

1 **Approved October 5, 2018**

2 California Library Services Board Meeting

3 April 17, 2018

4  
5 Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building

6 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500

7 Sacramento, CA 95814

8  
9 **Welcome and Introductions**

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

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

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

18 **Adoption of Agenda**

19 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Tauler) and carried unanimously*  
20 *that the California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the*  
21 *April 17, 2018 meeting.*  
22

23 **Approval of October 2017 Board Minutes**

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

27 **Board Resolutions**

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

32 **Board Meeting Date for Fall 2018/Spring 2019**

33 Annly Roman reported that the Board had already decided they wanted their next  
34 meeting to be in Sacramento and a Doodle Poll determined the best date was October

1 4, 2018. The question before the Board was what their preference was for the spring  
2 2019 meeting. Member Murguia stated that she would prefer an in-person meeting and  
3 Members Martinez and Christmas agreed. Member Williams stated that since the Board  
4 had discussed a need for greater advocacy that would be a good time to pursue that.

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

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

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

### 17 **Nomination of Board Officers**

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

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

30 Member Williams stated that she was happy to serve again and Member Ibanez  
31 volunteered as well.

1            ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Tauler) and carried unanimously***  
2            ***that the California Library Services Board appoints Florante Ibanez***  
3            ***and Connie Williams to the Nominating Committee to select board***  
4            ***officers for 2019.***

5  
6            **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

7            **Board President's Report**

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

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

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

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

24           **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

25           State Librarian Lucas reported that over the last six months most of what the State  
26           Library had been doing was fiscally related. Coming up on the first of May was the first  
27           budget sub-committee hearing on the Governor's proposed budget from January which  
28           contained \$9.5 million in library related spending. Of that amount \$6.5 million is one-  
29           time funding, \$5 million of which was directed at helping local libraries connect to the  
30           broadband network that is operated by CENIC. Part of that \$5 would have helped  
31           libraries pay some of the cost of connection and there was a new pot of \$3 million which  
32           was aimed at helping libraries to be able to deliver broadband at a higher capacity.  
33           Libraries connected to CENIC could connect at one gigabit but some libraries lack the

1 ability to connect at that speed inside the library because of the age of their system, and  
2 a variety of other reasons. So the second pot of money is aimed at trying to facilitate  
3 improving capacity. One of the reasons that was proposed had to do with the Board  
4 funded Lighting Up Libraries program because a number of the applications were more  
5 for basic capacity/hardware sort of issues than what the State Library had expected.

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

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

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

23 Lucas reported there was another \$2.5 million in ongoing money for the California  
24 Library Literacy Services Program to help bring back a portion of the program that used  
25 to exist, which provided family related literacy services. The program was traditionally  
26 aimed at adult learners. In the past there was a component that included the kids of the  
27 adult learners, so you could have a family-wide literacy strategy. If you could intervene  
28 with a kid at a younger age there is a larger benefit and potentially end the cycle of  
29 illiteracy. You read these studies about how just having a book at home or books to  
30 read at home was a step toward ending that cycle. There were jurisdictions that did  
31 have literacy programs that involved the entire family and what they had found and

1 reported to the State Library was that having the kids involved incentivized the adult  
2 learner and had the other benefits he mentioned previously. Assuming the budget was  
3 passed by the legislature and approved by the Governor that \$2.5 million would get the  
4 literacy program to the highest amount of money it had ever had.

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

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

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

1 of cases, but it was unlikely that it would have fully replaced the traditional delivery of  
2 books.

3 President Bernardo asked if State Librarian Lucas could update the Board on the K-  
4 12 online content for schools. Lucas said that the Governor's budget for the current  
5 fiscal year included \$3 million for online resources for K-12 schools. Up until this year  
6 California was the only state in the nation that didn't offer a suite of online content of any  
7 kind to public schools. Texas, for example, spent \$6 million a year for online databases  
8 for 5.3 million kids, New York, Ohio, Michigan and others had programs as well. The  
9 Governor's late chief of staff, Nancy McFadden, thought that it was important for  
10 California not to be the only state that didn't provide this and put \$3 million in the budget  
11 to make it happen.

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

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

### 28 **Lighting up Libraries: Broadband Update report**

29 Natalie Cole reported that, over the past four years the California State Library had  
30 been engaged in the state-funded High-Speed Broadband in California Libraries project.  
31 The goal of the project was to bring high-speed broadband to all California public libraries

1 by connecting them to the California Research and Education Network (CalREN), which  
2 is managed by the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

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

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

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

22 Member Murguia clarified that the proposed budget talked about another \$3 million to  
23 support the program. Natalie Cole stated that was correct. The money would go to help  
24 new libraries connect and to increase the capacity of libraries that were already on board.  
25 Member Martinez asked about the 338 that were not yet connected or that have chosen  
26 not to connect to the high speed broadband network. She wondered what they had in  
27 terms of connections. Cole said that those libraries did have internet access, it was just  
28 not as fast of a connection. She stated that some libraries want to connect but had  
29 challenges that prevent it, such as geographical or topographical challenges. In the rural  
30 part of the state it was very hard to for libraries to get connected. Cole also said that some  
31 libraries already had contracts with other service providers so that was a case of waiting

1 until those contracts expired since it was not always easy to get out of a contract. Some  
2 libraries had internet service that they were currently happy with but that could always  
3 change. Cole said at this point it was a case-by-case basis and different libraries had  
4 different reasons for not participating. They wanted the money and program to continue  
5 so that when libraries are ready they can accommodate them.

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

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

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

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

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

26 Natalie Cole reported that the project was connected to Broadband but was also  
27 connected to the Value of Libraries Project because by using Project Outcome they can  
28 use project data to show the impact libraries could have by having those new  
29 technologies. Libraries submitted their first progress reports in March which showed  
30 they had started buying a lot of new technologies. A lot of the purchases were not the  
31 new cutting edge technologies that had been anticipated at the start of the project, but it



1 did illustrate the need that libraries had for more technologies. Libraries also reported  
2 that they had started planning their programs which included robotics, resumes, job  
3 searching and business start-up support, coding camps and classes, research  
4 programs, homework help, senior outreach, gaming, tax preparation assistance, etc.

5 Cole reported that the program required libraries to work with partners and they had  
6 seen a variety of partnerships be strengthened and new partnerships had been created.  
7 There had also already been a cash match of \$222,470 and in-kind contributions of  
8 \$155,696 to the project and that was just in the very early stages.

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

### 13 **Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report**

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

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

27 Cole reported they had also worked with their British colleagues and participated in  
28 their summit for the Libraries Unlimited organization and the University of Exeter.  
29 England was doing a very similar project so they had been sharing information and  
30 research.

1       Natalie Cole stated that they were at the point when they felt the project would  
2 speed up a little bit. The plan was to connect what had been found with the library data  
3 with published data in other fields. So if they said that libraries provide learning  
4 opportunities and were a trusted space, they would also look at data from other fields to  
5 show why it is important to have learning opportunities or trusted spaces in the  
6 community. We knew that libraries did these things and now just needed to look at why  
7 that is important.

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

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

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

1 her it would be about the advisory group and making those next steps and getting  
2 political and getting the data out there to the people.

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

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

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

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

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

28 Califa was also looking to buy materials that were always available, so when you  
29 were talking about connecting 180 jurisdictions in California you don't want to have hold  
30 queues so some titles can be purchased with licenses that made them always available  
31 so no one had to wait in line. McKinnon said that they did still have some funds

1 available to purchase new content and Califa had just recently purchased the California  
2 University Press Collection which contained some really good non-fiction and research  
3 materials. Califa has also worked at building out the children's collection, there were not  
4 a lot of children's works purchased early on because children were not reading eBooks,  
5 it was mostly adults. So they have worked on purchasing graphic novels and picture  
6 books titles as well.

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

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

## 20 **Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader Program Report**

21 Paula McKinnon reported that SimplyE was a discovery and E-reader application.  
22 There were six libraries that were selected for to be connected under the grant. One of  
23 the libraries was the Black Gold Cooperative which included six libraries so the total  
24 jurisdictions that were connected were 11. All 11 are now connected in the app.

25 SimplyE allows libraries to stream all of their purchased eBook collections into a  
26 single app so patrons are not siloed into the Overdrive app, they are able to see  
27 whatever the library purchased in real time. The app was created using IMLS funding  
28 and it was just last year that New York Public in Brooklyn launched the app and there  
29 had been efforts by other states to get their public libraries connected.

30 Member Murguia asked how complicated it was for new jurisdictions to get the app.  
31 McKinnon stated that Califa was going to offer it as a subscription service so they would

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

9 Member Williams asked if SimplyE was similar to Hoopla. Paula McKinnon said that  
10 it was not. Hoopla was kind of on-demand, so if an item was available in the collection a  
11 patrons could use it. SimplyE was an app like the Overdrive app except that it was not  
12 limited to one vendor's collection. So a library could have SimplyE, Hoopla, Overdrive,  
13 3M, etc. the difference was that SimplyE drew all the collections together. Williams  
14 clarified that if she was a patron of a participating library she could have one app and  
15 find all available eBooks there. McKinnon confirmed.

#### 16 **Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

17 Diane Satchwell presented an infographic that surveyed all 18 participating libraries.  
18 In which 78% of participants have already planned their programs and are making good  
19 progress. An advisory group that was created met, reviewed applications, and awarded  
20 funds based on their projects. The projects are all different and they tried to break it up  
21 by types. There are projects around workforce development and some on education.  
22 These projects are serving their communities and creating extensive partnerships a lot  
23 of the libraries have really reached out to their communities and local vendors. Under  
24 education they have created mobile labs that go out into the community and some have  
25 partnered with schools where the lab stays at the school. Under workforce development  
26 they are using the broadband connection to do a lot more, such as applications on line  
27 and programs where they are video steaming different projects. The funding for this  
28 project was \$200,000 and it's been a phenomenal return on investment. They haven't  
29 yet captured the in-kind, but they will have it for the next board meeting. Member  
30 Williams asked if program was repeatable and Mrs. Satchwell replied yes and

1 furthermore one of the pieces of the application process has questions regarding  
2 sustainability. This project has been used out in the community. They are  
3 using virtual reality at local events, such as flea markets and the sustainability factor is  
4 there. In Alhambra they had a space that already had some technology pieces and this  
5 project enhanced what they already had. They also partnered with the Los Angeles  
6 Dodgers who helped them promote the project.

7 .

### 8 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

9 Janet Coles provided a brief report to go over in which she describes a two part zip  
10 book program. The program is a combination of federally funded project with 30 libraries  
11 and state funded program .As of 2017 the state program had 12 libraries that launched  
12 their services before November 2017, and 12 more libraries came on board in spring  
13 2018, with a mix of libraries from rural to urban including some large libraries. The North  
14 Net System Coordinator Jacquelyn Brinkley and the Zip Books coordinator Brett Lear  
15 are currently working on brining another wave of libraries on board focusing on  
16 municipal libraries. New promotional materials were printed and distributed to the new  
17 participating libraries. The new libraries are happy with the project and Janet Coles  
18 provided testimonial from some of the participating libraries. The project is on track to  
19 bring 35 libraries on board by 07/01/2018 as outlined in the original project. It is also  
20 expected to meet its target of new libraries hitting 40,000 Zip book transactions by the  
21 end of the project. Member Murguia asked if there was a subscription fee for  
22 participating libraries and Janet Coles replied there wasn't any fee. Janet Coles  
23 commented that they are looking at some sustainability models in hopes that libraries  
24 will see the cost benefit and patron service benefit and start to dedicate some of their  
25 book budgets to this method of procuring and community based collection. Janet Coles  
26 is not confident that without continued support from the federal/state funding the  
27 program will continue in the same way it has. State Librarian Lucas commented that the  
28 governor's budget has carried this project for at least one more year.

29

### 30 **CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

### 31 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

1 **Approve final CLSA Budget for FY 2017/2018**

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

5  
6 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Christmas) and carried***  
7 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the***  
8 ***Final 2017/2018 California Library Services Act budget as directed in***  
9 ***the Governor's 2017/2018 budget, totaling \$3,630,000 for allocation to***  
10 ***Cooperative Library Systems.***

11  
12 **CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2018/19**

13 Monica Rivas presented the Board with the Preliminary Budget for fiscal year  
14 2018/2019 for the amount of \$3,680,000 pending any changes. Before a vote was taken  
15 to approve the preliminary budget a representative from the Southern California Library  
16 Cooperative asked if it was possible to be granted an extension on the submittal date  
17 for their Plans of Service and expedite their official letters. An extension was requested  
18 on the basis that the system executive board meetings have a full agenda and that they  
19 meet in May, which makes it a tight time line since the Plans of Service are due in June.  
20 It was brought to the attention of the board that the Plans of Service are very time  
21 consuming and if an extension could be granted until 07/01/2018 that would be  
22 fantastic. Monica Rivas pointed out that the system receive no such letter but instead an  
23 email that provides the systems with the documents to complete their Plans of Service  
24 and that typically an email goes out right before or right after the Board meets and  
25 furthermore that the email would be going out that day. As for the extension Monica  
26 Rivas stated that when extensions have been requested, they have always been  
27 granted within reason and therefore had no problem with granting an extension until  
28 07/01/2018. Because the next board meeting wasn't scheduled until October it allowed  
29 for sufficient time to gather and process the documentation. If the board meeting would  
30 have been scheduled for September as they usual are it would have created an issue.  
31 Member Christmas suggested that we permanently extend dead line for the submission  
32 of the Plans of Service to July and presented a motion for a vote. There was some  
33 discussion before the vote that the Plans of Service had taken longer to be delivered

1 since there were some changes and additional questions were added. Concerns were  
2 brought up that if we extended the due date to July 01, what would happen if the  
3 systems asked for an extension past that date. Monica Rivas made the comment that if  
4 we permanently moved the due date to July 01, if an extension was requested, it would  
5 be hard to grant and at the same time complete the documentation needed. Carol Frost  
6 informed the board that they typically met in May and review the plans of service, and  
7 that at times the entire executive counsel only meets once per year. There was further  
8 discussion on feasibility of permanently moving due date and the complications it may  
9 cause. Annly Roman provided a point of clarification that the regulations stated that due  
10 date for the Plans of Service is June 01, so unless it was changed it in the regulations,  
11 we couldn't make a motion to amend.

12 Member Christmas removed his motion and it was agreed that Monica Rivas would  
13 grant the systems an extension until July 01 for the Plans of Service.

14 ***It was moved (Christmas) and withdrawn (Christmas) that the***  
15 ***California Library Services Board approves extending the deadline for***  
16 ***Cooperative Library Systems to submit their plans of services from***  
17 ***June 1 to June 30.***

18 The board proceeded with the motion to approve the Preliminary Budget for fiscal  
19 year 2018/2019.

20 ***It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Tauler) and carried***  
21 ***unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts,***  
22 ***contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2018/2019***  
23 ***California Library Services Act budget as directed in the Governor's***  
24 ***proposed 2018/2019 budget, totaling \$3,630,000 for allocation to***  
25 ***Cooperative Library Systems.***

## 26 RESOURCE SHARING

### 27 CLSA System-Level programs

28 Monica Rivas informed the board that the Plans of Service tell us what the systems  
29 plan to do with their funding and the Annual Reports reflect what they actually did with  
30 the funding. Typically physical delivery continues to be the number one priority,  
31 although the board has suggested that they do more with e-resources and resource  
32 sharing. The systems have begun to do a lot more with digital material such as e-books,  
33 Hoopla, Link+, Zinio, Overdrive and Enki. The review of the Annual Report shows the



1 systems are doing there due diligence in using their funds in an efficient way. Exhibit A  
2 is a synopsis of how each system is using their C&D funds. Diane Satchwell  
3 commented that she thought it was great that both Annly and Monica reached out to the  
4 system coordinators and had a long conversation on working together on the reports,  
5 because the systems struggle sometimes to make sure they align with what they are  
6 asked to report on since they all do things a bit differently when it comes to the  
7 reporting. Additional comments from the audience focused on proving more definitions  
8 and instructions for clarity on the Plans of Service and that this would also help them out  
9 when there's turnover of their staff.

## 10 **CLSA REPORTING**

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

30 President Bernardo asked if anyone was helping to develop the forms such as the  
31 Department of Finance or the state auditor's office. Annly Roman replied that we

1 haven't looked that far into it; we want to develop the base form with the State Library  
2 accounting department and the systems. Monica Rivas added that it is crucial that we  
3 involve the systems when we create the forms so that we make the process easy for all  
4 involved. Member Williams asked if the new reports will streamline the activities for the  
5 systems and make it easier for them to speak the same language. Monica Rivas replied  
6 that the new reports will make it easier to report the data since the reports haven't been  
7 updated in a very long time. Annly Roman added that the hope is that these new forms  
8 are clearer and easier to use.

9

10 **D. CLSA REGULATIONS**

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

31 **E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

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

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

24 Member Murguia inquires if CLA has taken a position on these measures and Annly  
25 Roman informs her that they have not. Member Williams elaborates on the letter to the  
26 Board of Education were they discuss the model school library standards that where  
27 created 10 years ago and how they need be re-updated to include information literacy  
28 and digital citizenship upgrades. Member Christmas asks if approved would the drafted  
29 letters show how these measure connect with libraries and how students can pursue  
30 information resources. Member Williams replies and asks the board if at the very least  
31 they would consider drafting a letter in support of updating the standards. Member

1 Martinez asks if there's any budget implication in any of the bills being discussed. Anny  
2 Roman states that these bills are in the appropriation committee that would imply  
3 there's a fiscal implication, she's not sure what the set cost are for each one, but they  
4 do have fiscal attachments because they are in the appropriations committee.

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

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

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

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

28  
29 President Bernardo discussed the last items in the legislative update which are  
30 some draft letters in support of CLSA funding for local libraries in this upcoming budget  
31 to the Senate Budget Review Committee and letter of support for IMLS funding. Annly  
32 Roman advised the board they can choose to send letters in support; they can choose  
33 only support certain sections or do nothing. State Librarian Lucas speaks to what was  
34 proposed in the governor's budget to be spent on libraries, which is 9.5 million. State  
35 Librarian Lucas informs the board that the legislative analyst is urging the legislature not  
36 to approve any of it. Their recommendation is to reject all proposals. State Librarian

1 Lucas believes that their recommendation isn't fatal, but isn't ideal either. State Librarian  
2 Lucas states the bigger the chorus of voices taking a divergent view than the legislature  
3 analyst, the more improved the odds are of lawmakers bucking their recommendations  
4 and approving the proposed expenditures. Member Murguia questions if we should be  
5 asking for more money than is proposed, that we certainly want the amount that's in the  
6 budget but it seems that we have an opportunity to ask for more funds. Member  
7 Murguia asks if we should be working with the senate budgets committee or certain  
8 legislatures to add more money. Member Christmas is in favor of both letters supporting  
9 the budget and the IMLS letter but in order to write the letter in support the board should  
10 offer areas where the budget can be increased at a state level.

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

19 Member Martinez asks if the State Library had input in the prosed budget for 9.5  
20 million dollars. State Librarian Lucas replied that they did and that this particular plan  
21 was created through conversations with the California Library Association, and CENIC  
22 the folks that operate broadband. Both parties met at the table and brought forth their  
23 priorities and together came up with 9.5 million. The Department of Finance also  
24 recommended that the budget be kept under 10 million dollars, that they would entertain  
25 something up to 10 million dollars. Carol White added that the California Library  
26 Legislative Advocacy Committee worked closely with State Librarian Lucas and the  
27 California Library Association president to come up with the letter, in order to represent  
28 the collaborative work between all of the public libraries and the state library. Mrs. White  
29 is concerned that the analyst office just completely rejected wholesale all the  
30 recommendations and so it would mean a lot in the spirit of advocacy to support this  
31 initiative. There are so many competing priorities since we are such a diverse state and

1 you can see that in the plans of service. A letter of support from the board would be  
2 appreciated. Individual libraries will also be writing letters to the department of finance.

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

10  
11 ***It was moved, seconded (Tauler/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that***  
12 ***the California Library Services Board directs State Library Staff to***  
13 ***send the draft letter (See Exhibit B) in support of the Governor's***  
14 ***proposed 2018/2019 spending on library programs and the draft letter***  
15 ***(See Exhibit C) in support of continued Federal IMLS funding included***  
16 ***in the Board packet and work on a plan to increase state funding for***  
17 ***the October meeting.***  
18

19 **F. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2018/19**

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

29 "The Mission of the California Library Services Board is to foster lifelong learning by  
30 ensuring that all Californians have free and convenient access to all library resources  
31 and services regardless of their age or ethnicity, or any geographical, financial, or  
32 administrative restraints." When asked if there were any comments from the audience it  
33 was pointed out that, "It's great to be inclusive, but there are several designations that  
34 aren't included, so the statement could be more inclusive by being more general or by

1 being more specific". Member Williams ask if it would be a good idea to relook at the  
2 mission statement in order to address the concerns that were brought up. Member  
3 Murguia suggested striking out everything from regardless on to read, "The Mission of  
4 the California Library Services Board is to foster lifelong learning by ensuring that all  
5 Californians have free and convenient access to all library resources and services". A  
6 motion was made to amend mission statement with Member Murguia suggestion and  
7 the results were as follows:

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

11  
12 ***The mission of the California Library Services Board is to foster***  
13 ***lifelong learning by ensuring that all Californians have free and***  
14 ***convenient access to all library resources and services.***

15  
16 Annly Roman read the values statement and accompanying clarifying statements that  
17 reads as follows:

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

- 20 • **Literacy:** Promote the importance of reading and the skills needed by individuals to  
21 participate fully in society
- 22
- 23 • **Cooperation:** Encourage the sharing of resources and collaboration between  
24 libraries and other government agencies, organizations, and diverse community  
25 groups.
- 26
- 27 • **Diversity:** Support programs and services that reflect the multicultural and diverse  
28 population of California.
- 29
- 30 • **Service to the Underserved:** Strengthen equitable distribution of resources and  
31 services to any population segment, regardless of economic status and other  
32 circumstances, whose needs are not adequately met by traditional library service  
33 patterns.
- 34
- 35 • **Access:** Affirm the principles of equitable access to resources across library systems  
36 through local control, local financing, and resource sharing.
- 37

38 When asked if there were any comments from the audience it was suggested to remove  
39 from the diversity section the word multicultural to just read, "Support programs and  
40 services that reflect the diverse population of California". Member Martinez also

1 suggested we change under cooperation the word “between” to “among”, because we  
2 are talking about more than two. A motion to consider value statement and  
3 accompanying clarifying statements with the suggested corrections was made and the  
4 results were as follows:

5  
6 ***It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***  
7 ***that the California Library Services Board adopts the following values***  
8 ***statement and accompanying clarifying statements.***  
9

10 ***The California Library Services Board values literacy, cooperation,***  
11 ***diversity, service to the underserved, and access.***  
12

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

27 Annly Roman read the Goals and subsequent actions to help accomplish those goals  
28 and they read as follows:  
29

- 30 • Education
  - 31 ○ Legislation Tracking (California State Library) and report
  - 32 ○ Lightening talks – Board members or experts in field
  - 33 ○ Develop protocols for sharing information
- 34
- 35 • Advocacy (Money for a program)
  - 36 ○ Meet with Legislators
  - 37 ○ Write Letters
  - 38 ○ Work with other organizations (Example: California Library Association)
  - 39 ○ Determine best mode of advocacy



1 With no added corrections from the audience a motion was made adopt and the results  
2 were as follows:

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

6  
7 • ***Education***

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

11  
12 • ***Advocacy (Money for a program)***

- 13 ○ ***Meet with Legislators***  
14 ○ ***Write Letters***  
15 ○ ***Work with other organizations (Example: California Library***  
16 ***Association)***  
17 ○ ***Determine best mode of advocacy***

18 **G. PUBLIC COMMENT**

19 There was no public comment brought forward.

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

21 There was no comment from the board.

22 **I. OLD BUSINESS**

23 There was no old business brought forward.

24 **J. AGENDA BUILDING**

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

30  
31 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

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