

1 **Approved April 17, 2018**

2 California Library Services Board Meeting

3 October 17, 2017

4
5 California State Capitol

6 Room 2040

7 Sacramento, CA

8
9 **Welcome and Introductions**

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

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

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

18 **Adoption of Agenda**

19 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried*
20 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the*
21 *agenda of the October 17, 2017 meeting.*
22

23 **Approval of April 2017 Board Minutes**

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

27 **Board Resolutions**

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

32 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously*
33 *that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library*
34 *Services Board Resolution 2017-03 for Gregory McGinity (Attached*
35 *as Exhibit B).*

1 ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Maghsoudi) and carried***
2 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts***
3 ***California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-04 for Dr. Kevin***
4 ***Starr (Attached as Exhibit C).***

5 **Election of Board Officers**

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

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

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

15
16 ***It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***
17 ***that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh***
18 ***Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the California Library Services***
19 ***Board for the year 2018.***

20 21 **Board Meeting Date for Spring 2018**

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

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

32 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

33 **Board President's Report**

34 President Bernardo reported that she ended her terms as a member of the
35 Legislative Committee for the Council of California County Law Librarians and as the

1 County Law Libraries' liaison on the Executive Committee of the Law Practice
2 Management and Technology section of the State Bar of California.

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

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

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

8 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

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

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

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

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

24 State Librarian Lucas reported that the State Library also received \$3 million in one-
25 time funding, to be spent over three years, for the California Civil Liberties Education
26 Program. The original program was centered on Japanese internment. New language
27 was added to the program statute that allowed consideration of projects that could also
28 address other violations of civil liberties. Lucas reported that staff would probably
29 request program ideas in mid-November.

1 Member Schockman asked if the State Library could take some of the Civil Liberties
2 Education Program money and examine the roll of sanctuary cities in California as a
3 civil liberties issue. State Librarian Lucas stated that the past program had allowed
4 potential grantees to present ideas and State Library staff assessed the proposals to
5 see which fit within the law. Lucas stated that there had been some conversations;
6 particularly by the Assemblyman who carried the bill, about channeling larger chunks of
7 the funding into bigger projects. For example, in 2017 the State Library had allocated
8 half of the one-time grant money for projects that had budgets of \$100,000 or higher.
9 One of them was a KCET media campaign to talk about all sorts of civil liberties
10 violations. Lucas stated he someone could put in a similar grant proposal dealing with
11 the sanctuary city issue.

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

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

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

28 Member Schockman stated that, since CLSA budgets originated from the
29 Governor's office and the Department of Finance, he was interested in the Board
30 interviewing the candidates for Governor. He felt they needed to look ahead as a

1 community and assess who would continue helping fulfill the mandate for libraries in
2 California.

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

9 **Lighting up Libraries: Broadband Update report**

10 Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to bring high-speed broadband to all
11 California public libraries by connecting them to the California Research and Education
12 Network (CalREN), a statewide, high-speed, high-bandwidth network, managed by the
13 Corporation for Education Network Initiative in California (CENIC).

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

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

30 In year three Technology Improvement Grants were provided to 28 libraries, 12
31 connecting to CalREN for the first time and 16 adding branches. Nine library

1 jurisdictions are interested in joining the project in year four and 13 wanted to add more
2 branches. Those numbers were in review and would be confirmed at the start of 2018.

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

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

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

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

27 Member Schockman said that he thought Cole's information was interesting but
28 reported outputs rather than outcomes. He asked if we would get to a point where we
29 were judging outcomes on connectivity investment because that would be useful in
30 advertising and annual reports. Natalie Cole said that she agreed outcome tracking was
31 needed but it would take more money because measuring outcomes was significantly

1 more work. She thought it was something that could be done as libraries were
2 connected for longer periods of time since only 34 libraries had been connected for 12
3 months. Cole also thought that some positive outcomes would be around programing
4 and increased services which took more time to implement.

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

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

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

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

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

28 Lena Pham informed the Board that the state library could provide them with a
29 spreadsheet from Califa showing what was purchased including specific titles, licensing
30 and the prices.

1 Member Williams asked if every library system that signed up for enki was in the
2 same library and had access to the same books. Pham replied that was the case.

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

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

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

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

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

28 Member Schockman asked how academic libraries would get access to this product.
29 Carol Frost replied that the product was set-up to deal with eBook collections that were
30 owned by a public library. If someone had a public library card to a library using SimplyE

1 they would have access. Other agencies, including universities, were not precluded
2 from going into partnership with New York Public Library to buy SimplyE.

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

5 **Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

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

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

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

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

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

30 Member Murguia asked for an example of a station. Diane Satchwell stated that the
31 Chula Vista public library, who worked with Qualcomm and the school district, was a

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

10 **Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Program Grant** 11 **Program Report**

12 Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to help libraries, particularly those in
13 underserved communities, make software and hardware improvements to maximize
14 benefits to patrons as they accessed new high-speed Internet connections.

15 Coles stated that the project team could already see that project funds would have
16 an impact on communities across the state, fostering partnerships and supporting a
17 variety of technology acquisition and programming in underserved communities. The
18 Committee was scheduled to meet on October 18th to make decisions about which
19 proposals would be funded.

20 45 applications for funds had been received from libraries in urban, rural, and
21 suburban communities. The applications demonstrated a need for upgraded and new
22 technologies in public libraries and a desire among library staff to provide innovative
23 programming. Most applications were for projects that would serve underserved
24 communities and from libraries that are connected or in the process of connecting to
25 CalREN. Applicants and their partners proposed contributing almost 200% in matching
26 funds to the grant funds they were requesting.

27 Natalie Cole reported that several libraries drew on their participation in other State
28 Library projects in their applications. Some libraries used information they gathered
29 during Community Conversations; one library connected its proposal to programming
30 related to PLP's Student Success Initiative which brought libraries, schools, and school

1 districts together to share data and give students more access to public libraries; and
2 others wanted to leverage projects developed through the new Virtual Reality program.

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

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

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

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

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

1 to public libraries and creating a study to test the definition and demonstrate libraries'
2 impact.

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

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

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

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

26 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

27 Janet Coles reported that that Zip Books was an alternate model to the traditional
28 interlibrary loan and ground to ground delivery and had been successfully used in 30
29 rural libraries in California since 2013 through a Library Services and Technology Act
30 funded statewide project. Last December the State Library, with the approval of the

1 California Library Services Board awarded a \$1 million Zip Book expansion project grant
2 to the NorthNet Cooperative Library System.

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

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

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

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

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

28 **CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

29 **RESOURCE SHARING**

30 **Consolidation and Affiliations**

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

8 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously***
9 ***that the California Library Services Board approves the affiliation of***
10 ***the Goleta Library with the Black Gold Cooperative Library System***
11 ***effective July 1, 2018, and waives the September 1, 2017 filing date***
12 ***for 2018/19 affiliations.***
13

14 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

15 **System Plans of service and Budgets**

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

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

31 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried***
32 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the***

1 **System Population and Membership figures for use in the allocation**
2 **of System funds for the fiscal year 2017/18.**

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

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

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

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

24 **System Reports**

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

29 Lucas stated that if you were to search the State Controller's website some of the
30 previous systems that consolidated to form the new systems had varying levels of

1 PERS payment responsibility. It was unclear, at least from the statements that we had,
2 who was responsible for those liabilities, the existing system or the original system.

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

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

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

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

29 Diane Satchwell commented that the systems could, when they submitted their
30 CLSA reports, attach their audits to try to give the State Library more information.

1 President Bernardo asked if State Librarian Lucas was thinking of developing a
2 template to effectively demonstrate where the money was going. Lucas confirmed that
3 was the goal. Member Christmas stated that he felt determinations on how to report the
4 information should come back to the Board.

5 **CLSA REGULATIONS**

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

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

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

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

28 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried***
29 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the***
30 ***California Library Services Act regulatory language as amended to***
31 ***remove the last sentence in code section 20107(a); "The definitions***
32 ***incorporated by reference are accurate to California Statutes 2016."***

1 ***And code section 20107(b)(2), the definition of the “Chief Executive***
2 ***Officer”.***

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

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

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

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

30 State Librarian Lucas also pointed out that word “contiguous” did not exist in the
31 statute, maybe because it was somehow implicit. Annly Roman stated that

1 contiguousness was kind of implicit under the definition of that constituted a cooperative
2 library system. The definition stated that the systems needed to be regional and that the
3 systems were the cooperative library systems in existence under the Public Library
4 Services Act of 1963 when the California Library Services Act was enacted in 1977.
5 Roman stated that the Board had been provided with a list of those original systems,
6 whose borders were very similarly to the current systems; with the exception of systems
7 that had merged into larger systems.

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

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

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

25 Member Williams said that she was not sure if she understood how the word
26 “contiguous” related to the distribution of materials because some of the letters had to
27 do with concern over moving print materials from point A to point B. She felt that maybe
28 the conversation they needed had to do with how libraries moved materials back and
29 forth. She was unclear about how she felt since she did not think the word “contiguous”
30 was needed in the regulations but could identify with the concerns.

1 Member Murguia asked if the maintenance of the word “contiguous” in the
2 regulations would hamper the effort to share e-resources. Annly Roman said that she
3 did not believe so; the systems were already sharing e-resources amongst themselves.
4 Roman believed the issues the systems had with sharing centered on difficulty
5 negotiating for some of those resources even within the larger systems, not
6 contiguousness.

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

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

27 Garzon felt that keeping the language benefited resource sharing of physical items.
28 There are over 5 million physical items that were shared annually. Libraries in the Bay
29 area believed that the word “contiguous” added to the equity of what they gave to their
30 communities. The Pacific Library Partnership believed that contiguous cooperative
31 systems really contributed to how services were provided within the systems and

1 removal of the “contiguous” language appeared to allow that type of mix to be done
2 away with. It seemed odd to be moving in the direction when so much of what the
3 libraries and even the state and local governments are doing revolved around looking at
4 how to invest and protect some of the most vulnerable populations.

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

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

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

26 Member Schockman stated that “contiguous” was in the current language, so as a
27 Board they had to consider that while reading the law. The reality was that there was
28 sharing all the time regardless of “contiguous” borders. Schockman stated that the
29 Board’s mission and value statements talked about local control, local financing,
30 services for the underserved, and resource sharing, so why would they allow some
31 hypothetical mega systems that would destroy their values and mission.

1 Gerry Garza said that he was going to get away from that hypothetical, but there
2 were a tremendous number of libraries that were telling the Board that they don't
3 understand why the word "contiguous" is being looked at. What the libraries were saying
4 was that the word "contiguous" was not limiting them. Gerry Garzon stated that he
5 wanted to bring-up that while the word "contiguous" is not in the statute, it was in the
6 regulatory language which was there to help interpret the law.

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

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

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

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

26 Carol Frost, Pacific Library Partnership, stated that there were a lot of examples of
27 libraries doing digital resource sharing effectively. In the NorthNet Library System funds
28 were divided up by a formula so each library in NorthNet received a distribution of funds
29 and then had a menu of services that they could chose to use their funds for such as
30 delivery, Zinio, eBooks, etc. It was up to the individual libraries how they wanted to use
31 those funds. Libraries could supplement those programs with their own individual funds

1 from the government. Similarly, there were 17 libraries in California that were sharing
2 digital resources through the Cloud library. None of those libraries were using CLSA
3 funds for that and it was working very efficiently.

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

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

12 ***It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Maghsoudi) and carried with a vote***
13 ***of seven aye votes (Buenafe, Ibanez, Maghsoudi, Mindnich, Murguia,***
14 ***Williams, Tauler), three no votes (Bernardo, Christmas, Huguenin),***
15 ***and one abstention (Schockman) that the California Library Services***
16 ***Board approves the retention of the word “contiguous” in California***
17 ***Library Services Act regulations, Sections 20180, 20185, and 20190.***
18 **2:41:33**

19 **Adjourned Open Session at 12:10pm.**

20 **Resume Open Session Public Meeting at 1:30pm**

21 **REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

22 President Bernardo resumed the public meeting of the California Library Services
23 Board at 1:30pm.

24 President Bernardo reported that the Board had completed their closed session and
25 approved the performance evaluation, with amendments and a recommended 10%
26 salary increase for the Administrative Assistant II to the California Library Services
27 Board.

28 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

29 Annly Roman reported that there were two measures the Board had taken positions
30 on at the April 2017 Board meeting. First was CLA sponsored SCA 3 (Dodd) which
31 moved through the legislative process but was held up at the end of session and did not

1 pass. Roman reported SCA 3 was held over on the inactive file and could be brought
2 forward again the next year. There was a lot of work done by CLA and the Lobbyists
3 trying to get the measure passed but it was a tough year because there was an early
4 tax vote which caused many republicans and moderates to be hesitant about casting
5 another positive vote on a tax related issue. Roman reported that CLA had discussed
6 making SCA 3 a priority for next year as well.

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

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

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

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

29 **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2017/18**

30 Annly Roman stated that the Board had been provided with some documents to
31 begin the discussion of a strategic plan. Staff had trouble finding the Board's last full
32 strategic plan but staff was able to provide Board actions which showed the vision

1 statement approved by the Board as well as the three year goals established and some
2 of the background documentation from the planning session.

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

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

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

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

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

30 Member Schockman asked if they would be looking at a three year or five year plan.
31 Annly Roman stated she thought the Board should start with a three year plan which

1 could be updated as needed within that period of time. Member Williams asked if they
2 were considering doing a planning session the day before the April meeting and Board
3 members agreed with the idea of a half-day session.

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

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

10 **I. PUBLIC COMMENT**

11 There was no public comment brought forward.

12 **J. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

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

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

26 That kind of partnership between public libraries and institutional libraries was
27 something Buenafe thought would help reduce recidivism and she was encouraged by
28 how enthusiastic the public libraries were. She felt that there had been a change in
29 California about how the incarcerated were perceived and since 95% would eventually
30 go back into communities, this was a way to help them be successful.

1 Member Ibanez stated that he attended, as an observer, the Pasadena Library's
2 community conversations with librarians, headed by Cindy Mediavilla. He felt it was a
3 very interesting conversation. He also wanted to encourage Board members to attend
4 the President's dinner at the CLA. He would be playing in the band.

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

9 **K. OLD BUSINESS**

10 There was no old business brought forward.

11 **L. AGENDA BUILDING**

12 There was no additional agenda items brought forward.

13 **M. ADJOURNMENT**

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

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-02
In Honor of Penny Kastanis*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that

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

Penny Kastanis

*for her commitment and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 17 October, 2017*

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-03
In Honor of Gregory McGinity*

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

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

Gregory McGinity

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

California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-04

In Honor of Dr. Kevin Starr

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that

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

Dr. Kevin Starr

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