

1 **Approved April 25, 2017**

2
3 California Library Services Board Meeting

4 October 14, 2016

5
6 California State Library
7 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
8 Sacramento, CA

9
10 **Welcome and Introductions**

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

13 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Brandy Buenafe, Gary Christmas, Aleita
14 Huguenin, Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Peter Mindnich,
15 Elizabeth Murguia, Eric Schockman, Sandra Tauler, and Connie Williams.

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

19 **Adoption of Agenda**

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

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

27
28 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried***
29 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the***
30 ***agenda of the October 14, 2016 meeting, as amended.***
31

32 **Approval of April 2016 Board Minutes**

33
34 ***It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***
35 ***that the California Library Services Board approves the draft minutes***
36 ***of the July 12, 2016 meeting.***
37

1 **Election of Board Officers for 2017**

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

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

9 There were no nominations from the floor.

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

13
14 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously***
15 ***that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh***
16 ***Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the California Library Services***
17 ***Board for the year 2017.***

18
19 **Board Meeting Date for Spring 2017**

20 Annly Roman reported that the Board had been meeting in-person in spring, so
21 members could meet with legislators, and holding a teleconference meeting in fall. A
22 teleconference meeting was held in July and an in-person meeting held in October of
23 2016 to discuss the one-time funds allocated in the 2016/17 state budget.

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

29 An additional proposal for a half day, all Board orientation was made, which would
30 have required an additional trip to Sacramento. Most Board members agreed to an
31 orientation. There was considerable discussion of whether the orientation could be
32 concurrent to one of the Board meetings, if both Board meetings should be in-person,
33 and whether legislator visits could still occur if the orientation was scheduled concurrent
34 to the spring meeting.

1 The final determination was that the Board would meet in-person in Sacramento in
2 April and again in fall. The orientation would be held on the day before the April meeting
3 and if Board members wanted to meet with legislators they would try to schedule their
4 own meetings in the early part of the day before the orientation.

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

7

8 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

9 **Board President's Report**

10 President Bernardo reported that she attended the Council of County Law Librarians
11 meeting in August and met with key legislators. At that same time she attended the
12 125th anniversary of the County Law Libraries reception that was held in Sacramento.
13 Senator Wolk recognized that anniversary with a proclamation.

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

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

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

18 **Broadband Update Report**

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

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

28 Coles reported that in November participating libraries would be invited to apply for
29 technology improvement grants. These grants would assist libraries with costs related to
30 connecting branches to CalREN.

1 Member Schockman wondered if the \$1 million in one-time funds for software and
2 hardware improvements for libraries recommended by the State Library would impact
3 the technology improvement grant program. Gerry Maginnity clarified that the existing
4 grants were used to connect libraries to CalREN. The State Library recommendation
5 would go to upgrade internal components such as PCs, Wifi, etc., not connect to
6 CalREN.

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

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

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

21 **State Library Literacy Program Report**

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

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

29 At the April 2016 Board meeting members had asked about the program's
30 evaluation and Dale reported that a sample report from the Tulare County Library

1 System was included in the Board packet. She offered to take specific questions about
2 the report after her presentation.

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

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

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

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

27 Member Williams asked about outreach to schools and the potential for working with
28 the California School Library Associations and teacher librarians. Dale reported that the
29 California Library Literacy Services (CLLS) Program had grown its partnerships with the
30 Department of Education and a number of the programs were reaching out to partner
31 with adult schools. Dale stated that they hesitated to reach out to younger grades

1 because the core of the program was adult literacy. There was so much money in
2 education that it was important to protect the \$4.8 million allocation for the adult literacy
3 learners and their children. There were, however, a number of programs that partnered
4 with schools to help children struggling with English language skills and some programs
5 used schools as a place to outreach to parents.

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

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

18
19 **CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

20 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

21 **System Amended Plans and Service**

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

30 Member McGinity asked Rivas to define what Zinio, Joomla and Overdrive were.
31 Diane Satchwell, responded that Joomla was a shared knowledge platform, sort of like
32 an intranet, that Blackgold Cooperative was coordinating for all of the cooperative

1 systems. It would be a place to find sample RFPs, existing policies and procedures to
2 compare, etc. to save time and energy for libraries at a minimal cost. Blackgold already
3 had 7 pages of depository topics that they would be populating and making accessible
4 to public libraries.

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

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

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

15 **CLSA Budget for FY 2016/17**

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

26 In considering Bibframe, the Library of Congress' system that would have made
27 library records google accessible, library staff had meetings with the Library of
28 Congress and the Public Library Partnership Cooperative. It was determined that the
29 project would have been a limited pilot program. The program would have developed
30 tools for other jurisdictions and made the records for pilot sites accessible, but it
31 probably would have taken additional funds to add jurisdictions. State Library staff could

1 not determine how beneficial the project would be to California's libraries so they were
2 not comfortable recommending one-time funds to move that program forward.

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

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

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

19 Member Williams pointed out that many of the makerspace materials were
20 expendables or consumables. She wanted to make sure purchases would go toward
21 setting them up to be on-going. Makerspaces were big in schools too, she reported, and
22 there were far too many that had empty labs because there was no money for materials,
23 or librarians to lead those programs. Williams said that she would hope that school
24 libraries would be included as partners in the innovation labs as well as the value study.

25 President Bernardo stated that she believed the recommendation did include an
26 advisory board composed of librarians, educators, and employers. She asked if Member
27 Williams was recommending that the California Library Services Board directly oversee
28 the advisory board. Gerry Maginnity stated that he did not think that was the intention.
29 As a group working with CLSA funding the advisory board would report to the Board but
30 it would be difficult set-up the advisory board and expend all funds by June 30, 2019 if
31 every decision was governed by the Board given the infrequency of meetings.

1 Member McGinity asked how decisions would be made for allocating the \$200,000;
2 would libraries be submitting proposals and if so who was going to make the final
3 decisions. Member Tauler also had questions about the exact plan for the innovation
4 labs. She thought they were a good idea but was concerned about sustainability and the
5 purchase of materials. Several other members, including Members Murguia and
6 Maghsoudi sited that they also had questions and concerns on exactly what the
7 innovation lab program would look like, how many labs would be created and how they
8 would be sustained. Members also asked if the program was expected to influence
9 other libraries to create lab spaces. Gerry Maginnity responded that the created spaces
10 would be models for public/private partnership and those local partnerships would allow
11 for sustainability due to continued investment. In response to a question by Member
12 McGinity he said there was a large demand for these programs.

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

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

26 Satchwell stated there were many options for providing programs like this, it did not
27 have to be engineering materials; it could also be artists, and sewing machines. She did
28 think the \$200,000 would need to be for test sites for libraries with partners already in
29 place. Partners and a plan were why Chula Vista's program and other partnership
30 programs had been successful.

1 Member McGinity stated he did not think the Board should fund the \$200,000 for the
2 Innovation Labs because he felt there would be ongoing costs. He also had issues with
3 the \$300,000 for the impact study because he was worried about the perception of
4 spending money on promotion and he did not feel that the program would make a
5 sustainable difference. His preference was to allocate \$750,000 for a digital lab
6 proposal and \$750,000 for the software and hardware improvements inside libraries.

7 Janet Coles, Library Development Services, reported that the State Library had \$1
8 million dedicated toward digitization statewide in 2016/17 and an equal amount for
9 2017/18. There was a consultant team in place that had met at the state library that day
10 and the day before, positioning themselves to move forward. There were 40 public
11 libraries already on board with the project and they had another 20-25 they anticipated
12 joining in the next 6 months. Coles also observed that digital labs actually were
13 expensive to sustain. There were many considerations, from staff to equipment and
14 infrastructure. She felt that it would not be a wise use of the one-time money,
15 particularly when they are already dedicating \$1 million this year and next.

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

23 Maginnity stated that the state library was constantly called by libraries saying they
24 need statistics on library impacts to help them dialog with relevant local powers. If the
25 perception persisted that public libraries were just a reading room, local governments
26 were not going to invest more money. State Library staff felt that an impact study and a
27 way to disseminate that information would be a good use of the one-time funds.
28 Member Buenafe said that as the representative for the 110,000+ incarcerated persons
29 in California she felt that anything that continued to elevate the profile of the public
30 library was important. Prisons were teaching that when people were paroled the public
31 library is where they need to go to get access to internet and job programs.

1 Christmas commented that one of the big issues that public libraries face today was
2 lack of awareness. Some of the cities in the Inland area of southern California, like
3 Riverside, had issues identifying the role of public libraries for budget talks with the city
4 council or board of supervisors for the county. He felt that the value study was a good
5 way to help show the broad spectrum of things public libraries do and help maintain
6 funding.

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

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

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

27 Maginnity said the past project was story based for marketing, this project would be
28 data driven to address the value of public libraries. President Bernardo said she felt it
29 would be important to have that bank of information. So much of what was presented to
30 legislators now had to be data driven with hard numbers for it to mean anything to them.
31 She was, however, unsure if the recommendation of \$300,000 for the project was the

1 right number. Gerry Maginnity said that estimate included gathering the data,
2 synthesizing it and making it available. Member McGinity and Vice-President
3 Maghsoudi expressed concern over who would be doing the work, was it the state
4 library or would they be hiring a consultant.

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

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

19 Member Schockman called for a vote on all three issues.

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

25
26 ***It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Ibanez) and carried with a vote***
27 ***of 9 ayes and 3 nays (McGinity, Mindnich, Schockman) that the***
28 ***California Library Services Board adopts \$200,000 of the 2016/17 CLSA***
29 ***one-time budget augmentation to create innovation labs through***
30 ***partnerships between libraries, employers, and educators.***

31
32 ***It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Ibanez) and carried with a vote***
33 ***of 8 ayes, 2 nays (McGinity, Mindnich), and 2 abstentions (Maghsoudi,***
34 ***Schockman) that the California Library Services Board adopts***
35 ***\$300,000 of the 2016/17 CLSA one-time budget augmentation to create***
36 ***an impact study and online clearinghouse cataloguing the economic***
37 ***and social value of California libraries.***

1
2 President Bernardo stated that when the question was called votes were taken prior
3 to public comment. She invited participants who had additional comments to speak.

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

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

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

29 Christina DiCaro, California Library Association (CLA) lobbyist, Stated that she and
30 Mile Dillon wanted to be a resource for the Board with any questions on how funding is
31 appropriated or obtained. She thought it would be helpful to give an overview of the two

1 ways funding came about in the budget. One is that the CLA legislative committee
2 identified a need, such as literacy or services act funding, then she and Mike worked
3 with the Department of Finance and the legislature. The recent increase in funding for
4 the literacy program, the services act and CENIC was a partisan effort in the legislature.
5 The second, more unusual, way is that the Governor thinks of an idea. In the case of
6 the \$3 million in one-time funds the Governor decided to give the funds to encourage
7 libraries to think of more innovative ways of digital delivery.

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

18

19 **D. CLSA REGULATIONS**

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

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

30 Annly Roman reported that there was a letter included in the Board packet from the
31 Systems that suggested changes, some of which the state library staff had included in

1 the draft before the Board. Roman reported that there was also a letter from the
2 California Library Association supporting the systems' recommended changes.

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

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

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

28 Member McGinity expressed confusion on the System and CLA regulation letters
29 and asked for clarification if all their requested changes were included in the
30 regulations. Annly Roman stated that staff attempted to address some of them. The
31 regulatory section the systems and CLA specifically addressed in their letters was the

1 communication and delivery definition section, which had been expanded in state
2 statute to include resource sharing. Some of the things the Systems recommended in
3 the communication and delivery regulatory section, specifically in the definition of
4 “other”, included system wide service assessment. Funding for assessment was
5 mentioned in statute, but was not currently included in the regulatory amendments
6 because staff did not know if it made sense to lump it under the communications and
7 delivery definitions

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

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

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

28 President Bernardo stated she agreed with the biennial and odd year proposals that
29 the other Board members had suggested. She added that she thought they needed
30 address some Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act conflicts in sections 20122, 20123, and

1 20134. Annly Roman said staff had already been complying with open meeting laws
2 and was aware that conforming changes needed to be made to the regulations.

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

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

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

28

29 **E. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2016/2017**

30 Annly Roman reported that the Board had previously discussed the possibility of
31 being more entrepreneurial. It was one of the concepts that were considered in the use

1 of the one-time funds to bring together public libraries, schools, businesses, and the
2 community. Staff left it on the agenda in case the Board wanted to continue discussion.

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

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

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

23 Vice-President Maghsoudi said that their library, for the last 5 years, had a campaign
24 that every first grader got a library card. Member Schockman asked how to model that
25 program and get it out to other jurisdictions that need assistance. Natalie Cole
26 commented that was one of the things the Student Success project would be working
27 on. As the project monitor she was working with Carol and her team to create a number
28 of models to reach people in different communities because the school library function
29 looked different in different communities. The beauty of their project was that they were
30 looking at different libraries in different communities in different schools and producing a
31 number of models that other communities could look at to see what would work for

1 them. So the aim of the project was not just the pilot communities but to also develop a
2 portfolio that could be disseminated statewide.

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

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

19

20 **F. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

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

28 Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that the CLA legislative committee was working
29 on a possible bond measure. Member Christmas asked what election cycle they were
30 looking at and Maghsoudi said that was still being discussed.

1 Member McGinity asked Annly Roman if they had heard where the tax receipts were
2 for the state. Annly Roman said she thought the most recent report showed receipts as
3 slightly up but they had been down for a few reports prior to that one. She was not sure
4 exactly where it averaged out but it would definitely not be like past years where
5 receipts were way above the estimates.

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

11 12 **G. PUBLIC COMMENT**

13 There were no public comments brought forward.

14 15 **H. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

16 Board members commented on the professionalism and civility of the group during
17 discussions and thanks Board members and staff for their work before and during the
18 meeting.

19 20 **I. OLD BUSINESS**

21 There was no old business brought forward.

22 23 **J. AGENDA BUILDING**

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

28 Janet Coles responded that was part of the digitization program for this year. As part
29 of the first phase, which ran from March to the end of September, public libraries were
30 invited to apply and a team of consultants would survey and interview library staff, local
31 partners such as historical societies, and other entities with important local history to
32 determine the digitization needs. There was a preliminary report that would be coming

1 out in October but the finding was that many public libraries did not have the staff
2 expertise, infrastructure, or knowledge to support a local digitization program. The
3 project was looking at consolidating services such as digitization, preservation, access
4 and discovery, and centralizing expertise, creating a few centers to serve many.

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

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

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

13

14 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

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