



California  
**STATE LIBRARY**

F O U N D E D 1 8 5 0

PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE, SHAPING OUR FUTURE

## **The California Library Services Board**

Anne R. Bernardo, President  
Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Vice-President  
Greg Lucas, Chief Executive Officer  
Brandy Rose Buenafe  
Gary M. Christmas  
Aleita Huguenin  
Florante Peter Ibanez  
Adriana Martinez  
Peter Mindnich  
Elizabeth O. Murguia  
Sandra Tauler  
Connie Williams

**April 17, 2018**  
**BOARD MEETING**

### **Library Development Services Bureau**

900 N Street, Suite 400  
P.O. Box 942837  
Sacramento, California 94237-0001  
(916) 653-7532 phone  
(916) 653-8443 fax



## **MEETING NOTICE**

**California Library Services Board**  
**April 17, 2018**  
**9:30am – 4:00pm**

**California Library Services Act Regulatory Hearing**  
*Immediately following Board business meeting*

**Stanley Mosk Library & Courts Building**  
**914 Capitol Mall, Room 500**  
**Sacramento, Ca 95814**

Annly Roman  
California State Library  
P.O. Box 942837  
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001  
(916) 323-0057

[annly.roman@library.ca.gov](mailto:annly.roman@library.ca.gov)

<http://www.library.ca.gov/services/to-libraries/ca-library-services-act/>

### **Additional meeting call-in locations are as follows:**

Black Gold Library Cooperative  
580 Camino Mercado  
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Calaveras County Library  
1299 Gold Hunter Rd.  
San Andreas, CA 95249

Fresno Public Library  
2420 Mariposa  
Fresno, CA 93721

Fullerton Public Library  
353 W. Commonwealth Ave.  
Fullerton, CA 92832

Pacific Library Partnership  
2471 Flores Street  
San Mateo, CA 94403

Redding Public Library – **OPEN AT 10AM**  
1100 Parkview Ave., Fireside Room  
Redding, CA 96001

Riverside Public Library  
3581 Mission Inn Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92501

San Diego County Library  
5560 Overland Avenue, Suite 110  
Conference Room B  
San Diego, CA 92123

Southern California Library Cooperative  
248 E. Foothill Blvd., Suite 101  
Monrovia, CA 91016

## **A. BOARD OPENING**

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

Welcome and introductions of Board members, staff, and audience

### **2. Adoption of Agenda**

Consider agenda as presented or amended

### **3. Approval of October 2017 Board Minutes – Document 1**

Consider minutes as presented or amended

### **4. Board Resolution – Document 2**

Consider resolution for Dr. H. Eric Schockman

### **5. Board meeting date for Fall 2018/Spring 2019 - Document 3**

Discuss dates for the upcoming Board meetings

### **6. Nomination of Board Officers – Document 4**

a. Discuss the procedures for election of Board Officers

b. Consider Nominating Committee for 2019 Board Officers

## **B. REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

### **1. Board President's Report**

Report on activities since last Board meeting

### **2. Board Vice-President's Report**

Report on activities since last Board meeting

### **3. Chief Executive Officer's Report**

Report on activities since last Board meeting

### **4. Lighting Up Libraries: Broadband Update Report**

Update on technology improvement grants and broadband efforts

### **5. Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Program Grant Program Report**

Update on the status of the Software and Hardware Improvement program funded by a one-time grant

### **6. Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report**

Update on the status of the Impact Study and Online Clearing House program funded by a one-time grant

### **7. California eBook Platform with Library Owned Content Program Report**

Update on the status of the California eBook Platform with Library Owned Content program funded by a one-time grant

### **8. Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader Program Report**

Update on the status of the Cross Platform eBook Discovery App and Reader program funded by a one-time grant

### **9. Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

Update on the status of the Innovation Lab program funded by a one-time grant

### **10. Zip Books Grant Program Report**

Update on the status of the Zip Books program funded by a one-time grant

## **C. CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

### **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

#### **1. Approve final CLSA Budget for FY 2017/2018– Document 5**

Consider the final budget for fiscal year 2017/2018

#### **2. CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2018/19 – Document 6**

Consider 2018/19 preliminary budget for CLSA.

**RESOURCE SHARING**

**1. CLSA System-level programs – Document 7**

Review and discuss System Annual Reports, FY 2016/17

**CLSA REPORTING**

Update on the status of potential changes to the CLSA reporting requirements and forms.

**D. CLSA REGULATIONS – Document 8**

Update on the status of the amendments to the CLSA regulations. Additional discussion will be held at the public hearing immediately following this Board meeting.

**E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE - Document 9**

Consider federal and state legislative issues

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

**Strategic Planning Session**

Update on the Board’s Strategic Planning session held on April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from 1:00pm-4:00pm. A report on the Board’s discussion and potential action on recommended goals or objectives.

**G. PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

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

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

**I. OLD BUSINESS**

Any old business the Board members wish to discuss

**J. AGENDA BUILDING**

Input on agenda items for subsequent Board meetings

**K. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourn the meeting

1 California Library Services Board Meeting

2 October 17, 2017

3  
4 California State Capitol

5 Room 2040

6 Sacramento, CA

7  
8 **Welcome and Introductions**

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

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

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

17 **Adoption of Agenda**

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

22 **Approval of April 2017 Board Minutes**

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

26 **Board Resolutions**

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

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

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

#### 5 **Election of Board Officers**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 32 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

#### 33 **Board President's Report**

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

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

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

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

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

### 8 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 5 **Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 26 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 29 **RESOURCE SHARING**

#### 30 **Consolidation and Affiliations**

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

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

#### 14 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

##### 15 **System Plans of service and Budgets**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24          **System Reports**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 5 **CLSA REGULATIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21 **REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

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

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

28 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 29 **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2017/18**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 **I. PUBLIC COMMENT**

11 There was no public comment brought forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 **K. OLD BUSINESS**

10 There was no old business brought forward.

11 **L. AGENDA BUILDING**

12 There was no additional agenda items brought forward.

13 **M. ADJOURNMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that*

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

*Penny Kastanis*

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that***

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

***Gregory McGinity***

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

*California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-04*

*In Honor of Dr. Kevin Starr*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that***

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

***Dr. Kevin Starr***

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

***California Library Services Board Resolution 2018-01  
In Honor of Dr. H. Eric Schockman***

**WHEREAS**, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Dr. H. Eric Schockman for his distinguished contributions as one of its members on the occasion of the conclusion of his term of service as a member of the board; and

**WHEREAS**, the board wishes to honor Dr. H. Eric Schockman for his exceptional public service and engagement representing the “Public-at-Large” since his appointment by the Senate Rules Committee on November 12, 2013; and

**WHEREAS**, it should be noted that Dr. H. Eric Schockman serves as Chair and Associate Professor at the Center for Leadership at Woodbury University, and as an adjunct Professor at the Sol Price School of Public Policy at the University of Southern California; he was a former Associate Professor and Associate Dean at the University of Southern California; and ran the Edmund G “Pat” Brown Institute for Public Affairs at CSULA and the Jesse M. Unruh Institute of Politics at USC; and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. H. Eric Schockman served as President and CEO of an international anti-hunger agency for over a decade, is the President and founder of the Global Hunger Foundation, served as the chairman of the National Anti-Hunger Organization, was a member of the National Interfaith Hunger director’s committee and the Alliance to End Hunger, and was on the Board of Directors of the Global Food Banking Network;

**WHEREAS**, Dr. H. Eric Schockman served in the Peace Corps and taught agriculture and sustainable development in Sierra Leone, and West Africa

**WHEREAS**, Dr. H. Eric Schockman was appointed to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in 2007 by Governor Schwarzenegger, and served on the Little Hoover Commission;

**WHEREAS**, Dr. H. Eric Schockman’s insight, public policy knowledge, and enthusiasm have proven invaluable to the California Library Services Board;

***NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that***

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

***Dr. H. Eric Schockman***

*for his contributions and service  
to the libraries and people of the State of California  
on this day of 17 April, 2018*

**AGENDA ITEM:** 2018/2019 Meeting Schedule and Locations

<b>2017 Proposed Board Meeting Schedule</b>		
<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Activities</u>
October 4, 2018	Sacramento	Regular Business Annual Budget Meeting Election of Board Officers for year 2019 LSTA State Advisory Council on Libraries Meeting
April 2019	Sacramento?	Legislative Visits? Budget and Planning Election of the Nominating Committee

**BACKGROUND:**

California Library Services Act (CLSA) regulations specify that the Board shall conduct bi-monthly meetings; however, Section 20118 (c) states:

“(c) Nothing in this regulation shall be construed to prevent the state board from altering its regular meeting dates or places of meetings.”

Staff has provided members with a Doodle Poll for the Fall 2018 meeting which will be held on October 4, 2018. The question for Board members is when and where to schedule the Spring 2019 meeting. A calendar of upcoming and future library-related events and dates is included to this agenda item as Exhibit A.

<b>CALENDAR OF UPCOMING LIBRARY-RELATED EVENTS AND DATES</b>
--

The following is a list of upcoming library-related events and dates worth noting:

<b>2018</b>		
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Association Meeting	April 24-26, 2018	Atlanta, GA
SLA (Special Libraries Association) Annual Conference & Info Expo	June 9-13, 2018	Baltimore, MD
PLA (Public Library Association) at ALA	June 21-26, 2018	New Orleans, LA
ALA (American Library Association) Annual Conference	June 21-26, 2018	New Orleans, LA
AALL (American Association of Law Libraries) Annual Meeting and Conference	July 14-17, 2018	Baltimore, MD
American Association of Archivist	August 12-18, 2018	Washington, D.C.
IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions) General Conference & Assembly	August 24-30, 2018	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
State Bar of California Annual Meeting	September 13-14, 2018	Los Angeles, CA, CA
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Association Meeting, Fall 2018	September 24-27, 2018	Washington, DC
Joint Conference for Librarians of Color	September 26-30, 2018	Albuquerque, NM
Educause Annual Conference	October 30-November 2, 2018	Denver, CO
CLA (California Library Association) Annual Conference	November 9-11, 2018	Santa Clara, CA
<b>2019</b>		
ALA (American Library Association) Midwinter Conference	January 25-29, 2019	Seattle, WA
California School Library Association 2019 Conference	February 7-10, 2019	City of Industry, CA
ACRL (Association of College & Research Libraries) 2017 Conference	April 10-13, 2019	Cleveland, OH
ALA (American Library Association) Annual Conference	June 20-25, 2019	Washington, DC
AALL (American Association of Law Libraries) Annual Meeting and Conference	July 13-16, 2019	Washington, DC
ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Association Meeting, Fall 2019	September 23-26, 2019	Washington, DC
Educause Annual Conference	October 14-17, 2019	Chicago, IL
AASL (American Association of School Libraries) National Conference	November 14-16, 2019	Louisville, KY

ACTION

**AGENDA ITEM:** Nominating Committee for 2019 Board Officers

**ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING:** Consider candidates to the Nominating Committee for 2019 Board Officers

**RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD:** I move that the California Library Services Board appoint \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ to the Nominating Committee to select Board Officers for 2019.

**BACKGROUND:**

California Library Services Act regulations, Section 20116 (a), state that, “The state board shall annually elect a president and vice-president at the first regular meeting of each calendar year.” It has been Board policy to elect Board officers at the last meeting of the calendar year so the new officers may begin their term in the new calendar year.

The Board will appoint two of its members to serve on the Nominating Committee and to report to the Board at its fall meeting the slate of Board Officer for 2019. In the absence of regulations prescribing the form and method for electing officers, according to Code of California Regulations Section 20127, the CLSB is guided by procedures set forth in Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised, Chapter XIV, Nominations and Elections.

**AGENDA ITEM:** CLSA Final Budget for FY 2017/18

**ISSUE TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING:** Consider the Final CLSA budget for FY 2017/18

**RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD:** I move that the California Library Services Board adopt, the 2017/18 CLSA budget as directed in the Governor's 2017/18 Budget, totaling \$3,630,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.

**BACKGROUND:**

The governor's budget, released in January for 2017-2018 fiscal year, includes a proposal to provide \$3,630,000 million in funding for the California Library Services Act.

**Recommendation:** Staff is recommending that the Board adopt the final budget.

**CLSA Final System Budget Allocations - FY 2017/18  
Communications and Delivery Program**

System	Baseline Budget	System Administration	Total
Black Gold	\$ 120,549	\$ 30,137	\$ 150,686
49-99	\$ 120,587	\$ 30,147	\$ 150,734
Inland	\$ 306,963	\$ 76,742	\$ 383,705
NorthNet	\$ 655,785	\$ 163,946	\$ 819,731
PLP	\$ 556,748	\$ 139,187	\$ 695,935
SJVLS	\$ 192,761	\$ 48,191	\$ 240,952
Santiago	\$ 168,830	\$ 42,208	\$ 211,038
Serra	\$ 216,946	\$ 54,236	\$ 271,182
SCLC	\$ 564,831	\$ 141,206	\$ 706,037
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 2,904,000</b>	<b>\$ 726,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,630,000</b>

Totals are based on May 2016 population figures from the Department of Finance, final budget allocation numbers will be based on population figures to be approved by the California Library California Library Service Board at a later meeting.



**AGENDA ITEM:** CLSA Budget for FY 2018/19

**ISSUE TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD AT THIS MEETING:** Consider the preliminary CLSA budget for FY 2018/19

**RECOMMENDED MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD:** I move that the California Library Services Board adopt, contingent upon the passage of the State Budget Act, the 2018/19 CLSA budget as directed in the Governor's Proposed 2018/19 Budget, totaling \$3,630,000 for allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.

**BACKGROUND:**

The governor's proposed budget, released in January for 2018-2019 fiscal year, includes a proposal to provide \$3,630,000 million in funding for the California Library Services Act.

**Recommendation:** Staff is recommending that the Board adopt the preliminary budget at this April meeting so that partial payments can be made to the Cooperative Systems as soon as the State Budget Act 2018 is signed. The remainder of the funds will be awarded when the System Plans of Service are approved by the Board at its fall meeting.

**RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE:**

Review and approve System Plans of Service and Budget for FY 2018/19.

**Exhibit A**

**CLSA Preliminary System Budget Allocations - FY 2018/19  
Communications and Delivery Program**

System	2018-2019		
	Baseline Budget	System Administration	Total
Black Gold	\$ 120,363	\$ 30,091	\$ 150,454
49-99	\$ 120,613	\$ 30,153	\$ 150,766
Inland	\$ 306,625	\$ 76,657	\$ 383,282
NorthNet	\$ 653,516	\$ 163,379	\$ 816,895
PLP	\$ 555,862	\$ 138,965	\$ 694,827
SJVLS	\$ 192,290	\$ 48,072	\$ 240,362
Santiago	\$ 168,043	\$ 42,011	\$ 210,054
Serra	\$ 216,653	\$ 54,163	\$ 270,816
SCLC	\$ 570,035	\$ 142,509	\$ 712,544
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 2,904,000</b>	<b>\$ 726,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,630,000</b>

Totals are based on May 2017 population figures from the Department of Finance.

**AGENDA ITEM:** CLSA System Annual Report, FY 2016/17

**GENERAL OVERALL PROGRAM UPDATES:**

CLSA funds continue to support the Communications and Delivery (C&D) program at the cooperative system level. In FY 2016/17, C&D funds supported all or a portion of each System's physical delivery of materials. Some Systems provided communications activity through virtual attendance at various meetings and use of their website and listservs for facilitating communications to member libraries. Exhibit A provides a summary of activities and how communities benefited through state funding. Exhibit B displays a summary of the actual workload statistics for 2016/17.

Expenditures for 2016/17: Exhibits C displays how CLSA and local funds were expended in support of System Administration and C&D. Exhibit C also provides data on local member contributions.

**RELATED ISSUES TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE:**

Consideration of 2018/19 System Plans of Service.

Staff Liaison: Monica Rivas

**California Library Services Act  
System Program Annual Report – FY 2016/17  
Communications and Delivery Program**

<b>System</b>	<b>Goals for Meeting the Needs Through CLSA</b>	<b>Were Goals Met – How did the Community Benefit?</b>
<p>Black Gold Cooperative Library System</p>	<p>The primary goal for CLSA funds is improving delivery of materials to patrons.</p>	<p>Goals were met and CLSA funds were used by Black Gold to ship over 530,000 items. At the beginning of the fiscal year 2015-2016 most libraries eliminated a \$1 hold fee for ILL titles. Black Gold members share an automated library system which makes it easy for patrons to request items from another library in the cooperative. The CLSA funds were used to partially cover the delivery contract and to improve access to digital materials such as Hoopla and eBooks. The community benefited because patrons are able to request items from libraries several hundred miles away and receive them very quickly, often as soon as the next day. This greatly increases the number of items available to patrons of any one library and especially useful for patrons at our very small and rural branches.</p>
<p>49-99 Cooperative Library System</p>	<p>The primary goal is to delivery at least twice a week to member libraries within the system. The System population is dependent on the availability of materials from member libraries.</p>	<p>49-99 began the LINK+ project it used funding to purchase the initial DCB which allows all the libraries to link into the shared database (LINK+). It went live in January with five of the six libraries. The libraries experienced a 15% increase in the first few months. Customers have shared their satisfaction with the improved service. The libraries had delivery twice a week prior to connecting to LINK+. They now have daily delivery. We also contracted with a local delivery service which reduced the delivery by 74%. We eliminated a library delivery service that had to create a special delivery beyond their jurisdiction and instead contracted with a local vendor already delivering in the areas, reducing the costs and reducing the wear and tear of the vehicles of the library providing the service. Funding also pay for CLSAinfo. Org maintenance.</p>

<p>Inland Library System</p>	<p>The goal is to provide for the physical delivery of materials to all of its 19 members libraries.</p>	<p>The goal to provide for physical delivery of materials to all 19 public library members was met. The goal of delivering within 10 working days for 95% of the time was met by using ILS courier, the Riverside County Library system delivery, UPS, and the US Postal Service. Interlibrary loans provided materials for those members who do not have OCLC; this was especially valuable for member libraries in rural and isolated geographical areas. C&amp;D funds were also used to move 3D printers between libraries and for e-resources for member libraries.</p> <p>To facilitate communication of system information, the ILS website was continually updated .GoToMeeting was cancelled; a conference call line is being used to provide flexibility.</p> <p>The community benefited by having access to the collection of all the ILS member libraries, getting materials from neighboring libraries in a timely manner, and by having libraries whose leaders and staff work effectively with each other on a regular basis.</p>
<p>NorthNet Library System</p>	<p>Delivery has been identified by member libraries as the highest priority. We are able to meet our goals for communication and delivery by supporting connections tailored to best meet the needs of individual member libraries and enable them to share resources for the benefit of end users.</p>	<p>Shared e-resources remain a priority for the members, especially those in smaller, more geographically remote areas. The NorthNet Library System (NLS) Zinio consortium made up of twenty-six libraries has proved to be popular and well-used service. Members use C&amp;D funds as well as local resources to support participation. Zinio subscriptions became more affordable with consortium pricing; with additional libraries participating more titles will be available. Members directed 18% of NLS CLSA funds to support Zinio and had 46,332 Zinio checkouts in FY2016/17.</p> <p>Overdrive also continues to grow in popularity and demand with NLS members with twenty-seven libraries participating Go OverDrive consortium using a combination of C&amp;D funds as well as local resources. Each library builds their individual library collection from</p>

<p>NorthNet Library System Cont.</p>		<p>the OverDrive catalog of more than 3.3 million titles. NLS members directed 12% of their CLSA funds to support OverDrive. There were 310,960 OverDrive checkouts in FY2016/17, an increase of 3% over the last fiscal year.</p> <p>Enki continues to be popular. Fourteen NLS libraries participated on Enki in FY2016/17 with a total circulation of over 14,000 items. A portion of CLSA funds were allocated for a study of the current state of interlibrary loan (ILL) among NLS members and provide a cost analysis for some or all of the 54 members to join Innovative Interfaces, Inc.'s (III) Resource Sharing (Link+) interlibrary loan.</p> <p>NLS also set aside funds for the implementation of one-time cost for LINK+, if LINK+ is not considered as a viable option the funds will be used for ZipBooks.</p> <p>Delivery contracts, with two courier services, funded with both local and CLSA funds, moved material among 2/3 of the NLS libraries. Libraries that were not served by contract delivery used the US mail service and/or UPS and were reimbursed for their cost. While intersystem delivery activity decreased in FY2016/17, the community as a whole benefitted because items that were requested were delivered at an affordable cost in a timely manner.</p>
<p>Pacific Library Partnership (PLP)</p>	<p>Delivery continues to be the first priority of our member libraries. Libraries throughout the region depend on resource sharing to enhance the breadth and depth of their individual collections and delivery is the critical component that makes this possible. PLP currently provides delivery in four separate services areas.</p>	<p>PLP used it's funding for renewed subscription to enki, support for hardware and connection costs, and further development of the SimplyE e book app.</p> <p>CLSA funding was also used to support resource sharing by moving materials within the PLP from location to location. The current delivery model has a 5 day a week delivery in San Mateo County using PLS-employed staff consisting of three drivers, sorting staff and 3 delivery vans. Libraries in Contra Costa County, Alameda County, and San Francisco City and (BALIS)</p>

<p>Pacific Library Partnership (PLP) Cont.</p>		<p>have 2-or-3 day courier delivery service depending on usage. The libraries in Santa Clara County (SVLS) contract with PLS for delivery service for a driver and van 2 days per week. Libraries in Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties (MOBAC) have courier delivery service 2 or 3 days a week with 2 jurisdictions providing additional local funds for 5-day a-week service. The delivery service has 2 touch points-once a week in San Mateo and Gilroy.</p> <p>All communities benefit from the reliable resources sharing of delivery, which enhances collections and allows materials to move between systems in a timely manner.</p>
<p>San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS)</p>	<p>Delivery continues to be a priority of our member libraries.</p>	<p>SJVLS used its funding for depository of information, increase e-book collection, and digitization of local collections. SJVLS met its C&amp;D goals for the Fiscal Year 2016/17. Within SJVLS, delivery is the physical movement of materials, between headquarters libraries. It is a contract service with the Fresno County Public Library and the County of Fresno (two different delivery systems). Each headquarter library receives materials three times per week (except holidays). The system volume dropped slightly but is still nearly 950,000 items annually.</p> <p>The materials were moved in a timely manner, with minimal delays around certain holiday weekends. This provided communities with access to the materials efficiently and met their information needs through access to materials held throughout the 10 member system.</p>
<p>Santiago Library System</p>	<p>Delivery is a top priority for System members. The goal of the original C&amp;D program was to better meet the demand for e-books.</p>	<p>Santiago used its funding to contracted services to move 3D printers to the participating libraries. Santiago also developed their own delivery model between member libraries that is paid with in-kind from all the member libraries and they do not use CLSA funds.</p>

<p>Santiago Library System Cont.</p>		<p>E-books were not purchased this year due to transition of administrative and fiscal services. The member libraries are developing a process to capture the data to report use of the e-books.</p>
<p>Serra Cooperative Library System</p>	<p>Physical delivery of materials between member libraries is a priority for the System members.</p>	<p>Funding was used for Overdrive and Zinio renewal and for additional purchase of titles for member libraries.</p> <p>Serra continues to use physical delivery of materials. San Diego County was historically the depository for materials. The delivery contract was amended and the driver stops at each library to pick up or drop off materials. It is no longer filtered through San Diego County and dropped off at branches at nearby locations to other member libraries.</p>
<p>Southern California Library System (SCLC)</p>	<p>SCLC priority is to provide physical delivery to its members.</p>	<p>SCLC continues to offer delivery of materials between member libraries (Santa Monica was added as a member). The contracted delivery service moved 3D printers among libraries. Delivery is also used as an informal method of communication for sending invitations, small objects, and mail between libraries.</p> <p>The SCLC website went live. SCLC updated their logo and decided on the most valuable content needed for a cooperative website. It also used it's funding for e-content.</p> <p>Staff is finalizing the purchase of at least one scanner to create a digitization lab.</p>



**Non-CLSA funded activities:****Black Gold:** Local funds paid for:

- The network connections from 29 library buildings to the server in San Luis Obispo
- Access to Public Access Catalog
- A telephone service which allows patrons to call in to renew items via an 800 number, and also calls patrons to let them know when a requested hold is available or when items are overdue.
- A separate public Internet connection for all the libraries in order to provide connectivity where available, and Wi-Fi.
- A shared OverDrive subscription for downloadable eBooks and audiobooks.

**49-99:**

- Attend the Association for Rural and Small Libraries conference
- Pay membership dues to join Califa and CLA

**Inland:**

- Active committees and interest groups that include adults presenting yearly workshops, digitization workshops, and immigration issues
- Training workshops
- Sent an attendee to the National Library Legislative Day

**NorthNet:**

- NLS provides support for staff development (\$1,000) for each member library
- Ten NLS libraries and one PLP library participated in the Libraries Lead the Way, an LSTA grant-funded project to provide staff development in community engagement and facilitation skills
- Nineteen NLS libraries participated in the Zip Books program
- ILL/Link+ study
- Six NLS member libraries participated in the Student Success Initiative

**PLP:**

- PLP contribute \$587,416 in local funds to support 5-day delivery. Two MOBAC libraries also provided local funds (\$2,000) to supplement additional deliveries
- Inter-Library Loan Services: Libraries fund inter-library loan services locally, including OCLC World Share and LINK+
- Libraries used local funds to invest in their connectivity via broadband to the CalREN network
- Funds were used to support local broadband activities
- Provided a shared eBook collection. ALL PLP libraries participate in the Enki eBook platform as well.

**SJVL:**

- A shared integrated library system (ILS), which allows all of the member libraries and their branches equal access to shared collections

**Santiago:**

- Networking
- Committees and interest groups that include Children's who do a Performer's Showcase and Marketing and Outreach to develop Social Media
- Events where there's considerable discussion regarding safety and security such as homeless issues

**Serra:**

- Committees and interest groups that include Youth Services which offer annual Professional Development Day
- STARC (Technology) which works on the website and reviews options for shared electronic resources
- In-kind support for Creando Enlaces

**SCLC:**

- Maintain staffing and an office
- Provided funding to attend the California League of Cities Conference
- Send two representatives for National Library Legislative Day in Washington, D.C.

**Exhibit B**

**System Communications & Delivery Program  
2016/17 Service Methods and Workloads**

System	Actual Comm. Workload Messages 2015/16	Actual Comm. Workload Messages 2016/17	Telecommunications Systems Usage			Actual Delivery Workload (Items) 2015/16	Actual Delivery Workload (Items) 2016/17	Physical Delivery Systems Usage					Actual Miles Traveled By All Delivery Vehicles
			Phone Fax	Internet E-mail	Other			System Van	Contracted Delivery	US Mail	UPS	Other	
BLACK GOLD	810,706	1,067,768	13%	87%	NA	530,666	531,271	NU	97%	2%	0.5%	0.5%	57,919
49-99	5,221	1,033	15%	85%	NU	3,010	17,375	NU	99%	1%	NU	NU	22,800
INLAND	10,340	10,106	3%	97%	0%	136,760	133,289	NU	2%	0.0%	0.0%	98% <sup>(a)</sup>	13,936
NORTHNET	NA	NA	NA	NA	NU	1,467,323	1,020,617	NU	79.5%	0.5%	20%	0%	234,109
PLP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NU	3,034,792	3,383,185	98.90%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	126,828
SJVLS	Unknown <sup>(b)</sup>	Unknown <sup>(b)</sup>	NA	NA	NA	1,023,321	949,656	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	NA
SANTIAGO	2,425	452	35%	65%	NU	1,372	12,870	NU	0%	0%	0%	100% <sup>(c)</sup>	858
SERRA	9,527	7,897	1%	99%	0%	18,207	18,207	NU	0%	2%	1%	97%	23,000
SCLC	18,149	20,272	5%	95%	NU	16,933	14,437	NU	99%	1%	NU	NU	60,100
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>856,368</b>	<b>1,107,528</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6,232,384</b>	<b>6,080,907</b>	<b>55.0%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>539,550</b>

NA - Not Available; or unable to determine

NU - Not Used

<sup>(a)</sup> Riverside County Library system delivery van

<sup>(b)</sup> Three years ago Fresno County transitioned SJVLS to a VOIP system making the detail on number of phone messages unavailable.

SJVLS transitioned to a Microsoft cloud service for internet email and no longer has the ability to generate any counts from the server.

<sup>(c)</sup> Delivery vans from member libraries

**Summary of Communications & Delivery (C&D) ,System Administration Expenditures,  
and Local Member Contributions for FY 2016/17**

System	CLSA C&D Expenditures	Percent of CLSA Expenditures for C&D	CLSA C&D Local Expenditures	Percent of Local Funds for C&D	Total Expenditures for CLSA C&D	CLSA System Administration Expenditures	CLSA System Administration Local Expenditures	Total CLSA System Administration Expenditures	LSTA Expenditures on System Administration
BLACK GOLD	\$ 147,000	44%	\$ 184,436	56%	\$ 331,436	\$ 3,440	\$ 331,254	\$ 334,694	
49-99	\$ 120,321	100%	\$ -	0%	\$ 120,321.00	\$ 30,080.00	\$ -	\$ 30,080.00	
INLAND	\$ 305,992	100%	\$ -	0%	\$ 305,992.00	\$ 76,502	\$ -	\$ 76,502	
NORTHNET	\$ 707,228	90%	\$ 77,749	10%	\$ 784,978	\$ 110,557	\$ 97,852	\$ 208,409	2,957
PLP	\$ 555,328	99%	\$ 2,000	0.40%	\$ 557,328	\$ 138,832	\$ 496,864	\$ 635,696	168,228
SJVLS	\$ 240,251	15%	\$ 1,415,260	85%	\$ 1,655,511	\$ -	\$ 181,551	\$ 181,551	
SANTIAGO	\$ 168,302	100%	\$ -	0%	\$ 168,302	\$ 42,076	\$ -	\$ 42,076	
SERRA	\$ 216,259	100%	\$ -	0%	\$ 216,259	\$ 54,064	\$ -	\$ 54,064	
SCLC	\$ 571,017	100%	\$ -	0%	\$ 571,017	\$ 142,751	\$ -	\$ 142,751	
TOTAL	\$ 3,031,698	64%	\$ 1,679,445	36%	\$ 4,711,144	\$ 598,302	\$ 1,107,521	\$ 1,705,823	\$ 171,185.00

## 2015/16 Expenditures:

	CLSA	Local	LSTA	TOTAL
Administration	\$598,302 (35%)	\$1,107,521 (64%)	\$171,185 (1%)	\$ 1,877,008
Communication & Delivery	\$3,031,698 (64%)	\$1,679,445 (36%)		\$ 4,711,144
Total	\$3,630,000 (56%)	\$2,786,966 (43%)	\$171,185 (1%)	\$ 6,588,152

TITLE 5. CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY/CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Update to Regulations Implementing the Library Services Act; Procedures of the California Library Services Board

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES ACT REGULATIONS

The California Library Services Board (CLSB or Board) will conduct a public hearing at the time and place noted below to consider approving for adoption the proposed amendments to the California Library Services Act Regulations.

DATE: April 17, 2018

TIME: At the conclusion of the California Library Services Board meeting beginning at 9:30 a.m.

LOCATION: Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building, 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500, Sacramento, CA 95814.

This item will be considered after a meeting of the Board, which will commence at 9:30 a.m., April 17, 2018. Any additional meeting information, including the agenda, will be posted at <http://www.library.ca.gov/services/to-libraries/ca-library-services-act/> under "Board Meetings". Please consult the agenda for the meeting, which will be available at least ten days before April 17, 2018, to determine when this item will be considered.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD AND SUBMITTAL OF COMMENTS:

Interested members of the public may present comments orally or in writing at the hearing and may provide written comments by physical mail or electronic submittal before the hearing. The public comment period for this regulatory action will begin on the date this notice is published, March 2, 2018. Written comments not physically submitted at the hearing must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on April 20, 2018. Comments submitted prior to the hearing must be addressed to one of the following: Physical mail: Annly Roman, California Library Services Board, California State Library, P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237 or Electronic submittal: [annly.roman@library.ca.gov](mailto:annly.roman@library.ca.gov). Please note that under the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code, § 6250 et seq.), your written and oral comments, attachments, and associated contact information (e.g., your address, phone, email, etc.) become part of the public record and can be released to the public upon request.

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE:

This regulatory action is proposed under that authority granted in California Education Code, sections 18724 and 18725. The changes are proposed to conform, update, and delete provisions related to sections 18702, 18703, 18710, 18720, 18724, 18726, 18731, 18740, 18741 (repealed, 2016), 18743, 18745, 18746, 18747, 18765 (repealed, 2016) of the Education Code.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST / POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW:

Sections Affected: Proposed amendment to California Code of Regulations, title 5, sections 20101, 20105, 20107, 20116, 20118, 20119, 20122, 20123, 20124, 20125, 20127, 20130, 20134, 20135, 20136,

20140, 20158, 20180, 20185, 20190, 20203, 20205, 20215, 20216, 20217, 20235, 20236, 20251, 20252, 20255, 20257, 20260, and 20265.

#### Background and Effect of the Proposed Regulatory Action:

Section 18700-18767 of the California Education Code creates the California Library Services Act (Act) to facilitate greater equality of access to library services and resources regardless of location, income, or education level, especially in communities where people lack or have barriers to information and library services.

Sections 18720-18726 detail the administration of the California Library Services Act, which is done by an appointed Board of 13 representatives of various section of the library community as well as the California State Librarian who serves as the chief executive officer of the Board.

Section 18731 and 18743 of the Education Code encourage equal access by allowing libraries to participate in universal borrowing, allowing anyone to check out items from their library regardless of residence, and requiring all member libraries of a Cooperative Library System to provide equal access to all residents of the system, not just those in an the library's immediate area.

As originally enacted in 1977, the Act authorized various programs to help libraries share resources and opportunities for public libraries to seek grant funds allocated under the Act. These programs included the application of public libraries to the California Library Services Board for grant funds to create targeted programs, reimbursements for costs associated with the loaning of physical materials, statewide coordinated reference centers, funding for program assessment, and grants to facilitate the communication and delivery of information and materials within and between Cooperative Library Systems. These programs were funded, at varying levels, with state funding. Due to budget constraints funding for the California Library Services Act was gradually reduced until 2010 when it was eliminated altogether. A small amount of funding was later restored only to the communication and delivery program established in section 18745 of the Education Code.

In 2016 the California Library Services Act was amended to remove references to the obsolete programs which no longer received funding; including references to the Interlibrary Loan Program, reimbursements for costs associated with loaning physical materials, and grant programs supporting changes in Cooperative Library System membership. Additionally, changes were made to modernize the Act. Originally the act was written to facilitate the sharing of print materials. Changes were made to the act to include digital materials and resource sharing in the services that could receive funding under the Act and under the communication and delivery program.

The California Library Services Act has existing regulations in place which give policies and procedures for the running of the Board, notice and posting requirements for meetings, and designated meeting processes that must be followed. The current regulations also address the administration of the Cooperative Library Systems (Systems) in California, clarify reporting requirements, and requirements for consolidations of Systems or process for libraries wishing to join or change Systems. Finally, the regulations provide guidance on the library eligibility to participate in grant programs and

reimbursements for programs set forth in the related statute, the related reporting requirements, and general administration of the programs.

The proposed action will conform the regulations to changes which have been made to the related statute under the Education Code. These changes include removing obsolete reimbursement and grant program provisions that are no longer supported by state funds or statute. Additionally, the proposed action will change the meeting requirements to conform to current Bagley-Keen (Bagley-Keen Act) Open Meeting Act (Government Code, sections 11120-11131) requirements. The California Library Services Board is required, under the government code to abide by notice and meeting procedure requirements dictated under the Bagley-Keen Act but the California Library Services Act regulations, as currently written, do not reflect these requirements and often list posting and procedural requirements which contradict current required practices. These changes will clean-up the regulatory language and do away with the confusion caused by conflicting regulatory and statutory requirements.

The proposed amendments to the California Library Services Act regulations also update the regulations to reflect the ability, added to statute in 2016, of Cooperative Library Systems to use remaining Communication and Delivery program grant funds for resource sharing and delivery of digital materials. The amendments also clarify the use of funds for technology supporting shared resources or digital resources to ensure that, on a go forward basis, there is a uniform interpretation of what is allowed under the corresponding statute.

#### CONSISTENCY EVALUATION:

No additional federal, state, or local regulations dealing with this or similar program were discovered that proved inconsistent or incompatible with the proposed regulatory action.

#### LOCAL MANDATE:

The California State Library has determined that there is no mandate imposed on local agencies or school districts by these regulations.

#### FISCAL IMPACT/COST IMPACTS:

The California State Library has determined that the changes to these regulations will result in: no cost to any local agency or school district requiring reimbursement pursuant to Government Code sections 17500 through 17630; no cost or savings to any state agency; no other discretionary cost or savings imposed upon local agencies; and no cost or savings in federal funding to the state. The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action. The California State Library has determined that the proposed regulations will not have a significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

#### RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

The California State Library has concluded that it is: unlikely that the proposal will eliminate or create any jobs and/or eliminate or have any impact on existing business; and unlikely that this proposal may lead to the creation of new business or expand business currently operating in California. The proposed

regulatory changes will be unlikely to have any impact to the health or welfare of California residents, worker safety, or the states environment.

**BUSINESS/SMALL BUSINESS:** The existing California Library Services Act regulations already contain a reporting requirement for California Cooperative Library Systems and no new reporting requirements are added in the proposed changes to the regulations. The current reporting requirement only applies to the California Cooperative Library Systems and does not apply to outside business. The California State Library has also determined that the proposed action does not affect small business.

**CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES** In accordance with Government Code section 11346.5, subdivision (a)(13), the Department must determine that no reasonable alternative it considered, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Department, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law. The California State Library invites interested persons to present statements or arguments putting forward alternatives to the proposed regulations, at the scheduled hearing or during the written comment period.

**CONTACT PERSON:**

Inquiries concerning the proposed administrative action may be directed to: Annly Roman by mail at: California Library Services Board, California State Library, P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237; by email: [annly.roman@library.ca.gov](mailto:annly.roman@library.ca.gov); or telephone: (916) 323-0057. The alternative contact person to obtain information concerning the proposed administrative action is: Monica Rivas, reachable by mail at Library Development Services Bureau, California State Library, P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237; or by phone at (916) 653-5471. Please direct requests for copies of the proposed text of the regulations, the initial statement of reasons, the modified text of the regulation, if any, or other information upon which the rulemaking is based to Annly Roman at the above contact information.

**AVAILABILITY OF STATEMENT OF REASONS AND TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS:**

The California State Library will have the rulemaking file available for inspection and copying throughout the rulemaking process at the Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building, 914 Capitol Mall, Suite 220, Sacramento, CA 95814. As of the date this notice is published in the Notice Register, the rulemaking file consists of this notice; the proposed text of the regulations; the initial statement of reasons; California Library Services Board Actions to approve initial language; and any petitions received from industry. Copies may be obtained by contacting Annly Roman at the address, email address, or phone number listed above.

**AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT:**

After considering all timely and relevant comments, the California State Library in conjunction with the California Library Services Board may amend the proposed regulations. Any modified text will be made available to the public at least 15 days before the California Library Services Board adopts the regulations as revised. Written comments will be accepted on the modified regulations for 15 days after



they are made available Please send requests for copies of any modified regulations to the attention of Annly Roman at the address, or email address listed above.

AVAILABILITY OF FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS:

Upon its completion, copies of the Final Statement of Reasons may be obtained by contacting Annly Roman at the address or email address listed above. Additionally, the Final Statement of Reasons will be available through the California State Libraries website at <http://www.library.ca.gov/services/to-libraries/ca-library-services-act/>.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS ON THE INTERNET:

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the proposed changes to the regulations can be accessed through the California State Libraries website at <http://www.library.ca.gov/services/to-libraries/ca-library-services-act/>.

## CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES REGULATIONS

(Code of California Regulations, Title 5, Division 2, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2,  
Articles 1-8, Sec. 20101-20265)

### SUBCHAPTER 2. CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES

#### ARTICLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### § 20101. General Provisions.

(b) Any public library participating in programs of the Act shall, under section 18724~~(g)~~(e) of the Act, provide access to the library's bibliographic and location data upon request from the State Board for inclusion in the appropriate database established by the State Board in implementation of the Act. The access shall be provided in such form, manner, and frequency as are agreed upon between the State Board and the library.

Authority: Section 18724 and 18725, Education Code, Reference: Sections 18724, Education Code

##### § 20105. General Requirements for Participation.

(b) Public Library Certification. Upon the authorization by the jurisdictional governing body, the head librarian of each public library wishing to participate in the programs of the Act must file a certification of compliance with provisions of the Act. This certification shall remain in effect until the library jurisdiction no longer complies with the stated provisions. The certification shall specifically include compliance with Education Code Sections 18703(c) and 18724~~(e)~~(d). If the library or jurisdiction is no longer in compliance, the head librarian shall notify the Board no later than thirty days following such a change in compliance status.

Authority: Section 18724 and 18725, Education Code, Reference: Sections 18703 and 18724, Education Code

##### § 20107. Definitions.

(a) The definitions concerning California Library Services Act components set forth in Education Code Section 18710 are hereby incorporated by reference, with additions as noted in subsection (b) of this section. ~~The definitions incorporated by reference are accurate to California Statutes 1979~~2016.

(b) Additions to the regulations hereby incorporated are as follows:

(1) "Board Assistant" means the Administrative Assistant II position designated to the Board

~~(1)(2) "Chief Executive Officer" means the State Librarian.~~

~~(2)(2) "President" means the elected President of the Board.~~

~~(3)(3) "Public library affiliation" means the formal and legal joining to a System (i.e. the obtaining of full System membership status) by a public library not previously a member of any System. A Public Library Affiliation is not considered complete until all necessary local System and jurisdictional agreements have been approved and are in force, and the State Board has approved the affiliation.~~

~~(4)~~(4) "Public library consolidation" means the formal and legal joining of the functions, services, operations, etc. of two or more formerly independent public libraries into a single public library, as defined in Education Code Section 18710 (f). A Public Library Consolidation is not considered complete until all necessary local jurisdictional agreements have been approved and are in force, and the State Board has approved the consolidation (see Administrative Code Section 20180, below).

(5) "Resource Sharing" refers to the allowed use or application of a resource created, purchased, or leased by one (1) or more participating libraries' with three (3) or more participating libraries.

~~(5) Reference collection. Reference collection means a collection of materials, both print and non-print, designed primarily for use in answering requests for information.~~

~~(6) Reference specialist. Reference specialist means a trained and experienced librarian who can provide reference referral services and who can also understand how to approach the community in general and the underserved in particular, together with appropriate skills in analysis of information needs and design and implementation of reference programs responsive to those needs. A reference specialist may be employed in providing any of the services for which he/she is qualified.~~

~~(7) "Secretary" means the Executive Secretary of the Board.~~

~~(8) "State Board" means the California Library Services Board.~~

~~(9)~~(6) "System consolidation" means the formal and legal joining of geographic service areas, functions, operations, etc. of two or more formerly separate Systems into a single Cooperative Library System, as defined in Education Code Section 18710 (c). A System Consolidation is not considered complete until all necessary local System consolidation agreements have been approved and are in force, and until the State Board has approved the consolidation (see Administrative Code Section 20185, below).

~~(40)~~(7) "Valid non-resident borrowers card" means a card that is issued free of charge by a public library to a resident of another jurisdiction which maintains a public library, as long as such card meets all of the legal requirements of the issuing library.

~~(44)~~(8) "Vice-President" means the elected Vice-President of the Board.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code, Reference: Sections 18700-18767, Education Code

## ARTICLE 2. CALIFORNIA LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD PROCEDURES

### § 20116. Officers of the State Board.

(a) The State Board shall ~~annually~~ biennially elect a President and Vice-President at the ~~first~~ last regular meeting of ~~each~~ every odd numbered calendar year.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### § 20118. Regular Meetings.

(a) Date. Regular meetings of the State Board shall take place at least ~~bi-monthly~~ on the third Thursday of the months of February, April, June, August, October; the

~~December meeting shall be held in conjunction with the California Library Association conference once each year.~~

~~(b) Place. The tentative time of year and locations for the regular meetings ~~of in~~ the following forthcoming calendar year shall be determined annually, at the last regular meeting of the calendar year.~~

~~(c) Change of date or place. Nothing in this regulation shall be construed to prevent the State Board from altering its regular meeting dates or places of meeting location.~~

~~(d) Meeting notice. A notice of regular meetings shall be provided at least seven days prior to the meeting date to any person annually requesting such notice under section 20119 below. Such notice shall include the time, date, and place of the regular meeting and a copy of the agenda therefor. Notices of regular meetings shall comply with all requirements laid out in Government Code sections 11120-11131.~~

(e) Any person or organization desiring to receive notice(s) of State Board meetings may email the current Board Assistant or direct the request to: California Library Services Board, State Librarian's Office, California State Library, P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237-0001.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

#### **§ 20119. Notices.**

~~(a) Eligibility. Notice of any regular or special public meeting of the State Board shall be given to any person annually requesting under section 20119(b).~~

~~(b) Procedure. Individuals and organizations wishing to receive notice of regular and special meetings of the State Board and copies of the agenda may annually request the Secretary to include their names on the mailing list. Inclusion on the mailing list will result in notification to the addressee of all regular and special meetings of the State Board. The Secretary shall annually notify interested agencies and organizations that, upon request, they are entitle to be placed on the mailing list.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

#### **§ 20122. Special Meetings.**

~~Special meetings may be called by the President of the State Board or a majority of the members thereof for any stated purpose. Notice of such meetings shall be provided at least 24 hours in advance to those persons so requesting under section 20119(b).~~

Special meetings shall comply with all special meeting provisions in Government Code sections 11120-11131.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### **§ 20123. Emergency Meetings and Agenda Items.**

(a) Power. An emergency meeting may be called by the President of the State Board or a majority of the members thereof without providing the notice required by ~~section 20119~~ section 20118(d) if there is an unforeseen emergency condition in existence.

(b) Definition. An unforeseen emergency condition exists when there is an immediate threat of adverse effects on the program authorized by the Act of such scope that requires action of the State Board to avert such effects.

(c) Agenda Items. An item may be included on the agenda of any regular meeting if an unforeseen emergency condition exists without the notice required by ~~section 20119~~ section 20118(d).

(d) Certification. Concurrence of 7 of the members is required to certify that an emergency condition exists in order to take any action at an emergency meeting or regarding an emergency item.

(e) Notice. If reasonably possible, notice of the emergency item or meeting shall be provided to those so requesting under ~~section 20119(b)~~ 20118(e). Lack of such notice shall not invalidate any action taken on said item or at said meeting.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### **§ 20124. Agenda.**

(a) All matters to be submitted for consideration of the State Board shall be sent ~~to the Secretary to the Board Assistant~~ at least ~~40~~ 15 business days preceding a regular meeting of the State Board, by email or by mail at California Library Services Board, California State Library, P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237-0001.

(b) Setting of Agenda. The agenda for regular meetings of the State Board shall be set by the Chief Executive Officer at least ~~8~~ 12 business days prior to the meeting.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### **§ 20125. Speakers.**

(a) Recognition of Speakers. Members of the public or the State Library staff ~~will~~ may be recognized by the President ~~of the State Board~~ to speak at any State Board meeting. All remarks made shall be germane to the business at hand and shall be addressed to the President. ~~No person other than the person having the floor and members of the State Board shall be permitted to enter the discussion.~~

(b) Subject of Remarks. All speakers before the State Board shall confine their remarks to the subject ~~indicated in their written request, or indicated in the recognition by~~ for which they were recognized by the President.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### **§ 20127. Robert's Rules of Order.**

Except where the provisions of the California Library Services Act of ~~1977~~ 2016 or of

these regulations provide to the contrary, or when the State Board determines otherwise, the State Board shall operate under the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### **§ 20130. Public Hearings.**

(c) Speakers.

(1) Notice. Persons wishing to address the State Board on a subject to be considered at a public hearing, should present a request to the ~~Secretary~~ Board Assistant four (4) working days in advance of the meeting ~~at the office of the Secretary by email, or in person at the Board Assistant's Office, at the Stanley Mosk Library-Courts Building, 914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento California 95814,~~ stating the subject they wish to address, the organization they represent, if any, and the nature of their testimony. Persons wishing to address the Board, who have not presented a request four days in advance, may be heard at the discretion of the presiding officer.

(2) Copies of Statement. The speaker may provide a written copy of his statement to the ~~Secretary~~ Board Assistant 24 hours in advance of the hearing.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### **§ 20134. Public Records.**

(a) Inspection of Public Records.

(1) Inspection of the original copy of any public record of the State Board (as defined in Government Code section 6252(d) and 6254) will be permitted during regular office hours of the State Library, Stanley Mosk Library-Courts Building, 914 Capitol Mall, Sacramento California 95814.

(2) Requests to inspect such records should be filed with the ~~Secretary~~ Board Assistant at least five working days prior to the requested date in order to insure availability.

(3) Requests for inspection should be as specific as possible in identifying the records desired.

(4) Original copies of public records shall not be removed from the ~~office the Secretary~~ Stanley Mosk Library-Courts Building.

(b) Obtaining Copies of Public Records.

(1) Requests to obtain copies of public records may be made in person or by mail to the ~~office of the Secretary~~ Board Assistant at California Library Services Board, California State Library, P.O. Box 942837, Sacramento, CA 94237-0001.

(2) Such requests should be as specific as possible in identifying the records desired.

(3) Certification of the authenticity of copies may be obtained from the ~~Secretary~~ Board Assistant.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18720 and 18724, Education Code.

### ARTICLE 3. GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR SYSTEMS

#### § 20135. System Budget Request and Plan of Service.

- (1) A population profile. This shall be no more than ~~five~~ three years old, and shall use the most current data available.
- (2) A description of the users ~~and the non-users~~ of the services of the members of the System.
- (3) A description of the services provided by the System.
- ~~(4) A list of the major unmet information needs of the population of the System area.~~
- ~~(5) (4) A plan for the use of CLSA funds, listing each of the services(s) in (3) above which the System plans to maintain or improve, and each of the unmet needs in (4) above which the System plans to address.~~ Under each such service to be provided, the plan shall include:
  - (b) Budget. The System budget shall document in the form and manner prescribed by the State Board the dollar amounts to be expended for providing each System service ~~or addressing each unmet need.~~
  - (d) Membership and Population Figures. The State Board shall periodically, and at least annually, review and approve the membership and population figures, and determine an appropriate funding formula which shall be uniform statewide.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18724(d), 18710(c), 18710(o), 18740, 18746, and 18747, Education Code.

#### § 20136. System Administrative Policy Manual.

Each System participating in programs of the Act must develop ~~by July 1, 1979,~~ a System Administrative Policy Manual which shall include along with any other items the System finds useful, its policies for:

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18710(c), 18710(o), 18740, 18746, and 18747, Education Code.

#### § 20140. System Administration.

(a) Cooperative Library Systems. The System Administrative Council shall consist of the head librarian of each jurisdiction in the system. In case of the head librarian's absence, an official delegate or alternate may vote in place of the head librarian. It shall have regular meetings, open and accessible to the public as required in the Ralph M. Brown Act (Govt. Code Section 54950-54964~~3~~). Information about the meetings of the Council shall be disseminated in such a way and in such languages as the Council determines will most effectively inform the public of the Council's activities. The Council shall provide for the position of a Council Chair-person, and for rotation of that position among the Council members.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18710(c), 18710(o), 18740, and 18747, Education Code.

## **ARTICLE 4. SYSTEM REFERENCE**

### **§ 20158. Allowance.**

~~Each System shall receive an annual allowance based on the number of member libraries of the System and on the total population served by that System. The State Board shall periodically, and at least annually, review and approve the membership and population figures, and determine an appropriate funding formula which shall be uniform statewide.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18724 and 18741(repealed 2016), Education Code.

## **ARTICLE 5: CONSOLIDATIONS AND AFFILIATIONS**

### **§ 20180. Public Library Consolidations.**

(a) ~~If any two or more contiguous jurisdictions operating public libraries wish to consolidate their libraries into a single library agency and receive establishment grants under Education Code Section 18732, a joint notice of intent signed by the head librarians of the consolidating jurisdictions must be filed with the State Board no later than September 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the effective date for consolidation. Authorizations to consolidate, approved by the governing body of each consolidating jurisdiction, and a joint plan for provision of consolidated services, signed by the head librarians, must be filed with the State Board no later than June 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the effective date of the consolidation.~~

(b) ~~The State Board's approval of requests for library consolidation funds under Education Code Section 18732 shall be based on its determination that the consolidation provides a more effective means of carrying out the purposes of the Act than would be the case if the consolidation did not occur.~~

(c) ~~For purposes of determining the eligibility of the consolidating jurisdictions to receive funds under other provisions of the Act, a~~ A public library consolidation approved by the State Board will be considered effective beginning July 1 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the consolidation authorizations are filed.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18724 and 18726c, Education Code.

### **§ 20185. System Consolidations.**

(a) ~~If any two or more Systems whose borders are contiguous-wish to consolidate and receive a consolidation grant under Education Code Section 18751, a joint notice of intent, approved by the Administrative Councils of the consolidating systems, must be filed with the State Board no later than September 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the effective date of consolidation. System participation authorizations approved by the jurisdictional governing body of each of the System's member libraries, and a new system plan of Service and budget, must be filed with the State Board no later than June 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the effective date of consolidation. If the State Board approves the consolidation funding request, a grant~~



shall be awarded for each of the two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the filing is made.

(b) The State Board's approval of requests for System consolidation funds under ~~Education Code Section 19851~~ shall be based on its determination that the consolidation provides a more effective way of carrying out the purposes of the Act than would be the case if the consolidation did not occur.

(c) ~~For purposes of determining the eligibility of the consolidating systems to receive funds under other provisions of the Act, a~~ A system consolidation approved by the State Board will be considered effective beginning July 1 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the consolidation authorizations are filed.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18724 and 18726c, Education Code.

### **§ 20190. Public Library Affiliation with an Existing System.**

(a) If any jurisdiction, not previously a member of any System, joins a System with borders contiguous to the jurisdiction, ~~and the System wishes to receive an affiliation grant under Education Code Section 18752,~~ the administrative body of the System shall file a notice of intent and the jurisdictional governing body of the affiliating library shall file an affiliation authorization with the State Board.

(c) ~~For purposes of determining the eligibility of the affiliating public library or system to receive funds under other provisions of the Act, a~~ An affiliation will be considered effective beginning July 1 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the affiliation authorization is filed.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18724 and 18726c, Education Code.

## **ARTICLE 6. DIRECT LOAN**

### **§ 20203. Residency.**

For purposes of this Article, each resident of the State shall be deemed to have a single legal residency, which shall entitle ~~him/her~~ them to resident library services of the jurisdiction in which ~~he/she~~ they resides, and such services shall not be reimbursable under this Article. In determining the places of residency, the following rules as excepted from Government Code section 244 shall be observed:

(a) It is the place where one remains when not called elsewhere for labor or other special or temporary purpose, and to which ~~he or she~~ one returns in seasons of repose.

(b) There can be only one residence.

(c) A residence cannot be lost until another is gained.

(d) The residence of the parent with whom an unmarried minor child maintains ~~his or her~~ their place of abode is the residence of such unmarried minor child.

(e) A married person shall have the right to retain ~~his or her~~ their legal residence in the State notwithstanding the legal residence or domicile of ~~his or her~~ their spouse.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18702, 18710(e), 18724, and 18731, Education Code.

**§ 20205. Non-Resident Borrower Eligibility.**

(a) Hold a valid borrowers card issued by ~~his/her~~ their home library, or

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18702, 18710(e), 18724, and 18731, Education Code.

**~~§ 20215. Reimbursement for Net Direct Loans.~~**

~~Loan of a library material of any type by a participating public library to an eligible nonresident borrower shall result in reimbursement from the state under Education Code Sections 18731 and 18743 to the extent that the number of such loans exceeds the number of items borrowed by that library jurisdiction's residents from other participating public libraries, during a specific reporting period.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18731 (repealed 2016) and 18743 (repealed 2016), Education Code

**~~§ 20216. Reporting Requirements.~~**

~~To obtain reimbursement, participating public libraries shall provide reports in the form and manner, and for the period required. Reports must be submitted by established deadlines. Records in support of claims for state funds must be maintained for four years.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18731 (repealed 2016) and 18743 (repealed 2016), Education Code

**~~§ 20217. Reimbursable Costs.~~**

~~Reimbursable costs, expressed on a unit basis, are those handling costs incurred by the lending library in processing a direct loan to a non-resident. The State Board shall periodically review, at least once a year, and approve such cost data, but the reimbursement rate, as adopted, shall be uniform statewide.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: Section 18731 (repealed 2016) and 18743 (repealed 2016), Education Code

**ARTICLE 7. COMMUNICATION AND DELIVERY**

**§ 20235. Definition of Reporting Terms.**

In complying with the reporting requirements of Section 20135 each system shall report the following items using the following definitions with respect to the communication, and delivery, and resource sharing programs:

(b) "Item delivered" means the physical-removal of a discrete item from one library to another by means of a delivery van, U.S. Mail, courier service, or other delivery system or the delivery of digital materials. Reasonable judgement shall be exercised in

determining particular “items” status (e.g., a carton containing 10,000 brochures is one - not 10,000 items).

(d) “Other” means that when a system employs communications, or delivery methods, or shared resources, other than those specifically cited on the standard reporting forms, the system must specify the method(s) employed and separately account for the message or delivery volume for each such method. The System must describe the communication, delivery method, or shared resource and the outcome of providing it.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18724(d) and 18745, Education Code.

### **§20236. Inclusion**

Unless otherwise prohibited by Education Codes 18745-18746, intra-system communication, delivery and resource sharing includes the acquisition or maintenance of technology or digital transmission products required to locate, create, or make accessible digital, virtual, or electronic material, which may also include telecommunication equipment and its installation along with service fees.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18724, 18745 and 18746, Education Code.

## **ARTICLE 8. INTERLIBRARY LOANS**

### **§ 20251. Scope.**

~~The regulations in this article refer to interlibrary loan activity covered under the provisions of Education Code section 18744 (i.e. System interlibrary loan) and 18765 (i.e. Statewide loan).~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18765 (repealed 2016), Education Code.

### **§ 20252. Intent.**

~~It is the intent of this program of the Act to support the sharing of library resources through interlibrary loan. Library materials needed by a library user and not available in that user's library will be made available to the user via interlibrary loan.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18765 (repealed 2016), Education Code.

### **§ 20255. Eligibility.**

~~(a) Public Libraries. Any public library as defined in Education Code section 18710(lj), which has been authorized by its jurisdiction to participate in programs of the Act must participate in the interlibrary loan programs of the Act.~~

~~(b) Libraries Other Than Public Libraries. To be eligible to participate these libraries must be authorized by their own administrative authorities to do so and must file the proper notice with the State Board as outlined in section 20105(c). Further, a library, other than a public library, may be eligible for a reimbursement only for a loan to an~~

eligible public library. Libraries, other than public libraries, which can become eligible for participation in the interlibrary loan reimbursement programs of the Act include only the following:

(1) Libraries operated by public schools or school districts. These libraries include only those defined in Education Code section 18710(m).

(2) Libraries operated by public colleges or universities. These include those academic libraries (Education Code section 18710(a)) which are funded primarily with public funds. Academic libraries potentially eligible for these programs include the libraries of the University of California, of the State University and College System, and of the California Community Colleges.

(3) Libraries operated by public agencies for institutionalized persons. Libraries for the institutionalized include hospital, correctional, and residential treatment facility libraries which are funded primarily with public funds (i.e. local, state, or federal tax monies).

(4) Libraries operated by nonprofit private educational or research institutions. These libraries include those operated by private colleges and universities which maintain nonprofit status under provisions of the federal Internal Revenue Service or the California Franchise Tax laws. These libraries also include those operated by private companies which are primarily devoted to educational or research purposes and which maintain nonprofit status under provisions of the federal Internal Revenue Service or the California Franchise Tax laws. Such libraries may be required by the State Board to furnish proof of their nonprofit status in addition to any other required notices and forms.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18765 (repealed 2016), Education Code.

#### **§ 20257. Reimbursable Transaction.**

An interlibrary transaction can result in reimbursement under Education Code sections 18744 and 18765 if it consists of the loan of a library material of any type which is collected by a library or if it consists of the provision of a copy in lieu of loan of a library material, from any eligible, participating lending library to any eligible public library as defined in section 20255 and in Education Code sections 18744 and 18765.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18765 (repealed 2016), Education Code.

#### **§ 20260. Reimbursable Costs.**

Reimbursable costs are only those handling costs which a lending library incurs in filling a successfully completed interlibrary loan transaction. The State Board shall periodically, and at least annually, review and approve the cost data and determine an appropriate funding formula which shall be uniform statewide.

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18765 (repealed 2016), Education Code.

### **§ 20265. Participation Requirements.**

Participating libraries, both public and nonpublic, shall conform to the following requirements:

- (a) ~~Reporting. To obtain reimbursement a library shall provide by the deadline reporting date, all required reports of its interlibrary loan transactions in an established form and manner determined by the Board for the period required.~~
- (b) ~~Audit. For audit purposes, a record of the interlibrary loan transactions must be maintained for four years.~~
- (c) ~~Fees. A library providing an item for interlibrary loan may not collect a handling fee on a transaction for which that library claims an interlibrary loan reimbursement under provisions of this article. A photocopy fee, exclusive of photocopy handling charge, may be collected.~~
- (d) ~~Direct Loan Availability. Participating libraries shall make maximum use of available bibliographic access tools to refer users to borrow directly from nearby libraries where requested material is easily available, rather than to process an interlibrary loan.~~
- (e) ~~Responsibility for Borrowed Materials. The borrowing library shall be responsible for all items it borrows, and if such item is lost or damaged by the library or its users, the borrowing library may be required by the lending library to make restitution for the item.~~
- (f) ~~Adherence to Standards. All participating libraries shall attempt to follow the standards described in the "California Library Services Act Interlibrary Loan Standards," which is hereby incorporated by reference. The State Board may withhold reimbursements to libraries which continually fail to meet the standards of performance.~~

Authority: Section 18724, Education Code. Reference: 18765 (repealed 2016), Education Code.

# **Initial Statement of Reasons**

## **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The Legislature adopted, as part of the 2016-17 fiscal year budget package, AB 1602 which amended the California Library Services Act (Education Code 18700-18767). The purpose of the California Library Services Act is to facilitate equal access to library resources regardless of location, income, or education level especially to underserved communities. In an effort to achieve this end funds are made available to libraries or localized library cooperative systems, under the Act, for various programs.

The Education Code sections 18700-18767 were originally enacted in 1977 and, due to the time period in which they were put in place; focus on creating equal access through the physical sharing of books and other physical resources. The amendments to Sections 18700-18767 removed references to obsolete programs which have not been funded by the legislature for several years. They also amended the statute to include modernizing language which references the sharing of electronic resources in addition to print materials.

While the new section 18700-18767 allow for the sharing of electronic resources there is no definition of sharing provided. There are also usually additional costs that coincide with electronic resources such as supporting technology or subscription fees but it is unclear in the statute whether these are acceptable costs for funding allocated under that section. Finally, electronic materials were included under the new language in the California Library Services Act as materials that can be shared. The reporting requirements that allow the California Library Services Act's governing body, the California Library Services Board, to assess if funds are being used effectively are contained in regulation so reporting on the use and sharing of electronic resources is not currently required. This limits the ability of the California Library Services Board to assess how these resources are being used.

## **BENEFITS**

The impact of the amendments to regulatory sections 20100-20265 will be to clean-up the regulatory language and remove obsolete provisions that are no longer supported by state funds or statute. It will also allow for the amendment of procedural language relating to meeting notifications and meeting requirements. These regulatory sections were put in place prior to the enactment of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Government Code sections 11120-11131) and while the Board does comply with newer open meeting requirements the language in the regulations does not and can be confusing to interested parties.

Electronic resources allow patrons easier, more convenient access to information and there is a demand, among library patrons for both print and digital materials. Allowing the funding of technology, digital products, equipment, and service fees to support digital resources will expand the number of products and programs the Cooperative Library Systems can provide to their member libraries as well as increasing the availability of the information and services provided by those products to a larger number of patrons both within the libraries' service area and beyond.

## **PURPOSE**

**Section 20101, subdivision (b) and Section 20105, subdivision (b):** To regulate the basic requirements for participation and specify information that shall be provided by participating libraries and notification requirements.

**Section 20107:** To define terms not already defined in statute for the purposes of the regulatory section.

**Sections 20116, 20118, 20119, 20122, 20123, 20124, 20125, 20127, 20130, 20134:** To specify procedures for the governance and meetings of the California Library Services Board to ensure business is carried out in an organized, timely, transparent manner with ample opportunity for public participation.

**Section 20135:** To identify the requirements for public library cooperative system reports to the California Library Services Board to allow for the assessment of their use of funds and the collect information to assist in the allocation of funds.

**Sections 20136, 20140:** To provide guidelines for the governance of Cooperative Library Systems.

**Section 20158:** To identify how funding would be allocated under the now repealed system reference programs.

**Sections 20180, and 20185:** To provide defined procedures for consolidations of public library jurisdictions and Cooperative Library Systems that ensure each consolidation is reviewed and furthers the purpose of the California Library Services Act.

**Section 20190:** To provide defined procedures for the joining of a public library jurisdiction with a Cooperative Library System that ensures both participating parties are willing to affiliate and that the public library jurisdiction's affiliation with the Cooperative Library Systems furthers the purpose of the California Library Services Act.

**Sections 20203 and 20205:** To establish guidelines for residence and eligibility for library cards and services.

**Sections 20215, 20216, 20217:** To establish guidelines for reimbursement under the repealed direct loan program and requirements for reporting a libraries qualified loans.

**Section 20235, subdivision (b) and subdivision (d):** To define information the Cooperative Library Systems have to report in their annual reporting to the State Library.

**Section 20236:** To clarify how communication, delivery, and resource sharing money can be spent.

**Sections 20251, 20252, 20255, 20257. 20260, 20265:** To create guidelines and procedures for the governance and funding of the now repealed Interlibrary Loan program.

## **NECESSITY**

**Section 20101 and 20105:** Amending these sections is necessary to reflect changes made to statute in 2016. These amendments will ensure that each regulatory section is referencing the intended statute section.

Section 20107, subdivision (a): Amending this section is necessary to ensure the section is referring to the most updated Statute rather than the original version since the statutory definitions have changed over time.

**Section 20107, subdivision (b):** Amending the definitions in this section is necessary to reflect current practices and removed obsolete language referencing definitions already present in statute, repealed programs, and removed positions.

In the 2016 amendment to Education Code section 18745 was amended to include “resource sharing” in the allowed items cooperative library systems can fund. The section also indicates that cooperative library systems base funding proposals on “the more cost-effective methods of exchanging print and digital materials and information...” Digital materials are not always owned outright like print materials. Instead a library might lease, or pay for access to digital materials. In addition to the variety of way libraries can obtain materials, the financial resources to support these communication, delivery and resource sharing activities are limited.

A definition new of “Resource sharing” is necessary to ensure that funds are used to further the statutory requirement of exchanging print and digital materials while ensure that libraries have the freedom to share those resources regardless of format or how the content was obtained by the library. The definition is also necessary to encourage libraries to spread the limited resources further ensuring that at least three libraries find value in and agree to share a resource before it can be funded.



**Section 20116:** The California Library Services Board, due to budget cuts and reductions in funding, meets twice each year to conduct its business. Due to the regulatory requirement that Board officers be elected every year time is spent at each meetings either electing a nominating committee or voting on Board officers. Amending this section to allow for biennial Board elections will save limited time that the Board has since elections would only be addressed every other year and allow that time to be allocated to the discussion of more pressing topics. Additionally, the Board officers would have more time to adjust to and become comfortable in their roll since they currently are only serving as officers for one meeting before new elections are held.

**Section 20118:** Amending the meeting notice requirements in this section is necessary because they no longer align with Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements with which California Library Services Board meetings are required to comply. Referencing the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act statutes will ensure that all meeting notices comply with the open meeting act regardless of changes made to open meeting rules in the future.

Additionally, these regulations were put in place prior to the prevalence of email in correspondence. Amending the language to allow notice requests to be submitted by email will align with current practices and allow notice requests to be made much closer to posting deadlines and meetings since those requesting notification will not have to account for physical mail timelines or the cost of placing such a request.

Finally, prior to 2010 it was necessary for the California Library Services Board to meet several times a year to effectively administrate the funds and programs that fell under the Board's purview. In 2010 the funding for the California Library services Act was zeroed out and only a small portion of those funds, allocated to a single program have been restored. The Board no longer needs to meet bi monthly. Amending the regulatory language to indicate that the Board should meet at least once year aligns more with the current practice of meeting twice yearly to address the business of the Board while still allowing leeway for the Board to meet more often if necessary.

**Section 20119:** This section is no longer necessary as meeting of the Board are governed by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Government Code sections 11120-11131) which details the notice requirements and is referenced as the governing stature in Section 20118.

**Sections 20122, 20123, 20124, 20125 and 20126, 20130, and 20134:** Changes to these sections are necessary to conform language to recommendations for additional regulatory changes we are requesting at this time, update contact information and modernize practices by allowing email submissions and communication, and conform

timeframes for notifications and submissions to notice requirement timelines in the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Government Code sections 11120-11131).

**Sections 20135:** The funding the Cooperative Library Systems receive from through the California Library Services Act is allocated by formula that is based on library distances and service populations. In order to effectively allocate these funds the Board has to review and understand the population and system membership figures. The only mention of this requirement was contained in a regulatory article which was tied to a statutory program that has been repealed. It is necessary to retain the regulatory language regarding the review of population figures as well as the ability for the Board determine a uniform funding formula should the existing formula need to be revisited due to changes in populations or library services. Since the Cooperative Library Systems budget is based on funding it received through the formula the requirement for the California Library Services Board to review the population figures was placed in this section.

Additionally amendments to the section are necessary to reflect current practices based on the ability of the Cooperative library Systems to gather and provide information.

**Sections 20136 and 20140:** Minor amendments to these sections are necessary to ensure that the regulation language is reference current statutes.

**Section 20158:** This section references a program authorized under Education Code section 18741. This code section was repealed. Language contained in this section that is needed to regulate other, continuing programs under the California Library Services Act was moved to section 20135. This section is unnecessary and no longer has a statutory basis so it should be repealed to clean-up the regulations and prevent confusion for library jurisdictions or cooperative library systems reading the regulations.

**Section 20180, 20185, 20190:** The regulatory language removed in each of these sections references grant programs that are no longer funded and whose authorizing statutory language has been repealed. Removing the irrelevant language is necessary to clean-up the regulations and prevent confusion for library jurisdictions or cooperative library systems reading the regulations.

**Sections 20203, 20205, 20215, 20216, 20217:** The regulatory language removed in each of these sections references a reimbursement program that is no longer funded and whose authorizing statutory language has been repealed. Removing the irrelevant language is necessary to clean-up the regulations and prevent confusion for library jurisdictions or cooperative library systems reading the regulations.

**Section 20235:** Changes to this section are necessary to reflect changes to Education Code 18745 which modernized the language to reference the funding of resource

sharing and digital materials. Currently Cooperative Library Systems are required to report to the Board on programs and services they are funding under section 18745. This section defines items that are required to be reported and these changes would ensure that they are also reporting on digital materials and shared resources being funded. This kind of information is necessary for the Board to be able to assess if funds are being used in the most effective, beneficial manner.

**Section 20236:** Access to digital materials allows library patrons easier and more convenient access to information and resources. The cost of digital materials extends beyond the lease of, subscription to, or purchase of these materials. Libraries often have to purchase new technologies or servers to support these programs in addition to ongoing monthly, quarterly or yearly costs. Additionally, many libraries have unique physical collections that could be valuable to patrons in other areas but are not easily accessible. Libraries are contemplating ways to provide increased access to these kinds of materials and collections. Digitization is a good option for preserving and expanding access to these materials; however it is expensive due to the cost of scanning equipment, software, server space to store files, and platforms to share the materials

Amendments to Education Code section 18745 allows for the funding of resource sharing and digital materials but does not mention supporting technologies, service fees for digital materials, or technology or products for creating or accessing digital material to share. Providing language that clarifies that these expenses are acceptable as long as they comply with the statute will allow libraries to explore a larger variety of products and services that might expand access to information and benefit their patrons and the people of California.

**Sections 20251, 20252, 20255, 20257, 20260, and 20265:** Removing each of these sections will clean-up the regulations and prevent confusion for library jurisdictions or cooperative library systems reading the regulations. These sections reference a reimbursement program that is no longer funded and whose authorizing statutory language has been repealed.

## **BASIS FOR REGULATORY CHANGES AND ADDITIONS**

Three major factors were considered in the recommended changes and additions to these regulation sections. The first was changes to statutes impacting these regulations including Education code sections governing the California Library Services Act as well as Government Code open meeting act requirements. The second was recommended changes put forward by members of the California Library Services Board that were felt to streamline processes and save on limited time and funds. Finally, input provided by the Cooperative Library Systems in the form of letters to the Board as well as conference calls between State Library staff and the Cooperative Library System

coordinators. The recommendations from the Cooperative Library Systems centered on seeking ability to more effectively serve library patrons using technology that has become prevalent since the regulations were enacted.

The formal recommendations from the Cooperative Library Systems and comments by Board members and members of the public on this issue can be found on the California State Library's website in the April 2017 Agenda Packet, agenda item D. ([http://www.library.ca.gov/loc/docs/2017-04\\_Agenda\\_packet.pdf](http://www.library.ca.gov/loc/docs/2017-04_Agenda_packet.pdf)).

## **ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT/ANALYSIS**

The proposed amendments to regulatory sections 20101-20265, which implement the California Library Services Act (Education Code 18700-18767), will remove obsolete references to unfunded programs no longer supported by statute, update California Library Services Board procedures to reflect current Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements and current Board procedures, and update remaining program language to mirror changes to statute and clarify allowable costs.

The changes to these regulations are technical and clarifying in nature. They have no impact on the amount of funding designated by the legislature or how those funds are distributed to public libraries.

### Creation or Elimination of Jobs within the State of California

The proposed amendments to these regulations will update and clarify the existing regulations already in place governing the processes of the California Library Services Board and the implementation of the programs they oversee. The program related language that is being removed references programs that have not been funded since 2010 at the latest (some programs lacked designated funding almost since implementation). Since the programs have not had funding for the last seven years there are no staff members at the State Library, the Cooperative Library Systems, or public libraries working specifically with those programs so the changes will not result in any job loss.

The funding still received under the California Library Services Act is allocated to the Cooperative Library Systems in California to fund and create library services related to communication, delivery, and resource sharing of information, and print and digital materials. The proposed language changes related to this remaining program aligns with and clarifies the allowable program costs based on 2016 changes to statute. While this change does reflect a slight expansion of how program funds can be spent, the new program language does not coincide with any additional funding and so would not create new jobs. The updated language allows those already working on the services provided under this program more options for services and activities.

Additionally, the staff members assigned to the California Library Services Board already comply with the open meeting requirements and processes, since they are required by statute, so conforming the regulations to reflect those requirements will not result in any new Board staff.

#### Creation of new or elimination of existing business in the State of California

The California Library Services Act regulations govern the process of the California Library Services Board and the implementation of the programs they oversee. The funding provided for California Library Services Act programs are for the benefit of Public Libraries in California. While the services are beneficial, the funds received are a very small portion of a public library's budget and would not allow for the formation of a new library or library district, especially when it is considered that the funds are divided for the benefit of all 182 public library jurisdictions in California.

Funds allocated to the communication, delivery, and resource sharing program are sometimes used to contract with existing information resources related businesses and database providers. Based on the *Plans of Service* and *Annual Reports* from the Cooperative Library Systems detailing what services are being funded, libraries are contracting with the larger, well known information and database providers. The existence of such contracting opportunities would not inspire the creation of new businesses based on both the preference for known, tested products, and the limited amount of funding actually available once divided amongst the Cooperative Library Systems and allocated toward the variety of communication, delivery, and resource sharing services being provided.

There is some opportunity for Cooperative Library Systems to expand their service offerings based on the recent statute changes and proposed regulatory amendments. However, even if some Cooperative Library Systems choose to allocate funds to different services because of those changes, the amount of overall funding allocated to each service is not significant. Therefore no existing businesses in California would be materially hurt based on those changes.

#### The expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California

The California Library Services Act regulations govern the process of the California Library Services Board and the implementation of the programs they oversee. Funds allocated to the remaining library program (communication, delivery, and resource sharing) are used to contract with existing information resources related businesses and the changes to the regulations can allow for expanded program options. However, even if some Cooperative Library Systems choose to allocate funds to different services because of those changes, the amount of overall funding is so small that it would not allow for business expansion.

## Benefits of the Regulations to the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the State's environment

The California Library Services Act regulations govern the process of the California Library Services Board and the implementation of the programs they oversee. The proposed amendments simply clean-up the existing regulatory language, conform to changes in statute, and clarify allowable program costs. The amendments could have a slight benefit to the welfare of those California residents who use and benefit from expanded services but there is no guarantee that services will change or who and how many patrons will use the service if there is a change as the kinds of services that can be provided must still fit within "communication, delivery and resource sharing". These regulations are specific to certain library services and have no impact on California resident health, worker safety, or the environment.

### **EVIDENCE SUPPORTING NO ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT**

These regulatory changes are amendments to existing California Library Services Act regulations governing the process of the California Library Services Board and the implementation of the programs they oversee. During the process of drafting the amendments California State Library staff analyzing the current regulatory language as well as looking at the changes to the Education code sections 18700-18767 (enacted by AB 1602, 2016 Statutes), and the requirements of the Bagley-Keen Open Meeting statutes (Government Code sections 11120-11131).

The California State Library solicited input from the California Cooperative Library Systems (Systems) on how the changes were perceived and the potential impacts. The State Library held a stakeholder meeting with representatives from the Systems to discuss the language changes and provided advanced opportunities for members of the public and the library community to express their opinion of the perceived impact of the regulatory amendments on the Systems and the public library community.

These discussions did lead to one change within the State Library's original draft language being discarded due to a widespread belief by the library community that it would have an adverse economic impact on the Cooperative Library Systems and public libraries in California, specifically the smaller and more economically disadvantaged library districts. The library community in California saw no economic impacts from the rest of the language changes with a chance of positive programmatic impacts from the clarified requirements.

State Library staff also analyzed past *Plans of Service* and *Annual Reports* for the California Library Cooperative Systems which detail the over-all budgets, what programs are being provided, and how much is being spent on each program. This analysis was done to determine, realistically, how much was being allocated toward

contracts with individual companies and how likely it was that a change in contract would have an adverse impact on the companies involved.

The overall funding for the California Library Services Act is \$3.63 million allocated to the communication, delivery, and resource sharing program. These funds are divided up amongst the nine Cooperative Library Systems (Systems) based on the distances between the libraries in their service area and the populations they serve. The amounts received by the Systems range from around \$150,000 to almost \$820,000. On average 20% of the funds received by a system are used for internal administrative costs.

Most of the Systems use at least some of the money to finance the physical delivery of materials between System member libraries through the use of vans or payment for shipping costs. These delivery amounts can vary from 80% of the overall funding the System receives to 10%. An analysis of the services being provided shows that each System is providing between two and nine separate services based on the size of the System and how much money it receives, including internal library programs like digital labs being shared among the libraries belonging to that System or subscriptions for eBooks for all the libraries in the System.

The services that would require contracting with outside businesses are the provision of eBook collections. These collections are provided by contracting with eBook publishers and providers such as Overdrive, Zinio, and Hoopla. An analysis of the Cooperative Library Systems' reports showed that all of the providers they are contracting with are large, well established companies that provide services to libraries, schools, and other organizations around California and in some cases nation and worldwide. The companies that the Cooperative library systems are working with have enough business to make it unlikely that they are dependent on any of the Cooperative Library Systems contracts to maintain their business. Especially considering the small amount of funding the Cooperative Library Systems actually have available for these contracts based on overall allocations, subtraction of administrative costs, expenditure of funds on physical delivery, and the division of remaining funds over several services and programs.

Based on this information the California State Library determined that, even if expansion of program language in the regulations did lead to changes in the kinds of services libraries were contracting for, it would not have a significant adverse economic impact on businesses in California.



March 22, 2018

Annly Roman  
California Library Services Board  
California State Library  
P.O. Box 942387  
Sacramento, CA 94237

Dear Ms. Roman:

The Southern California Library Cooperative (SCLC) Administrative Council is requesting your acceptance of this letter as public comment to the proposed *Update to Regulations Implementing the Library Services Act; Procedures of the California Library Services Board*.

On behalf of the Administrative Council as the Chair of SCLC, we support the California State Library as well as the California Library Services Board (CLSB) in their consideration and work on updating regulatory California Library Services Act language to align with current trends, as well as consideration of future impacts the language could have on public libraries.

SCLC is interested in two sections and is submitting comments for Article 2, Section 20118. Regular Meetings and Section 20125. Speakers.

**Article 2, Section 20118, Regular Meetings**

The elimination of the language for the CLSB to meet at least bi-monthly and in conjunction with CLA is supported by our Council. There is a concern over the qualified 'at least' that has been included in the 'at least once each year.' In our efforts to work collaboratively with the CLSB, we would respectfully request it be increased to at least twice a year. It is a requirement of the systems to submit a Plan of Service (June) and an Annual Report (September); and the CLSB approves the State Library budget, certifies population figures and much more. The implication of once a year meetings would have a considerable impact on the business of the system. If a library requested to join or withdraw from a system, it would require substantial planning time and a potential delay for the library, especially to participate in the system's programs. Delays in certifying population figures would delay funding to the systems. This could impact program planning for resource sharing and implementing much needed services within the system.

We respectfully request that the CLSB entertain modifying the proposed regulatory language to 'at least twice each year.'

Southern California Library Cooperative  
248 East Foothill Boulevard • Suite 101 • Monrovia, California 91016  
(626) 283-5949 • Fax (626) 283-5949  
Website: <http://www.socallibraries.org> • E-mail: [scchq@socallibraries.org](mailto:scchq@socallibraries.org)



**Article 2, Section 20125. Speakers.**

The proposed change in Subsection (a) states "Members of the public or the State Library staff may be recognized by the President..." We would respectfully request that the CLSB not change the word 'will' to 'may.' The value of public participation can be found in all public libraries' meetings, where public comment is encouraged. We would like the CLSB to also ensure that all comments will be heard. Changing the language could open the possibility to imply bias or blocking of comments. Keeping the word "will" ensures transparency and openness.

We appreciate the consideration of this letter by the State Library staff as well as the CLSB. Should you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at [jryan@santafesprings.org](mailto:jryan@santafesprings.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Joyce Ryan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Joyce Ryan  
Chair/Southern California Library Cooperative

cc: Southern California Library Cooperative Executive Committee



2471 Flores Street, San Mateo, CA 94403  
650-349-5538 Fax: 650-349-5089

[www.northnetlibs.org](http://www.northnetlibs.org)

March 22, 2018

Anne R. Bernardo, President  
California Library Services Board  
California State Library  
P.O. Box 942837  
Sacramento, CA 94237

Dear Ms. Bernardo,

On behalf of the NorthNet Library System (NLS), please accept this letter as public comment to the proposed updates to the Regulations Implementing the Library Services Act, Procedures of the California Library Services Board.

First of all, on behalf of NLS, thank you for all the work that the board has done on behalf of the public libraries here in California. Updating the CLSA regulations will have a welcome impact on allowing libraries to serve their communities better and provide them with resources that those libraries might otherwise struggle to afford. This will help most of the libraries here in northern California.

When reviewing the upcoming changes there are a couple of sections that NLS would like to comment on.

**Article 2, Section 20118, Regular Meetings.**

We understand the need to update the current schedule since bi-monthly is a bit much but would like to express our wish that the CLSB meet at least twice a year. We believe that it is probably the intent of the board to do so but making sure the board meets at least twice will insure the work of the consortiums can move along well. Here at NLS we have sometimes struggled to meet CLSB deadlines due to state time lines and infrequency and alignment of the current CLSB meetings. Once per year minimum would make those deadlines more difficult to meet. This is especially important for us when deciding how to best use CLSA monies to best serve the libraries and communities in NorthNet. In addition, if it is the intent of the board to meet several times per year then the regulations should so state.

**Article 2, Section 20125. Speakers.**

The proposed change in Subsection (a) states “Member of the public or the State Library staff may be recognized by the President...”

Members of the public would include public libraries and their representatives and system coordinators. This is the “public” group which has the most interest in and impact from decisions made by the CLSB. We are uncertain of the intent of changing will to may and there is no explanation for this change.

As mentioned above, the work of the board directly impacts services to California state residents and the libraries that serve them. We appreciate the work of the board in supporting the day-to-day direct service that libraries provide to California communities and believe that input from the field cannot but enhance the discussion and decision-making of the board.

California embraces transparency in its government and welcomes public input. Changing “will” to “may” appears to be a way that such public comment may be blocked. Keeping the word “will” ensures transparency and openness, and ensures compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act.

Thank you for giving NorthNet an opportunity to address our concerns. If you have specific questions or comments, you may email me at: [mightbody@buttecounty.net](mailto:mightbody@buttecounty.net). I do plan on attending the meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Mel Lightbody', written over a printed name.

Mel Lightbody

Mel Lightbody  
Chair, NorthNet Library System  
Butte County Librarian

cc: NLS Executive Committee

March 24, 2018

Ann Bernardo  
California Library Services Board  
California State Library  
P.O. Box 942837  
Sacramento, CA 94237

Dear Ms. Bernardo,

Please accept this letter as public comment to the proposed updates to the Regulations Implementing the Library Services Act, Procedures of the California Library Services Board.

As the President of the Pacific Library Partnership (PLP), I would like to express PLP's appreciation of the efforts which have been undertaken by the California State Library as well as the California Library Services Board (CLSB) to consider updating regulatory California Library Services Act language to reflect current as well as future needs of our public libraries. PLP would like to provide comments on two sections.

Article 2, Section 20118, Regular Meetings.

We agree with the elimination of the language for the CLSB to meet at least bi-monthly. We also appreciate that the qualified 'at least' has been included in the 'at least once each year.' In the spirit of collaboration and ensuring that the business of the libraries is being addressed, we respectfully request that the CLSB consider increasing this to at least twice a year. The CLSB carries out important work, including the approval of the CLSA Plans of Service, the allocation of funds, the certification of population figures, the approval of libraries to move from one system to another, as well as many other important tasks. Although the spirit of the phrase infers that the Board could meet more than once a year, the proposed wording would allow a precedent for the Board to be able to meet just once a year. This would have severe impacts on the ability for libraries to perform their functions. For instance, for libraries wishing to form, or to move from one cooperative library system to another, with the Board currently meeting twice a year, the library must wait for a Board meeting to be scheduled. Should that be potentially reduced to once a year, that library may miss out on CLSA funds for an entire year. Another example is the certification of population. At least one cooperative library system uses these certified numbers to determine the CLSA allocation between member libraries. Delaying certification could cause delays in funds being allocated to libraries. We respectfully request that the CLSB entertain modifying the proposed regulatory language to 'at least twice each year.'

Article 2, Section 20125. Speakers.

The proposed change in Subsection (a) states "Member of the public or the State Library staff may be recognized by the President..." We would respectfully request that the CLSB not change the word 'will' to 'may.' The CLSB Mission Statement includes the following: "Public

**Participation** – We value and ensure public participation in carrying out the intent of the California Library Services Act through locally appointed System Advisory Boards, open public meetings, and involvement of voluntary groups.” The value of public participation can be found in all public libraries’ meetings, where public comment is encouraged. We would like the CLSB to also ensure that all comments will be heard. Changing the language could open the possibility to imply bias or blocking of comments. Keeping the word “will” ensures transparency and openness, and ensures compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act.

We appreciate the consideration of this letter by the State Library staff as well as the CLSB. Should you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at [hmurphy@cityofpleasantonca.gov](mailto:hmurphy@cityofpleasantonca.gov).

Sincerely,



Heidi Murphy  
President, Pacific Library Partnership  
Library Director, Library Services Department, Pleasanton

cc: Pacific Library Partnership Executive Committee



**SCA-3 Local government financing: public libraries: voter approval.** (2017-2018)

SHARE THIS:  

AMENDED IN SENATE MARCH 06, 2017

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2017–2018 REGULAR SESSION

**SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL  
AMENDMENT**

**No. 3**

**Introduced by Senator Dodd**  
**(Coauthors: Senators ~~McGuire Hill~~, ~~McGuire~~, and Wieckowski)**

**January 30, 2017**

A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 1 of Article XIII A thereof, and by amending Section 18 of Article XVI thereof, relating to public libraries.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SCA 3, as amended, Dodd. Local government financing: public libraries: voter approval.

The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions that include a tax rate to service ~~banded~~ *banded* indebtedness incurred by a school district, community college district, or county office of education for school facilities and approved by 55% of the voters of the district or county voting on the proposition at an election.

This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit for a rate imposed by a city, county, city and county, or special district to service *banded* indebtedness incurred to fund public library facilities, that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, city and county, or special district, as ~~applicable~~ *applicable, if the proposition meets specified requirements*.

The California Constitution prohibits specified local government agencies from incurring any indebtedness exceeding in any year the income and revenue provided in that year, without the assent of 2/3 of the voters and subject to other conditions. In the case of a school district, community college district, or county office of education, the California Constitution permits a proposition for the incurrence of indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities, to be adopted upon the approval of 55% of the voters of the district or county, as appropriate, voting on the proposition at an election.

This measure would similarly lower to 55% the voter-approval threshold for a city, county, or city and county to incur bonded indebtedness, exceeding in any year the income and revenue provided in that year, that is in the form of general obligation bonds issued to fund public libraries.

Vote: 2/3 Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: no Local Program: no

Resolved by the Senate, the Assembly concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2017–18 Regular Session commencing on the fifth day of December 2016, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California, that the Constitution of the State be amended as follows:

**First**— That Section 1 of Article XIII A thereof is amended to read:

**SECTION 1.** (a) The maximum amount of any ad valorem tax on real property shall not exceed 1 percent of the full cash value of that property. The 1 percent tax shall be collected by the counties and apportioned according to law to the districts within the counties.

(b) The limitation provided for in subdivision (a) shall not apply to ad valorem taxes or special assessments to pay the interest and redemption charges on any of the following:

(1) Indebtedness approved by the voters prior to July 1, 1978.

(2) Bonded indebtedness for the acquisition or improvement of real property approved on or after July 1, 1978, by two-thirds of the votes cast by the voters voting on the proposition.

(3) Bonded indebtedness incurred by a school district, community college district, or county office of education to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities, approved by 55 percent of the voters of the district or county, as appropriate, voting on the proposition on or after November 8, 2000. This paragraph shall apply only if the proposition approved by the voters and resulting in the bonded indebtedness includes all of the following accountability requirements:

(A) A requirement that the proceeds from the sale of the bonds be used only for the purposes specified in this paragraph and not for any other purpose, including teacher and administrator salaries and other school operating expenses.

(B) A list of the specific school facilities projects to be funded and certification that the school district board, community college board, or county office of education has evaluated safety, class size reduction, and information technology needs in developing that list.

(C) A requirement that the school district board, community college board, or county office of education conduct an annual, independent performance audit to ensure that the funds have been expended only on the specific projects listed.

(D) A requirement that the school district board, community college board, or county office of education conduct an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds until all of those proceeds have been expended for the school facilities projects.

(4) (A) Bonded indebtedness, approved by 55 percent of the voters of a city, county, city and county, or special district, as applicable, voting on the proposition on or after the effective date of the measure adding this paragraph, incurred by the city, county, city and county, or special district to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public library facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of public library facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for public library facilities.

*(B) This paragraph shall apply only if the proposition approved by the voters includes all of the following accountability requirements:*

*(i) A requirement that the proceeds from the sale of the bonds be used only for the purposes specified in this paragraph and not for any other purpose, including personnel and operating expenses of the public library.*

*(ii) A list of the specific public library facilities projects to be funded and certification that the city, county, city and county, or special district has evaluated the degree to which existing public library facilities are inadequate in meeting the needs of, and the degree to which the proposed public library facilities projects respond to the needs of, the residents in the library service area, in the development of that list.*

*(iii) A requirement that the city, county, city and county, or special district conduct an annual, independent performance audit to ensure that the funds have been expended only on the public library facilities projects listed.*

*(iv) A requirement that the city, county, city and county, or special district conduct an annual, independent financial audit of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds until all of those proceeds have been expended for the public library facilities projects.*

*(C) For purposes of this paragraph, "special district" has the same meaning as that term is used in subdivision (c) of Section 1 of Article XIII C, but does not include a redevelopment agency.*

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law or of this Constitution, a school district, community college district, county office of education, city, county, city and county, or special district may levy a 55-percent-vote ad valorem tax pursuant to subdivision (b).

**Second**— That Section 18 of Article XVI thereof is amended to read:

**SEC. 18.** (a) A county, city, town, township, board of education, or school district shall not incur any indebtedness or liability in any manner or for any purpose exceeding in any year the income and revenue provided for that year, without the assent of two-thirds of the voters of the public entity voting at an election to be held for that purpose, except that with respect to any such public entity that is authorized to incur indebtedness for public school purposes, any proposition for the incurrence of indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds for the purpose of repairing, reconstructing, or replacing public school buildings determined, in the manner prescribed by law, to be structurally unsafe for school use, shall be adopted upon the approval of a majority of the voters of the public entity voting on the proposition at that election; nor unless before or at the time of incurring the indebtedness, provision shall be made for the collection of an annual tax sufficient to pay the interest on the indebtedness as it falls due, and to provide for a sinking fund for the payment of the principal thereof, on or before maturity, which shall not exceed forty years from the time of contracting the indebtedness.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), on or after November 8, 2000, in the case of any school district, community college district, or county office of education, any proposition for the incurrence of indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for school facilities, shall be adopted upon the approval of 55 percent of the voters of the district or county, as appropriate, voting on the proposition at an election. This subdivision shall apply only to a proposition for the incurrence of indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds for the purposes specified in this subdivision if the proposition meets all of the accountability requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 1 of Article XIII A.

(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), on or after the effective date of the measure adding this subdivision, in the case of any city, county, or city and county, any proposition to incur indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds shall be adopted by 55 percent of the voters of the city, county, or city and county, as applicable, voting on the proposition at an election, where the general obligation bonds would fund public libraries, including, but not limited to, the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public library facilities, the furnishing and equipping of public library facilities, or the acquisition or lease of real property for public library facilities.

(d) When two or more propositions for incurring any indebtedness or liability are submitted at the same election, the votes cast for and against each proposition shall be counted separately, and when two-thirds or a majority or 55 percent of the voters, as the case may be, voting on any one of those propositions, vote in favor thereof, the proposition shall be deemed adopted.





**AB-2523 Computer science: content standards: digital literacy.** (2017-2018)

SHARE THIS:  

Date Published: 03/23/2018 04:00 AM

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 22, 2018

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2017–2018 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 2523**

**Introduced by Assembly Member Grayson**

**February 14, 2018**

An act *to amend Section 60605.4 of the Education Code*, relating to ~~digital literacy~~, *computer science*.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2523, as amended, Grayson. ~~Digital literacy: public schools.~~ *Computer science: content standards: digital literacy.*

*Existing law requires the Instructional Quality Commission to consider developing and recommending to the State Board of Education, on or before July 31, 2019, computer science content standards for kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, and, in so doing, to consider existing computer science content standards and content standards that include, but are not necessarily limited to, standards for teaching coding.*

*This bill would require the commission to also consider content standards that include standards for teaching digital literacy, as defined, when considering developing and recommending those computer science content standards.*

~~Existing law provides for a system of public schools and requires the adopted course of study for grades 1 to 12, inclusive, to include instruction in specified areas of study.~~

~~This bill would state that it is the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would address digital literacy in public schools and the ability of pupils to use information and communication technologies to find, evaluate, create, and communicate information, requiring both cognitive and technical skills.~~

Vote: majority Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: ~~no~~yes Local Program: no

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

**SECTION 1.** *Section 60605.4 of the Education Code is amended to read:*

**60605.4.** (a) On or before July 31, 2019, the Instructional Quality Commission shall consider developing and recommending to the state board computer science content standards for kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, pursuant to recommendations developed by a group of computer science experts. The Instructional Quality Commission shall consider existing computer science content standards, which include, but are not limited to, the national K-12 computer science content standards developed by the Computer Science Teachers Association, and consider content standards that include, but are not necessarily limited to, standards for teaching ~~coding~~ *coding and digital literacy*. For purposes of this section, "coding" is the process of converting a program design into an accurate and detailed representation of that program in a suitable language. *For purposes of this section, "digital literacy" means the skills associated with using technology to enable users to find, evaluate, organize, create, and communicate information.*

(b) (1) The Superintendent, in consultation with the state board, shall consider convening the group of experts referenced in subdivision (a), and shall ensure that the members of the group include, but are not necessarily limited to, all of the following:

(A) Teachers who teach computer science, including mathematics and science teachers, in kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive.

(B) Schoolsite principals.

(C) School district or county office of education administrators.

(D) University professors.

(E) Representatives of private sector business or industry.

(2) The Superintendent, in consultation with the state board, shall ensure that one-half of the members of the group are teachers as described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1).

(c) The computer science content standards may be used by school districts to develop computer science programs and course assessments but are not mandatory.

(d) The operation of this section is subject to an appropriation being made for purposes of this section in the annual Budget Act or another statute.

~~SECTION 1.(a)The Legislature finds and declares that, according to the American Library Association, a digitally literate person does all of the following:~~

~~(1)Possesses the variety of skills, technical and cognitive, required to find, understand, evaluate, create, and communicate digital information in a wide variety of formats.~~

~~(2)Is able to use diverse technologies appropriately and effectively to retrieve information, interpret results, and judge the quality of that information.~~

~~(3)Understands the relationship between technology, life long learning, personal privacy, and stewardship of information.~~

~~(4)Uses these skills and the appropriate technology to communicate and collaborate with peers, colleagues, family, and on occasion, the general public.~~

~~(5)Uses these skills to actively participate in civic society and contribute to a vibrant, informed, and engaged community.~~

~~(b)It is therefore the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would address digital literacy in public schools and the ability of pupils to use information and communication technologies to find, evaluate, create, and communicate information, requiring both cognitive and technical skills.~~



**SB-830 Pupil instruction: media literacy: model curriculum.** (2017-2018)

SHARE THIS:  

Date Published: 03/21/2018 09:00 PM

AMENDED IN SENATE MARCH 21, 2018

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2017–2018 REGULAR SESSION

**SENATE BILL**

**No. 830**

**Introduced by Senator Dodd**  
**(Principal coauthor: Senator Jackson)**  
**(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Mullin)**  
**(Coauthors: Senators Bradford and Leyva)**  
**(Coauthor: Assembly Member Voepel)**

**January 03, 2018**

An act to add Section 51206.4 to the Education Code, relating to pupil instruction.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 830, as amended, Dodd. Pupil instruction: media literacy: model curriculum.

Existing law requires the adopted course of study for grades 1 to 6, inclusive, and for grades 7 to 12, inclusive, to offer courses in specified areas of study, including social sciences. Existing law establishes the Instructional Quality Commission and requires the commission to, among other things, recommend curriculum frameworks to the State Board of Education.

This bill would require the commission to develop, and the state board to adopt, reject, or modify, a model curriculum in media literacy for kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, for voluntary use by educators. The bill would require the commission to submit the model curriculum to the state board on or before January 1, ~~2020~~, 2023, and would require the state board to adopt, reject, or modify the model curriculum on or before March 31, ~~2020~~, 2023, in accordance with specified procedural requirements. The bill would require the State Department of Education to make available on its Internet Web site a list of resources and instructional materials on media literacy, including media literacy professional development programs for teachers.

Vote: majority Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: yes Local Program: no

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

**SECTION 1.** (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) The social implications of technological development are pervasive, and the reach and influence of digital media platforms will continue to expand.

(2) Nearly two-thirds of American adults use social networking sites, and social media usage is ubiquitous among the youngest adults, with over 90 percent of young adults using social media.

(3) Two out of every three adults say fabricated news stories cause a great deal of confusion about the basic facts of current issues and events.

(4) A recent Stanford University study showed that 82 percent of middle school pupils struggled to distinguish advertisements from news stories.

(5) During the final, critical months of the 2016 presidential campaign, 20 top-performing false election stories from hoax [Internet](#) Web sites and hyperpartisan blogs generated 8,711,000 shares, reactions, and comments on social media; where, within the same time period, the 20 best-performing election stories from 19 major news Internet Web sites generated a total of 7,367,000 shares, reactions, and comments on Facebook.

(6) It is necessary to confront questions about the moral obligations and ethical standards regarding what appears on social media networks and digital platforms.

(7) Access to media literacy education for all pupils is a challenge, especially for underrepresented and economically disadvantaged communities.

(b) It is therefore the intent of the Legislature to ensure that young adults are prepared with media literacy skills necessary to safely, responsibly, and critically consume and use social media and other forms of media.

**SEC. 2.** Section 51206.4 is added to the Education Code, to read:

**51206.4.** (a) For purposes of this section, "digital citizenship" and "media literacy" are broad terms that encompass consumption and use of media and digital products and are defined as follows:

(1) "Digital citizenship" means a diverse set of skills related to current technology and social media, including the norms of appropriate, responsible, and healthy behavior.

(2) "Media literacy" means the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and use media and encompasses the foundational skills that lead to digital citizenship.

(b) The Instructional Quality Commission shall develop, and the state board shall adopt, reject, or modify, a model curriculum in media literacy for kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, for voluntary use by educators.

(c) The model curriculum in media literacy shall be designed for the purpose of providing instruction in the safe and responsible use of media and supporting pupils' use of critical thinking skills when consuming media. The model curriculum in media literacy shall address, but not be limited to, instructing pupils in how to do all of the following:

(1) Safely and responsibly use and consume media.

(2) Access relevant and accurate information through media.

(3) Analyze media content in a critical way.

(4) Evaluate the comprehensiveness, currency, relevance, credibility, authority, and accuracy of media content.

(d) The model curriculum in media literacy may be designed to promote the development of pupils' skills in all of the following:

(1) Creativity and innovation.

(2) Communication and collaboration.

(3) Research and information fluency.

(4) Critical thinking and problem solving.

(5) Digital citizenship.

(6) Technology operations and concepts.

(7) Information, media, and technological literacy.

(8) Concepts of media representation and stereotyping.

(e) The model curriculum in media literacy shall do both of the following:

(1) Provide model lessons and activities for each grade level and identify supporting instructional materials for use in its implementation.

(2) Identify the ways in which it aligns with, and is supportive of, the common core academic content standards and the Next Generation Science standards.

(f) In developing the model curriculum in media literacy, the Instructional Quality Commission shall convene an advisory group comprised of experts in media literacy education. A majority of this group shall be current public school elementary or secondary classroom teachers who have a professional teaching credential that is valid under state law and who have experience or expertise in media literacy education.

(g) The Instructional Quality Commission shall hold a minimum of two public hearings for the public to provide input on the model curriculum in media literacy in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Article 9 (commencing with Section 11120) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code).

(h) On or before January 1, ~~2020~~, 2023, the Instructional Quality Commission shall submit to the state board the model curriculum in media literacy.

(i) On or before March 31, ~~2020~~, 2023, the state board shall adopt, reject, or modify the model curriculum in media literacy submitted by the Instructional Quality Commission at a subsequent public meeting.

(j) If the state board modifies the model curriculum in media literacy submitted by the Instructional Quality Commission, the state board shall do both of the following:

(1) Explain, in writing, the reasons for the modifications to the Governor and the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature.

(2) Provide written reasons for its revisions in a meeting conducted pursuant to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (Article 9 (commencing with Section 11120) of Chapter 1 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code). The state board shall not adopt the model curriculum in media literacy at the same meeting in which it provides its written reasons but shall adopt the revisions at a subsequent meeting conducted no later than July 31, ~~2020~~, 2023.

(k) If the state board rejects the model curriculum in media literacy, the state board shall transmit to the Superintendent, the Governor, and the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature a specific written explanation of the reasons for the rejection of the model curriculum in media literacy.

(l) Following the adoption of the model curriculum in media literacy, the Superintendent shall post the curriculum on its Internet Web site for voluntary use by educators.

(m) On or before July 1, 2019, the department shall make available to school districts on its Internet Web site a list of resources and instructional materials on media literacy, including media literacy professional development programs for teachers.

(n) Following the adoption of the model curriculum in media literacy, the department's Internet Web site shall have a mechanism accessible to school districts and teachers to provide feedback on the model curriculum in media literacy.

(o) Private resources may be used as funding sources to supplement the development of a model curriculum in media literacy.



**SB-947 Pupil instruction: digital citizenship and media literacy.** (2017-2018)

SHARE THIS:  

Date Published: 01/30/2018 09:00 PM

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE— 2017–2018 REGULAR SESSION

**SENATE BILL**

**No. 947**

**Introduced by Senator Jackson  
(Principal coauthor: Senator Dodd)**

**January 30, 2018**

An act to add Section 51206.5 to the Education Code, relating to pupil instruction.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 947, as introduced, Jackson. Pupil instruction: digital citizenship and media literacy.

Existing law provides for a system of public schools and requires the adopted course of study for grades 1 to 12, inclusive, to include instruction in specified areas of study.

This bill would require, on or before December 1, 2019, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the executive director of the State Board of Education, to identify best practices and recommendations for instruction in digital citizenship, Internet safety, and media literacy and to report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature on strategies to implement the best practices and recommendations statewide. The bill would require the Superintendent to convene and consult with an advisory committee consisting of specified representatives in developing the best practices and recommendations.

Vote: majority Appropriation: no Fiscal Committee: yes Local Program: no

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

**SECTION 1.** (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

- (1) Media and technology have become pervasive in all areas of our lives.
- (2) In our classrooms, pupils must learn how to safely, ethically, responsibly, and effectively use media and technology resources.
- (3) Kids have never had as much access to the Internet, media, and mobile technologies at home and school as they do today.

(4) Schools can play a critical role by educating, empowering, and engaging children with the best practices around technology use.

(5) While media and technology have great promise for learning, young people need support and education to learn how to make sound judgments when navigating the digital world.

(6) School administrators and educators are now faced with new and, at times, overwhelming challenges, such as those related to privacy, digital footprints, cyberbullying, and sexting.

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature to provide a process by which pupils, parents, guardians, teachers, teacher librarians, other school employees, school administrators, and community representatives will engage in an ongoing discussion on safe media and technology use, with the goal of establishing digital citizenship and media literacy as part of the state's basic educational goals and essential academic learning requirements.

**SEC. 2.** Section 51206.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:

**51206.5.** (a) (1) For purposes of this section, "digital citizenship" and "media literacy" are broad terms that encompass consumption and production of media and digital products and are defined as follows:

(A) "Digital citizenship" means a diverse set of skills related to current technology and social media, including the norms of appropriate, responsible, and healthy behavior. Major areas include safety concerns such as cyberbullying prevention.

(B) "Media literacy" means the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, develop, produce, and interpret media and encompasses the foundational skills that lead to digital citizenship.

(2) The Legislature finds and declares that digital citizenship and media literacy education provide digital technology skills essential for success in the 21st century.

(b) (1) On or before December 1, 2019, the Superintendent, in consultation with the executive director of the state board, shall identify best practices and recommendations for instruction in digital citizenship, Internet safety, and media literacy and shall report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature on strategies to implement the best practices and recommendations statewide.

(2) The best practices and recommendations shall be developed in consultation with the advisory committee specified in subdivision (c).

(3) The best practices and recommendations shall include instruction that provides guidance about thoughtful, safe, and strategic uses of online and other media resources and education on how to apply critical thinking skills when consuming and producing media in any form.

(4) The requirement for submitting a report imposed pursuant to this subdivision is inoperative on December 1, 2023, pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code.

(c) The Superintendent shall convene and consult with an advisory committee when developing best practices and recommendations for instruction in digital citizenship, Internet safety, and media literacy. The advisory committee shall be comprised of a majority of certificated teacher librarians and current certificated classroom teachers with experience teaching media literacy and shall include representatives from all of the following:

(1) California County Superintendents Educational Services Association.

(2) California School Boards Association.

(3) Experts in digital citizenship, Internet safety, and media literacy.

(4) Other stakeholders, including pupils, certificated teacher librarians, parent organizations, diverse current classroom teachers, and school administrators.

(d) The recommendations of the advisory committee may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Revisions to the state learning standards and the state educational technology plan.

(2) Model policies and procedures on digital citizenship, Internet safety, and media literacy developed by the School Superintendents Association.

(3) School district processes necessary to develop customized school district policies and procedures on electronic resources and Internet safety that can be used within a school district technology plan.

(4) Best practices, resources, and models for instruction in digital citizenship, Internet safety, and media literacy.

(5) Best practices, resources, and models for instruction that are compliant with the federal Universal Service E-rate program administered by the Schools and Libraries Division of the Universal Service Administrative Company and federal mandates established in the federal Children's Internet Protection Act (Public Law 106-554).

(6) Strategies that will support school districts in local implementation of the best practices and recommendations developed by the department, including strategies for delivering professional development to educators and school administrators.