> <p>c. An orientation session will be scheduled to inform new SAB members of System operations and services.</p> <p>d. SAB will review the System Plan of Service and Budget.</p> <p>e. The SAB will seek local city and county legislative support of System programs.</p> <p>f. The SAB will recommend techniques for publicizing System programs and projects.</p> <p>g. The SAB will advise on all issues referred by the Administrative Council.</p>	<p>a. Objective met. The SAB met four times during the year with the Administrative Council. The System Plan of Service and Budget were agenda items at the appropriate joint meetings; a separate SAB meeting was scheduled on the same day as the joint meeting. A SAB report, both from the entire Board and from individual members, was a standing item at all Administrative Council meetings.</p> <p>b. Objective met. The SAB used their travel funds to support the Children’s and Young Adult Services Committees’ program “The Fun Facts of Early Literacy: Communicating with Parents Through Storytimes.”</p> <p>c. Objective not met. However, the SAB members reviewed assignments for the system committees and chose committees of interest to support. They attended the committee meetings and reported to the other SAB members during the AC/SAB meetings.</p> <p>d. Objective met. The SAB reviewed the preliminary Plan of Service and Budget at the May 2011 joint meeting.</p> <p>e. Objective met. The SAB member for San Diego Public Library reported on System activities regularly at the monthly meetings of the San Diego City Board of Library Commissioners. SAB members reported back at meetings of the library that they represented.</p> <p>f. Objective not met. An SAB member is a member of the Adult Services Committee. The SAB takes an active part in all AC discussions.</p> <p>g. Objective met. The SAB takes part in all discussions held at AC meetings; the chairman of the SAB takes part in Executive Committee meetings.</p>
<p>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LIBRARY COOPERATIVE (SCLC)</p>	<p>a. 100% of SAB members will be able to provide reports on SCLC to local boards, City Councils, and/or other local bodies, and local news media.</p> <p>b. 100% of SAB members will be able to provide input to the SCLC Council on new program development and on service priorities for their local libraries.</p> <p>c. 100% of SAB members will be able to inform legislators about the needs of libraries.</p>	<p>Objectives a-c were met. The System Advisory Board met in May 2011 in conjunction with the Administrative Council meeting where they were updated on SCLC activities and current legislation, and given the opportunity for providing input to the Administrative Council. Minutes from the Council and interest group meetings are posted on the SCLC website.</p>

Summary of System Advisory Board Expenditures for FY 2010/11
System Uniform Expenditures Report

System	CLSA Expenditures	Local Expenditures	Total Expenditures
BLACK GOLD	\$ 1,353	\$ 40	1,393
49-99	899	511	1,410
INLAND	1,605	0	1,605
NORTHNET	7,367	0	7,367
PLP	2,000	0	2,000
SJVLS*	0	0	0
SERRA	1,924	0	1,924
SCLC	1,000	0	1,000
TOTAL	\$ 16,148	\$ 551	\$ 16,699

*SJVLS returned unexpended funds (\$150) to CSL.

Summary of Library of California Board (LCB) position on bills and other legislation:

**Date Adopted
by the Board**

Homework Assistance

April 2007 Adopted a position of support for AB 1233, Homework Assistance.

Legislation

February 1999 Adopted a position of support for full funding for the Public Library Foundation (PLF).

Adopted a position of support for telecommunication services for California libraries at the most affordable costs.

April 1999 Adopted a position of support for SB 927, Newspaper Preservation.

April 2000 Adopted a position of support for AB 2757, relating to telephonic reading system.

June 2000 Adopted a position of support for SB 1774, Computer Access, *if* amended so that CSL administers the program for public libraries.

April 2001 Adopted a position to authorize the Board President and the Legislative Committee Chair to take appropriate action regarding a state budget augmentation for FY 2001/02 for county law libraries.

August 2001 Adopted a position of support in favor of the U.S. Senate revision of ESEA that identifies specifically support for school library services and that the Board President or his designee take appropriate action in support of the U.S. Senate version of ESEA, which includes support for school libraries.

Adopted a position of support of the California Teleconnect Fund and that the Board President or his designee be authorized to communicate the Board's support for expanding the services provided under the California Teleconnect Fund on behalf of California libraries, and to communicate this support position to members of the California Public Utilities Commission.

February 2003 Adopted a position to endorse and support the California Library Association's campaign to retain CLSA funding for reimbursement for interlibrary loan, equal access and universal borrowing services; and, further, that the LoC Board will actively participate in this campaign.

Adopted a position of support for a strong California State Library, continuing the one hundred fifty three year tradition of information sharing services to California state government and the people of California, and providing leadership to and fostering resource sharing among the 8000 libraries statewide.

October 2005 Adopted a position recommend and endorse all bills supporting librarians,

in addition to those that support the teachers, parity and equity in their practices.

August 2008 Adopted a position of support for increased funding for the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

Library Construction/Facilities

February 1999 Adopted a position of support for SB 3, public library construction and renovation bond act.

May 2002 Adopted a position of support for SCA 10, the Senate Constitutional Amendment, which would amend the state constitution to allow the voters to approve a bond for public library facilities with a 55% majority, rather than a two-thirds majority, and would also allow ad valorem tax on real property to exceed the 1% limitation to pay for library facility bonds.

February 2003 Adopted a position of support for SB 40 and AB 222, which propose a public library construction bond measure for 2004.

October 2005 Adopted a position of support for SB 1161, the California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act, which is on the ballot for the June 2006 election.

April 2007 Adopted a position of support for SB 156, the California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2008.

August 2008 Adopted a position of support for SB 1516, the California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2010.

Library of California

February 1999 Adopted a position of support for increased funding for the Library of California Act.

February 2001 Adopted a position to undertake activities to support a legislative augmentation of the Library of California programs and services consistent with the Board's overall goals of full funding for the LoC; and that the Board President and the Legislative Committee Chair continue to monitor the status of LoC funding for 2001/02.

February 2003 Adopted a position of support for continued authorization for operation of the Library of California and continued funding, at a minimum, at the 2002/03 level.

Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)

- February 1999 Adopted a position of support for adequate funding for the Library Services and Technology Act and work towards the equitable distribution of those funds in accordance with the State based nature of the statute.
- August 2001 Adopted a position to authorize the Board President or his designee to take appropriate action in support of increased funding for LSTA for fiscal year 2002/03 and for reauthorization of LSTA in 2003/04.
- February 2003 Adopted a position of support for the 2003 reauthorization of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA).

Literacy

- February 1999 Adopted a position of support for increased funding for the Families For Literacy Act and the California Library Literacy Service Act.
- June 1999 Adopted a position of support for SB 571, Family Literacy.
- April 2007 Adopted a position of support for AB 1030, Literacy and English Acquisition Services, young adult component.
- February 2008 Support for CLLS and urge Governor to not eliminate it as introduced in Senate Republican's version of the proposed 2008-09 state budget.

Rulemaking procedure

- February 1999 Moved to place the direct loan waiver provision on the table for discussion during the rulemaking procedure with the changes noted.
- Moved to place the net imbalance reimbursement formula on the table for discussion during the rulemaking procedure, and direct the CEO to have a study taken to look at alternative cost containment measures as well as full reimbursement costs.
- Moved to add a draft regulation comparable to Section 28 (d) (1) for academic, school, and special libraries that requires them to determine the eligibility of an individual as a member of their primary clientele before direct borrowing privileges are provided under the provisions of the Direct Loan program.
- Moved to retain the draft regulation for reciprocity in the electronic direct access program.
- Approved the proposed regulations for submittal to the Office of Administrative Law.

Adopted the hearing process as presented to the Board on the document titled "Public Hearings on the Library of California Proposed Regulations."

- August 1999 Moved to modify the proposed Library of California regulations and initiate a second public comment period.
- November 1999 Moved to submit the proposed regulation to the Office of Administrative Law.
- February 2000 Moved to make changes in the proposed regulations and notice them with cover letter summarizing the changes and indicating that they do not inhibit the authority of Regional Library Networks to develop protocols. If no public comment received, submit proposed regulations to the Office of Administrative Law.

School Libraries

- April 1999 Adopted a position to accept testimony on AB 1289, California School Library Media Teacher Expansion Program.
- April 2000 Adopted a position of support for AB 2311, School libraries: California School Library Media Teacher Expansion Program.
- April 2001 Adopted a position of support for AB 336, School Library Pilot Program.
- February 2002 Adopted a position of support that the LoC Board Legislative Committee support strong public school library services, including supporting the preservation of the California Public School Library Association (CPSLA) and the budgetary line item that supports it. *(This position was ratified by the full Board at its May 2002 meeting.)*
- February 2003 Adopted a position of support for the California Public School Library Act and the continuation of the budget line item to fund library materials for school libraries.
- April 2007 Adopted a position of support for AB 333, School libraries: online databases: subscriptions

Young Adult Services

- February 1999 Adopted a position of support for the Board President, Access Services Committee Chair, and their delegates to make appropriate legislative contacts regarding development and implementation of the Statewide Young Adult Services Program; and reconfirm the Board's commitment to the Statewide Young Adult Services Program.