1 **Approved March 28, 2019**

2 California Library Services Board Meeting
3 October 4, 2018

4 California State Capitol
5 Room 113
6 Sacramento, CA

7 **Welcome and Introductions**

8 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on

9 October 4, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.

10 **Board Members Present**: Anne Bernardo, Brandy Buenafe, Gary Christmas,

11 Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Peter Mindnich, Elizabeth Murguia, Maria

12 Senour, Sandra Tauler, and Connie Williams.

13 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State

14 Librarian Narinder Sufi, Carolyn Brooks, Natalie Cole, Janet Coles, Suzanne Flint, Susan

15 Hanks, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Beverly Schwartzberg, and Mark Webster.

16 **Adoption of Agenda**

17 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Tauler) and carried*
18 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the*
19 *agenda of the October 4, 2018 meeting.*

20 **Approval of California Library Services Board Strategic Planning Meeting Minutes**

21 *It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried with eight*
22 *ayes and one abstention (Senour) that the California Library Services*
23 *Board approves the draft minutes of the April 16, 2018 California*
24 *Library Services Board Strategic Planning Session.*

25 **Approval of April 2018 Board Minutes**

26 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried with eight ayes*
27 *and one abstention (Senour) that the California Library Services*
28 *Board approves the draft minutes of the April 17, 2018 California*
29 *Library Services Board Meeting.*

30 **Approval of California Library Services Board Public regulatory Hearing Minutes**

31 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Murguia) and carried with*
32 *eight ayes and one abstention (Senour) that the California Library*

1   ***Services Board approves the draft minutes of the April 17, 2018***
2   ***California Library Services Board Regulatory Hearing.***

3 **Election of Board Officers**

4   Member Williams reported that the nominating committee recommended that the
5 Board elect Anne Bernardo as President and Gary Christmas as Vice-President.

6   ***It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***
7   ***that the California Library Services Board elects Anne Bernardo as***
8   ***President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2019.***
9
10   ***It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***
11   ***that the California Library Services Board elects Gary Christmas as***
12   ***Vice-President of the California Library Services Board for the year***
13   ***2019.***
14
15 **Board Meeting Date for Spring 2019**

16   Monica Rivas reported that based on the last Doodle poll the next meeting would be
17 on April 2, 2019. Rivas asked whether the Board wanted to meet in late August or early
18 September for their fall meeting.

19   Member Tauler and President Bernardo both suggested late August based the option
20 for a last chance of legislative input at the end of session. State Librarian Lucas stated
21 that this year's session would run until mid-September. Member Christmas asked if State
22 Librarian Lucas thought that there would be a great need for advocacy around the fall
23 meeting. State Librarian Lucas said unless you are a powerful interest group it was difficult
24 do anything in the last few weeks of the legislative session.

25   Member Christmas suggested meeting in Southern California to provide an
26 opportunity for library directors in that area to participate. President Bernardo asked if that
27 would be difficulty. Rivas stated that might be more difficult and more expensive because
28 staff would have to travel. Member Buenafe thought that since Board members travelled
29 from Southern California that cost savings might off-set flying down staff. Member
30 Maghsoudi offered Whittier Library to host the meeting. Member Williams requested
31 seeing a cost comparison before a decision was made.

32   Williams asked if Board members would do advocacy the day before the next Board
33 meeting and if that was a good day for legislators. Rivas stated that the Board could
34 change the date. President Bernardo asked to re-look at the dates to see what was open.

1

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Board President's Report

President Bernardo reported that as a member of the Council for California County Law Librarians she had been supporting their efforts with County Law Libraries in California. The Governor had been generous in supporting the county law libraries with one-time funding.

She had been active in online webinars, the Calix listserv, and other special library activities. She had been in touch with local US legislators as well as active in ALA on library issues.

Bernardo wanted to thank to State Librarian Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Sufi and Janet Coles for their assistance in helping county law libraries gain public library recognition at the federal level, which would enable them to take advantage of national grants.

Board Vice-President's Report

Vice-President Maghsoudi had been attending the California Library Association Legislative Committee as much as she could and following up with their agendas. She reported that IMLS had just been reinstated with some more money.

Chief Executive Officer's Report

State Librarian Lucas reported that the final budget was approved and contained all the original funding from the Governor's proposed budget: $5 million in one-time funds to improve internet speed and broadband connectivity for the state's libraries, $1 million in one-time funding to carry on the work that we are doing with Zip Books and $450,000 to digitally connect the catalogues of all of the libraries north of San Francisco. Lucas reported authority to hire a broadband coordinator at the State Library was included as well as a chunk of money for various fees incurred by CENIC, the entity that manages the broadband network libraries were connecting to.

$1 million in one-time funds, requested by Senator Holly Mitchell, was also included to encourage public libraries to become places that offer free meals in the summer. During the school year around 2 million of the state's 6.2 million students get a subsidized or free meal during the school day and only 1 out of 5 of those kids gets one in the summer.

4

1　Libraries had become a popular place to go for these meals because of all the other

2　services, learning possibilities, and enrichment they offer. Part of the bill gave libraries

3　microgrants to go to lunch sites that were less attractive to parents and kids to see if that

4　would boost attendance. Lucas stated that Senator Mitchell's original intent was for on-

5　going funding but in budget negotiations the Governor Brown approved legislative

6　requests only if they were one-time funds. His understanding was that Senator Mitchell

7　looked at it as a three-year pilot.

8　State Librarian Lucas reported that there were two other items that were one-time in

9　nature: $1 million to help build a library in Felton, a city in Santa Cruz, and $1 million over

10　two years to support writing project literacy programs. President Bernardo stated that the

11　Governor had also included another $1 million for Career Online High School.

12　Lucas stated that the Federal budget provided about $2 million more devoted to

13　libraries but if you read the fine print, the $2 million went to the people who institute the

14　program at the Museum of Library Services. It did not appear that it would send more

15　money to the states.

16　There was an effort by Senator Reed from Rhoad Island to increase the minimum

17　amount that every state gets under the Federal Library Services and Technology Act. So

18　right now, around $700,000 is the minimum. Reed is trying to boost that to $1 million. The

19　beneficiaries would be the smaller states and, if it was the same pot of money, the larger

20　states would get less, particularly California. California was not supportive of that idea

21　unless there were stronger assurance that the larger states would be held harmless. To

22　do what Senator Reed wants and hold all states harmless would be another $17 million.

23　Lucas reported that Governor Brown approved two bills that the Board took a position

24　on. One was SB 830, which said that the Department of Education had to put out

25　guidelines to teach kids about media literacy. The other bill required the State Library to

26　create a webpage by July 1, 2020 that showed all of the grant opportunities in California.

27　The State Library was going to spend the remainder of the year trying to get an idea of

28　the scope of that project.

29　Finally, State Librarian Lucas reported the State Library had begun an initiative to

30　focus on being digital first; using online exhibits, more crowd sourcing, more effective

31　communication with local libraries and improving the webpage. The State Library's

1 mission was to empower the people of the most diverse state in the nation, and the only
2 way to accomplish that was to make more of what we do accessible.

3 Member Williams asked for a quick report on the statewide databases. State Librarian
4 Lucas stated that until 2018 California was the only state in the nation that did not provide
5 a suite of online content to school kids. The now deceased Executive Secretary for the
6 Governor, Nancy McFadden, thought that it was important and ear-marked $3 million to
7 begin providing online content. Lucas said that the State Library went through a process
8 where people with an expertise in education, including Member Williams, looked at a
9 number of proposals and selected three products: ProQuest, Encyclopedia Britannica,
10 and Teaching Books. The vendors and State Library staff then reached out to school
11 districts. Prior to September 1, the databases were in just over 50% of school districts,
12 representing about 70% of school kids.

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

14 Beverly Schwartzberg reported that the goal of the project was to bring high-speed
15 broadband of at least 1 Gigabit per second to all California public libraries by connecting
16 them to the California Research and Education Network (CalREN), which is managed by
17 the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

18 As part of the State Library's strategic planning process to support efforts to efficiently
19 finish the job of delivering world-class internet access to all California libraries, staff had
20 taken a close look at potential next steps for the program.

21 A total of 144 jurisdictions, out of a total of 184 jurisdictions, had connected or were in
22 the process of connecting to CalREN. The total included four new jurisdictions in process
23 that were part of Year 4. Of the State Library's 1,125 public library outlets, which include
24 main and branch libraries, 53 percent were connected, 18 percent were in the process
25 of connecting, and approximately 30 percent were not yet connected, had chosen not to
26 participate, or were not eligible for the program. Of the 30 percent classified as 'Not
27 Participating', approximately half were not CSLA eligible locations.

28 Based on survey results, the new high-speed broadband connections had a positive
29 impact in California's public libraries and their communities. As part of the survey process
30 directors were also asked to note any challenges, which included getting funding situated,

1   overcoming geographical issues, infrastructure build delays, and access to a reliable IT

2   professional in their library.

3   Schwartzberg reported that connections for libraries joining as part of Year 4 were in

4   process. Four new library jurisdictions (County of Los Angeles Public Library, San Diego

5   County Library, Roseville Public Library, and City of Santa Clarita Public Library) joined

6   the program. An additional 17 jurisdictions applied for grant assistance and already had

7   agreements in place from previous years. Within these 21 jurisdictions, 151 branches

8   were either connected or in the process connecting, the majority of which were in Los

9   Angeles County.

10   Based on data from Califa, there were 11 new jurisdictions, which include 55 library

11   branch location, interested in joining the program for Year 5. An RFP for services had

12   been issued and more detail about the status of the procurement would be available at

13   the next board meeting.

14   Schwartzberg said that the challenge presented at this stage of the program was how

15   to get the necessary infrastructure close enough to the remaining libraries to connect

16   them to CalREN. The current grant program, which supported making connections to

17   CalREN through one-time support for connectivity funding, equipment purchase, building

18   modifications to make connections possible, and costs associated with equipment

19   configuration, was in the process of reviewing goals and processes.

20   Schwartzberg reported that the legislature had allocated an additional $2 million in

21   funding for the current grant program and an additional $3 million in one-time funding to

22   be used by the state library to make grants related to ensuring the infrastructure gap is

23   closed. The broadband project team was evaluating recommendations on how those

24   funds would be dispersed.

25   Member Murguia asked if the Stave Library was planning on asking the Governor for

26   more money to address the infrastructure problem and if so how much more money would

27   it take. State Librarian Lucas said that the short answer was not at the moment. There

28   were estimates that ranged anywhere from 100 to several hundred millions dollars to

29   make those infrastructure connections. In his view it was something that needed to be a

30   broader discussion than just connecting libraries. It seemed that a lower cost way of

1 connecting libraries in those difficult to connect areas was to include other institutions in

2 the connection process.

3 Member Murguia asked if that areas that had the basic infrastructure problems had

4 been identified. Lucas stated that 70 or so individual locations had been identified.

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

6 **Program Report**

7 Beverly Schwartzberg reported that the Libraries Illuminated Project allowed libraries

8 to apply for funds to support the purchase of: cutting-edge technology to provided

9 innovative services and programming that fulfilled the potential of their broadband

10 connections; functional hardware and software so libraries could use their new broadband

11 connections effectively; and technology that enabled libraries to make the best use of

12 their non-broadband Internet connections. In addition to the funds awarded to Libraries

13 Illuminated applicants, the State Library provided 35 libraries with virtual reality

14 equipment.

15 Schwartzberg stated that nearly all 38 Libraries Illuminated institutions had purchased

16 equipment and the State Library anticipated that all libraries would have purchased

17 equipment by the end of 2018. Most had begun offering programs and services this past

18 summer. To date, about $645,000 of the grant funds had been spent, matched by

19 $1,041,000 in cash or local funds and $475,000 worth of in-kind matches. Close to 500

20 programs were created such as workshops featuring Minecraft, gaming design, robotics

21 and app development, 3D printing and laser cutting, business start-up information, health

22 apps, skype author visits, resume and job search workshops, using online library

23 resources, and research skills. Libraries also reported a variety of innovative partnerships

24 with institutions of higher education, community volunteers, school districts, interest

25 groups like CoderDojo, makerspace groups, senior centers, service organizations, local

26 government, corporations like GoPro, and community access TV stations.

27 In addition, Libraries Illuminated included a model evaluation component. So far

28 survey results showed 96% learned something that was helpful, 94% feel more confident

29 about what they learned, 90% intend to apply what they learned, and 93% were more

30 aware of resources and services provided by the library.

Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report

Natalie Cole reported that the goal for the project was to create an impact study and online clearinghouse cataloging the economic and social value of libraries. The project funding was $300,000 through June 2020. They had received an extension to allow them to complete the project successfully. The project team had collected and examined an additional set of 16 resources developed by thought leaders within the library sector about the current and future state of libraries. Those would be added to the much larger data sets already collected. These resources provided a general context to the other, more academic works already in the online clearinghouse. They reflected on how public libraries' foundational concepts of equality, and connecting people and ideas remained cornerstones of library service and how new approaches to service should be explored. We are working with the Institute of Social Research at Sacramento State University to issue a survey to identify what Californians valued and how their values aligned with the services that libraries provided. That was almost complete.

Natalie Cole reported that during the summer she spoke about the Value of Libraries project at a national Action Research Summit on Future Facing Libraries in London. The summit was presented by Libraries Unlimited and the University of Exeter Business School with which we had been collaborating. The summit was attended by representatives from the UK Government, local councils, the British Library, public libraries, and the BBC. It was a really great opportunity to discuss some ideas with people who were doing similar work. The focus of the summit was: what specific social value do libraries create and how; and were there ways that libraries could better connect social value to financial value in ways that amplify rather than undermine what makes them special.

To start raising awareness of what libraries do an article was submitted, based on our first literature review, to the journal *Library Management*. The article proposed a value framework that included the six areas of value that had emerged from the literature review, supported by the foundation of access to and use of technology in libraries; the combination of people, space, information, ideas, and opportunities that libraries comprise; and the change or transformation that public libraries can effect. This

1 framework was based on the academic research and it was anticipated that it would grow

2 as data was gathered from other spaces.

3 Coles reported they were working with the California Research Bureau, within the

4 California State Library, to develop a report on the state of the state's public libraries. We

5 would contribute data to the report from the Value of Libraries project, as well as from

6 other Library Development Services' projects and work, notably the California Public

7 Library Survey. The report was a library-wide effort that was led by the Research Bureau.

8 On the basis of the information gathered to date, we were developing the impact study

9 that would tell us more about the value of California's public libraries. We were taking a

10 bricolage approach to data collection and our immediate next steps include connecting

11 the library data with published data in related fields (e.g. sociology, public policy, and

12 education). For example, library literature told us that libraries were trusted community

13 spaces but it was research done in other fields that would tell us why those things were

14 important.

15 They were gathering outcomes data, which is where a mini-grants program came

16 along. The Library Development Services (LDS) Bureau, had developed a set of outcome

17 statements that were used to evaluate the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA)

18 projects so they had a consistent tool. The project team would be using those statements

19 to support a range of programs. So libraries would be allowed to apply for a mini-grant

20 that would help libraries develop programs and evaluate what they were doing. In

21 addition, they would be looking at the Public Library Association's Project Outcome and

22 gathering the California data. There was already so much data within the Library

23 Development Bureau about the good things libraries were doing that they would collect

24 that information.

25 The data they had was really a lot of academic studies so it was driven by what those

26 people chose to research. It was not necessarily showing the full picture of what libraries

27 were doing They would also being looking at the professional literature for a bigger

28 picture of what libraries were doing. Then they will be convene an advisory group to

29 provide input how the data would get out.

1   Member Murguia asked what the timing was in terms of the report and convening the

2   advisory group. Cole reported probably the first few months of 2020. She stated that this

3   was the time it would take to gather the original data.

4   President Bernardo ask if, when they were considering all the data and studies out

5   there, they considered the larger studies like Pew. Cole said yes. She said there were

6   those big studies but there was also a lot of research that hadn't been done. In the

7   academic research there were big areas, like youth services, which weren't really covered

8   by a lot of rigorous research. Obviously that was a huge part of what libraries do so they

9   had to make sure that they were gathering that information if hadn't been published. That

10   was why they had to start with the literature review. It was a slightly slower project then

11   originally thought but they wanted to be really thorough.

12   Member Christmas stated that he thought the work they were doing was really good

13   way to get information out there about the value of libraries, not just the social value but

14   the economic as well. Natalie stated that one of the things she thought was emerging was

15   that libraries played a unique role in society.

16   Member Williams asked if Cole had anything they could use for the April meeting for

17   advocacy. Cole said not currently. Williams stated that she felt the Board needed to

18   pinpoint where their advocacy efforts were going to go so she would love to see what they

19   were observing.

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

21   Lena Pham reported that the Enki library program was a shared eBook platform

22   created by libraries with over 70,000 titles. Over the course of that project, over 6500 new

23   titles had been purchased for the collection from multiple publishers. Most of the titles

24   purchased were licensed as always available, meaning they could have unlimited,

25   simultaneous views. The purchases included young fiction from the Press which is fiction

26   for struggling readers, children's fiction, graphic novels, and items for the business

27   collection. For the 18/19 Fiscal year the State Library had also invested $50,000 in LSTA

28   funds for e-content, which would translate to approximately 5000 additional titles.

29   29 new library jurisdictions had been added to the Enki platform. As of September 1,

30   2018 there were over 100 libraries connected to Enki and 64 libraries to attempt to bring

31   onboard.

Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader Program Report

Lena Pham reported that the SimplyE app aggregated all of a libraries ebooks from various vendors so patrons could search all platforms from one application. With this project, six pilot libraries had been setup on SimplyE: Alameda County Library, Black Gold Cooperative Library System, Butte County library, Los Angeles Public Library, Porterville Library and Santa Clara County library District. Each library was live in the production app and in various stages of launching the new service to their patrons. Alameda County Library went live first and they currently had 444 registered users.

Pham reported that another exciting aspect of the project was the integration of audio books so that downloadable audio books the library purchased would also be accessible. The rollout for that feature is scheduled for the end of 2018.

Paula McKinnon stated that the goal was for libraries to continue to purchase from multiple platforms but that patrons would be able to access everything from one location. The platform also allowed libraries to have additional conversations with vendors about how they licensed ebooks. McKinnon stated that down the road they wanted to incorporate geolocation so that when you were in the state you would have access to platforms like Enki automatically without having to have a library card.

Innovation Lab Grant Program Update

Lena Pham reported that the purpose of this project was to create innovation stations or labs. The program was built upon the premise of cooperation between libraries, educators, and public/private organizations to connect people to needed skills and encourage creative problem solving. The project included more than 18 libraries for the last year.

The types of projects included makerspaces, maker boxes, labs and different types of library services. 15 of the projects were fixed location and 6 were mobile. Pham also highlighted the types of partnerships being created which included 29 organizations, 1900 libraries, and 12 public entities and schools.

The grant was for $200,000 and the total in-kind was around $362,000. The investment in these projects had also led to the creation of 60-70 programs within the participating libraries. A final survey would be done at the end of the year to determine the exact number of programs created.

1   Member Williams asked for specific examples of the library programs interfacing with

2   schools. Diane Satchwell commented that in a couple of places the lab was actually

3   located at a school because they couldn't afford to bring it to the library.

4   Member Senour stated that one of her interests was education reform in jails and

5   prisons, which did not have internet available. Senour said that she was aware that idea

6   might not fit into that particular grant but wondered if any thought had been given to

7   providing textbooks so people could take classes and where that the potential existed

8   within the Board's purview.

9   Member Maghsoudi stated that she thought they had used some funding to purchase

10   books specifically for prisons but that was several years ago. Senour stated that she was

11   on the Board at the Community College district and she knew that the number one factor

12   in recidivism reduction was if they could offer credit programs to folks so they came out

13   with real skills. She felt the idea of providing textbooks, which obviously would be

14   expensive, seemed like something the Board ought to consider.

15   Member Buenafe stated that she worked for the Office of Correctional Education and

16   they had college programs at 34 of their 35 institutions. The issue of textbooks was a big

17   one. They were looking at free open sourced material that they could provide inmates on

18   e-readers. Buenafe stated that thinking was shifting toward wanting to get inmates on the

19   internet but prisons are located in rural areas which are difficult due to infrastructure

20   issues.

21   State Librarian Greg Lucas reported that there were also several counties that had

22   agreements with the local jail systems to conduct courses, everything from basic literacy

23   to connecting inmates with adult education programs and job center kinds of programs,

24   so there are models already at work in other parts of the state.

25   **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

26   Carolyn Brooks reported that through the Zip Books project, when a patron visited a

27   library and a specific book they were looking for was not available library staff could order

28   the book from Amazon and ship it directly to the patron's home at no cost. When the

29   patron was done with the book it was returned to the library where staff had the choice of

30   adding the book to the collection or offering it to other participating libraries.

1   Zip Book bridged the gap between patron need, the normal acquisition process and

2 outreach home delivery service, which few libraries could afford. In the rural libraries this

3 program was especially important because a trip into town to the library was a big deal.

4   Brooks stated Zip Books was extremely popular with libraries and patrons. It provided

5 patrons with speedy access to materials they might not be able to access without the long

6 wait associated with interlibrary loan. The program was much easier for library staff to

7 administer and since Amazon shipped directly to the patron it saved the effort and cost of

8 packaging and mailing materials. The program also added a patron driven development

9 approach to libraries' usual process, resulting in a collection that was much more in-tune

10 with the local community.

11   Brookes reported that the original 239 libraries were funded with LSTA funds. Those

12 were all rural libraries and had experienced tremendous success. 30 libraries had been

13 brought on utilizing CSLA funding and were completely through the process. The new

14 libraries were working on developing their patron base for the program and usage was

15 increasing. Some mid-sized libraries in more populated regions were added to test the

16 flow in larger library systems and that pilot was experiencing the same outstanding

17 reviews. Six more libraries were in the process of coming on board and several rural

18 libraries that were not originally able to participate worked diligently with their local

19 systems to accommodate the Zip Model.

20   Brooks reported that some of the new libraries have expressed a need for additional

21 startup assistance which might include advertisement, accounting processes, and patron

22 tracking. They were looking to provide additional supports to the newest libraries through

23 a mentoring process where the more experienced libraries shared lessons learned and

24 best practices. The State Library was also looking to change and align a lot of the fiscal

25 processes in order to increase the efficiency, streamline the billing processes and reduce

26 administrative costs. The goal was to spend the money on books in patron's hands rather

27 than trying to figure out fiscal timing.

28   Member Ibanez asked if there was a limitation on what books could be ordered.

29 Carolyn Brooks stated that most of the libraries had parameters, books could not be more

30 than $35 and the libraries are able to determine their process. For example, some libraries

31 only allow paperbacks, some libraries would not order non-fiction that is older than 2000.

1 Member Senour asked if the program only included new titles or if it could be used to

2 additional copies of books with a long list of holds. Brooks said that if the library already

3 owned the book it should not be ordered through Zip Books.

4   Carolyn Brooks stated that the Santa Cruz library wanted to do a twist on the model.

5 Because of their close relationship with the local jail the library was allowed to provide

6 inmates with books without having to go through the regular search and hold process that

7 can take weeks or months. The librarians were excited to figure out how the benefit of the

8 Zip Model could reach the incarcerated.

9   President Bernardo asked if any other were states using the Zip Book model. State

10 Librarian Lucas said that many institutions used some kind of patron driven acquisition

11 but he had found the model more in academic libraries. Lucas said that one of the

12 unexpected outcomes of the pilot in more urban areas was feedback about the value of

13 someone receiving something in the mail that they actually want to see.

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

15 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

16 **System Plans of service and Budgets**

17   Monica Rivas reported that the System Population and Membership Figures were one

18 of the items used when calculating the funding. The 2018/19 numbers were approved by

19 the State Librarian.

20   *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Tauler) and carried unanimously*
21   *that the California Library Services Board approves the System*
22   *Population and Membership figures for use in the allocation of System*
23   *funds for the fiscal year 2018/19.*

24   Monica Rivas reported that the System's Plans of Service showed more resource

25 sharing for things like DigiLabs, updating their website and logos, using Link+, Zinio,

26 Overdrive, Enki, SimplyE and repositories of information. It seemed like the systems were

27 starting to move toward using e-resources, which showed that they were being efficient

28 and diligent with the funding.

29   *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously that*
30   *the California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System*
31   *Plans of Service and Budgets for the nine Cooperative Library*
32   *Systems, submitted for fiscal year 2018/19.*

Monica Rivas stated that the final budget numbers did not change from the preliminary ones the Board approved at their last meeting. The Board just needed to approve the final version.

> ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Maghsoudi) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the Final 2018/19 CLSA budget as directed in the Governor's 2018/19 Budget totaling $3,630,000 for allocation to the Cooperative Library Systems.***

Library Services Act New Budget Allocation for 2018-2019 Fiscal Year

State Librarian Lucas reported that of the budget items approved by the Governor, $1.45 million in one-time funding was allocated under the California Library Services Act: $1 million for Zip Books and $450,000 that allowed the libraries north of San Francisco to digitally connect their catalogs through Link+.

Member Buenafe stated that she was excited to see the $450,000 because she had used Link+ and it provided access to books that were in college libraries. She just finished her MBA this year and she thought that more than 50% of her books were from Link+ rather than purchased. She felt that it would be good for a lot of the northern area to have access to other materials.

> ***It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Murguia) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the $1 million allocated in the 2018-2019 budget to invest in the Zip Books program to ensure timely and cost-effective access to information in California's hard-to-reach and underserved communities.***

> ***It was moved, seconded (Buenafe/Tauler) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the $450,000 allocated in the 2018-2019 budget to pay the one-time connection cost of digitally connecting the catalogs of 26 county library systems and 15 city library systems, and 13 academic libraries in the northern third of the state.***

RESOURCE SHARING

Consolidation and Affiliations

Monica Rivas reported that Hayward Public Library had requested to be removed from Pacific Library Partnership in 2014 but they would now like to rejoin and PLP had agreed to the re-affiliation.

> ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the affiliation of the***

1   ***Hayward Public Library with the Pacific Library Partnership***
2   ***Cooperative Library System effective July 1, 2019, and waive the***
3   ***September 1, 2018 notification date for 2018/19 affiliations.***

4 **CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES ACT REPORTING**

5   Monica Rivas stated the State Library was looking into changing the forms for the

6 Plans of Service and Annual reports. Staff had discussions with the Systems and decided

7 to ask for additional information. Once all the information was in staff would have a follow-

8 up meeting with the systems to determine how best to use all of the data and how to make

9 the forms more efficient. The systems also had asked for more training on how to

10 complete some of the forms to make sure that the reporting was uniform.

11   The first step was sending out the plans of service with some additional questions to

12 see what kinds of data the systems could provide. The next step would be sitting down

13 with the systems to come up with what the new forms would look like.

14 **<u>CLSA REGULATIONS</u>**

15   Monica Rivas reported that the Board needed to take action on one final regulatory

16 item. The Office of Administrative Law wanted the Board to clarify the section pertaining

17 to "home library." At the last California Library Services Board meeting on April 17, 2018

18 a regulatory hearing was held to discuss proposed regulatory changes. Based on the

19 comments from the Systems and other library stakeholders two changes were made to

20 the regulations pertaining to meeting frequency and public recognition. Additionally, a

21 definition of "home library", which should have been included based on instructions from

22 the Board at previous meeting, was missing from the regulations.

23   These changes were incorporated into the regulatory language and publicly noticed

24 for 15 days. No public comment or additional suggestions were submitted during that

25 time. The Final Statement of Reasons and packet had been submitted to the Office of

26 Administrative Law for their review. The Office of Administrative Law stated that since the

27 Board had not voted for the specific definition of "home library" it was not an eligible part

28 of the regulatory language.

29   Rivas stated that in order to include the language and continue with the regulatory

30 process the Board needed to take an approving motion. The reviewer from the Office of

31 Administrative Law stated that a motion from the Board at the current meeting would be

1 sufficient since the language was crafted with the participation of the systems and had

2 been publicly noticed. A "home library" means "the public library within whose taxing area

3 a person resides."

4   ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously***
5   ***that the California Library Services Board approves the definition of***
6   ***"home library" contained in the proposed language for section***
7   ***20107(b)(2) of the California Library Services Act Regulations.***

8 Monica Rivas stated that hopefully the regulations would be completed by the end of the

9 year.

10 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

11   President Bernardo asked about AB 2252, the bill that made the State Library

12 responsible for a website listing all state grants. The bill was introduced by

13 Assemblymember Limon and sponsored by the Association of Nonprofits. It was designed

14 to make it easier for someone to find grant opportunities offered by the state. Bernardo

15 asked if the State Library had a person for that project. Lucas stated that the State Library

16 did not have a person at the moment, but it did seem like they would need one, if only to

17 keep it current.

18   President Bernardo asked if this would be a link on the State Library's website. Lucas

19 reported that staff was meeting with some of the nonprofit groups to determine the best

20 place and format. The State Library had been assured that the Department of Technology

21 would help in shaping the site. Right now the State library was just looking at the scope

22 of the project.

23   State Librarian Lucas reported that there had been some discussions among the State

24 Librarians throughout the nation about seeking a dollar per capita in federal support for

25 libraries through the Institute of Museums and Library Services. That would essentially

26 double the $180 million currently provided in federal local assistance grants to libraries.

27   Member Murguia stated that years ago federal funding was also provided library

28 renovation or construction and she wondered if construction funding had been part of the

29 discussion. Murguia stated that was something the Board should advocate for. Member

30 Christmas brought up the idea of another library bond act.

1   President Bernardo asked if the Board thought they should move toward requesting

2 more funding. Member Murguia stated that at the strategic planning meeting they can

3 discussed the concept of the Board becoming more of an advocate. Since there would

4 be a new Governor and new legislators she thought the Board should direct the State

5 Library to put together a letter advocating for funding in the budget.

6   Murguia suggested, as a tie-in to early childhood education, advocating for a program,

7 coordinated with schools and early childhood education groups, to put a library card into

8 the hands of every kindergartener when they enrolled. Secondly, she felt the Board

9 should make a case to the new administration about library facility needs. She also felt

10 they should ask for on-going funding for Zip Books. Finally, she felt the other one-time

11 funding programs had been so successful that they Board should try to get on-going

12 funding for those as well.

13   Murguia suggested starting with a letter to the Governor then working with ALA and

14 their advocates. She stated that the Chair of the Senate Budget Committee was a library

15 advocate who helped extend the summer lunch program so she thought they should

16 contact her as well. Several board members agreed with that statement.

17   State Librarian Lucas stated that the State Library had spent federal grant money on

18 exploring strategies for putting library cards in the hands of school kids. Carol Frost, from

19 Pacific Library Partnership, stated that they were in the third year of a grant called the

20 Student Success Initiative, which had the full support of the Department of Education. As

21 of this year there were 63 library jurisdictions statewide participating. Frost stated that

22 they were working at two different levels. At the ground level librarians were talking with

23 Principals, Superintendents, and county offices of education to make that collaboration

24 and at the system level they were working with the Department of Education. Last year

25 over 750,000 cards were issued to kids. That was beyond just a regular library card, there

26 were wrap around services that went with the program because they wanted to be able

27 to give children and teachers services that they needed as well. Frost thought it would be

28 wonderful if California could say that 95% of all kids had a library card.

29   Frost also brought up the Veterans Connect program as an example of a growing

30 program that could show existing partnerships to building on. She also brought up how

31 the Napa County libraries had turned into operational centers during the fires because

1 their network was one of the only ones functioning. It showed how important those

2 programs were.

3 Member Williams asked if the Student Success Initiative was the program trying to

4 give every student a library card where the number was the same as their school ID

5 number. Frost stated that was the most imbedded way to do that so the number would

6 follow a student.

7 Hillary Theyer from SCLC and the Torrance Library, said that a lot of the projects they

8 were talking about were layered projects where libraries could come participate from

9 where they were. One example was the Student Success program. One of the options

10 that libraries had was to simply get a mentor that could help have conversations with

11 schools or IT departments. Another example was CENIC. Torrance was facing an

12 infrastructure problem and their libraries had amazing wireless. They applied for a

13 Libraries Illuminated grant and got two portable technology labs that could go to any

14 library and could run entirely on their wireless. They could use those to set up

15 Chromebooks, print, etc. One of the programs they were doing was emergency

16 preparation with their libraries. They were bringing in experts to show them everything

17 from their Torrance alerts app all the way to the FEMA app. Then ending with saying if an

18 emergency happens a function of your branch library was to turn into an area disaster

19 center.

20 There was some discussion of the amounts that should be assigned to any budgetary

21 requests, especially Zip Books. State Librarian Lucas said that with some of the programs

22 they did not know yet what the overall need would be. For example, with Zip Books they

23 were only 6 months into testing in the newly added urban areas, so going with a lower

24 ask might be more prudent. Additionally, he couldn't really say what library participation

25 would be because different libraries have different levels of participation. The Board

26 settled that the State Librarian would make recommendations as to amounts then run it

27 by the Board or Board officers for approval.

28 Todd Deck, from Tehema County reiterated the importance of broadband connectivity.

29 Many of the people in his area struggled with connectivity so forging those connections

30 would have real impacts on real people.

1   President Bernardo asked, in terms of the Student Success Initiative, is that was

2   something they could fund under communications and delivery. Monica Rivas stated that

3   the Board could advocate for things outside of the communication and delivery funding.

4   ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Christmas) and carried***
5   ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board directs***
6   ***California State Library staff to draft a letter to the Governor Elect,***
7   ***Budget Chairs, Senate Pro Tempore, Assembly Speaker, and other***
8   ***relevant legislative leadership under the new incoming administration***
9   ***advocating for ongoing funding for the current California Library***
10   ***Services Act grant programs under the Board's purview and the***
11   ***Student Success Initiative, funding for Broadband expansion, and a***
12   ***bond act for library facilities, with the amount requested to be***
13   ***suggested by the California State Librarian and approved by the Board***
14   ***Officers.***

15   Member Murguia suggested asking the Board officers to reach out and make contact

16   with CLA and their advocates as well as making contact with Senator Holly Mitchell, the

17   Budget Chair and other members before the April meeting.

18   **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2017/18**

19   President Bernardo stated that the Nine Cooperative Library Systems were going to

20   give a presentation on how their systems work. Diane Satchwell stated that in 1911 the

21   County Library Law was written, and within that law there were all of the rules and

22   regulations which could be found on the State Libraries website. In 1977 the California

23   Library Services Act was passed. There were originally 15 systems. In 1989-1995 Dr.

24   Kevin Starr started the Library of California Act which included law libraries, special district

25   libraries, school libraries, public libraries. Budgets cuts began after that and the systems

26   went down to nine.

27   Each year the Systems project their funds based on the populations figures then

28   determine what they would like to do with that projected money. Once the Governor's

29   budget is approved they implement their programs and report back to the Board in their

30   annual reports.

31   Carol Frost stated that the systems cover a vast area and there was a lot of

32   cooperation among libraries over a large distance. There were nine library systems, and

33   five library system coordinators; Diane Satchwell had five systems, Maureen Theobald

34   had Black Gold, Kelley Landano had SJVLS, and Carol Frost had Pacific Library

1 Partnership and NorthNet with the help of Jacquie Brinkley. They collaborated together

2 on projects as well as worked with the Board and the State Library.

3 Frost also reported that the System were very diverse; some even included other kinds

4 of libraries, for example PLP had nine academic libraries, SCLC had a law library,

5 NorthNet had some academic and some law libraries. Systems thought a lot about what

6 their goals should be and how to reach those goals, which could be very difficult. They

7 also worked to make sure that all the funds allocated by the Board or LSTA and other

8 grants are available and being spent in a fiscally prudent way.

9 Frost wanted to report on some of the initiatives that the systems did together. A few

10 years ago the systems used some CLSA funds to create a knowledge portal called

11 CLSAInfo,org which was hosted by the Black Gold Cooperative Library System. It was a

12 way for all of the systems to share policies and procedures so no one was reinventing the

13 wheel if they were doing an RFP or something another system had already done.

14 Maureen Theobald stated that each system council or board identified their individual

15 system priorities and representative from each system would be reporting.

16 Chris Barnickel, representing Black Gold, stated that their system represented three

17 different counties, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura. Within those three

18 counties there were 7 jurisdictions. Black Gold had over a one million item collection in a

19 shared catalog that any of their patrons could access and materials were shipped back

20 and forth via currier services. The area covered by the systems was so vast that getting

21 representation for the rural libraries was paramount. Black Gold provided a four-day

22 service and had about a $1.9 million budget. In the last year they circulated about 5 or 6

23 million items. The four items the Systems had identified as priorities were: equity of grants

24 since it seemed that the larger systems were able to access grants more readily. They

25 are also prioritizing assistance in capital expenditures for maintenance, help with resource

26 sharing for e-content as well as courier shipping of materials back and forth, and finally,

27 more communications back and forth, especially with the State Library.

28 Laura Einstadter from 49-99, County Librarian for Amador County, stated that many

29 49-99 libraries were rural, consisting of Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Stockton-San

30 Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties. The overall system goals were staff development,

31 which would include things like training. They had received a Pitch-an-Idea grant from the

State Library called Collaborative Connections and it was going to focus on video conferencing and providing ESL workshops and bi-lingual story times to libraries across the system to support ESL families with developing strong literacy skills to succeed in school and fully participate in their communities. Stockton would host the events and share them with remote 49-99 libraries. E-resources such as eBooks and e-magazines. They were also looking at improving their logo and putting together a website that focused on 49-99 libraries. All of the libraries had been participating in Link+ for just over a year and a half and it had gone tremendously well.

Abbie Schellberg, from the Corona Public Library and Chair of the Inland Library System, reported that the Inland system was made up of Inyo, San Bernardo and Riverside Counties. They were a broad system in terms of where their cities and libraries sit financially. Inland was trying to focus on sharing resources and how that will benefit the jurisdictions. For example, RB digital, without a consortium might cost an individual library $13,000 versus $1000. Speaking for her own library system, they had regular cuts and just this year had to cut 7% so they had to look at letting go of things like digital resources. Since they the consortium was working together there were resources they could obtain and provide to the community. They also worked together on staff development and had an adult committee, a children's committee, teen committee and a literacy committee made up of people from each library. They created professional development for each other and created programming for the tutors. They also met quarterly as directors to share ideas and in Corona they just implemented using library cards as student IDs and now 55,000 kids have a library card.

Todd Deck, Tehema County Librarian representing NorthNet, reported that the NorthNet region covered 57,000 square miles, and 64% of their libraries were classified as frontier or rural and the other 44% were urban or suburban. Link+ and shared resources were incredibly important to a library system like theirs. Zip Books was incredibly important. To put it in context, his library had a $10,000 print materials budget annually and Zip Books provided them with $12,000 in additional funds. Link+ was the power for rural patrons to be able to look and see what was outside their county and created a culture of collaboration. They supported the sharing of e-resources including Zinio, e-magazines and Overdrive. Deck stated that as a rural library, having the

opportunity to purchase collaboratively had tremendous savings and for libraries that had CENIC it was important they continue to offer those services. With the large geographic area, resource sharing was challenging; two-thirds of the libraries used curriers while one-third used the postal service. NorthNet libraries shared 1.25 million physical copies and last year circulated over 300,000 materials. They also used non-CLSA funds to support staff development.

Brad McCulley, PLP President, stated that PLP was comprised of the 8 counties of the greater bay area. They were rural and urban with 42 library jurisdictions; 33 public and 9 academic institutions. PLP strove to allocate the CLSA funds for items that would benefit all their libraries. They shared 3.5 million physical items annually through delivery, they spenp CLSA funds on shared e-resources and Broadband. Eight of the more rural libraries were using CLSA funds to study a shared catalog to increase resources sharing and better meet the needs of their community. System membership fees supported PLP through major initiatives, including a strong professional development component. They provided local level training for library staff and had been offering a one year intensive training for middle managers and for executive management. Each year they allocated $150,000 toward technology and opportunity grants, offering grants up to $15,000 to either experiment with an innovative idea or replicate another library's program. Two examples of this were the Discover and Go project to give either free or reduced museum passes. Another \example was a Book Bikes grant a library received to build a book bike trailer to bring books, outreach, and services into the community.

Each year PLP asked libraries what ideas they had for regional LSTA grants and last year they received a grant for the creation of a toolkit for librarians to teach patrons about finding critical news sources. This year they had the idea of using Minecraft to help tweens and teens learn about online security such as passwords, and internet safety. They also had the Student Success Initiative. In the first year they partnered with NorthNet Library System and had 12 libraries participate, it went statewide last year and now they had over 60 libraries participating.

Diane Satchwell reported for SJVLS because Kelley Landano had a conflict. SJVLS had a shared ILS and their libraries circulated over 1 million items per year. They had taken on delivery which made a huge impact, especially on those libraries with a lower

1 budget. SJVLS would like to see some funding so they could increase their e-resources.

2 They were looking at digital preservation additions. They had some programs that had

3 already started but they wanted to expand those programs considerably. They did receive

4 additional funding through the broadband grant to upgrade their equipment because with

5 broadband, their equipment could not handle the one gig. They were also looking at how

6 they could improve staff development.

7 Genesis Hansen, Mission Viejo Library representing Santiago, reported Santiago was

8 a geographically small system but represented over 2.5 million people. They were

9 constantly working to build resources and capacity as a system and as individual libraries.

10 Some of their priorities were communication tools like basecamp to help them work more

11 effectively across jurisdictions. They were looking at re-doing their website to make it

12 more efficient, effective, and easier to update. They were also really invested in staff

13 development which was something they were doing a much as they could with non-CLSA

14 funds. Their geographic area was close so they were trying to take advantage of that.

15 They were looking for opportunities to improve services to member communities. They

16 were also interested in things like Analytics on Demand which would help assess and

17 improve what they were doing. Santiago used CLSA funds for eBooks and some libraries

18 were dependent on that because there was no money in their own collection budget for

19 ebooks.

20 Bob Cronk, Deputy Director for San Diego Public Library and the Chair of Serra,

21 reported that their priorities were staff development. The Seguimos Creando conference

22 down in San Diego had allowed staff to share experiences statewide and internationally.

23 They also had an annual youth services training day which was free for library staff from

24 all the Serra partners. They would also like to do more with adult services and technology

25 training. Serra was going to encourage the youth services committee and the newly

26 formed adult services committee to expand trainings and workshops. Managing diversity

27 needs within the system was also a priority. The Serra system ranges from large library

28 jurisdictions to small rural locations and their cooperation through Serra helped delineate

29 their differences and discuss how best they could help each other. The cooperative also

30 funded a delivery system among its members. Physical delivery was a silent service that

1 had a large impact on users and expanded the reach and potential of shared collections.

2 Serra needed to update their logo and website.

3   Cronk reported Serra was constantly re-evaluating their e-resources. Cooperation

4 throughout the region made sure these resources were broadly available and increased

5 access. The Serra Technology and Automation Review Committee was looking at ways

6 to optimize their size to get better discounts. They were working to procure more digital

7 books and magazines as well as considering Zip Books and streaming video. They were

8 investigating if Serra could benefit from Analytics on Demand or a similar product for

9 marketing and local/regional assessments. Serra was also looking at video conferencing

10 capabilities because with the upcoming Creando conference they were going to do

11 streaming with Fresno.

12   Hillary Theyer, Torrance Library representing SCLC, stated that among the things on

13 SCLC's plate were staff development because they were experiencing a lot of turnover in

14 their libraries and wanted to bring back some in-person training. InfoPeople, the staff

15 development arm of the state moved almost entirely online but in local cooperative groups

16 they really did need to get together. She also wanted to bring up Analytics on Demand,

17 They had it in Torrance and it was a complex, detailed tools that was amazing. They were

18 realizing the next layer on that project was how to ask the questions to get the data you

19 want. They had been looking at Analytics on Demand or a similar product regionally so

20 they could ask regional questions.

21   There was a lot of local history in Southern California and way to much of it was sitting

22 in someone's album, or a single local history museum. So they had a crowdsourcing

23 platform working on digitizing, sharing, and creating and curating it in a shared platform

24 creating community centered augmented reality. SCLC was also working on building on

25 the virtual reality platforms, peer to peer lending, pursuing grant as a cooperative, and

26 collective resource sharing for things that they could not individually buy. They had

27 worked together to bring in a nationally known trainer and share the cost. Informally,

28 through the networks created by SCLC's existence they were working on a public library

29 fair for April for the South Bay region.

30   Diane Satchwell asked if anyone had any questions. Members stated that they thought

31 the presentation was informative and gave them a better understanding of the

cooperatives and how they were working to reflect their jurisdictions. Member Williams stated staff development seemed to be a theme and she felt that it would be useful for the Board look into that. Diane Satchwell stated that under CLSA rules and regulations you could only do staff training if it was attached to a communication and delivery program. Williams stated that she would like to look at staff development around their priorities and how the Board could work with the Systems on that.

I. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment brought forward.

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

Member Senour stated that one of the individuals made a comment about how coming to the meetings gives them an opportunity to learn what others were doing. She thought that was a really good reason to have these meetings, so that it brought everyone together to exchange ideas and develop new initiatives.

K. **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business brought forward.

L. **AGENDA BUILDING**

Member Buenafe stated that the conversation earlier about the services provided to incarcerated people made her realize that the Board had talked during the strategic planning session about doing presentations on what Board member do. Buenafe stated she would be happy to do like a five or ten minute presentation on incarcerated people since she was representing them on the Board.

Member Murguia suggested asking the CLA lobbyists to make a presentation at the next Board meeting. Rivas stated that they were normally very busy at that time but the State Library could certainly ask.

M. **ADJOURNMENT**

President Bernardo called for adjournment of the California Library Services Board meeting at 1:42pm.