

1 Approved June 25, 2020

2 **California Library Services Board Meeting**
3 **February 4, 2020**

4 Stanley Mosk Library and Courts Building
5 914 Capitol Mall, Room 218
6 Sacramento, CA 95814

7 **BOARD OPENING**

8 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board meeting to
9 order on February 4, 2020 at 1:02 pm.

10 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh
11 Maghsoudi, Adriana Martinez, Elizabeth Murguia, Maria Senour, and Connie
12 Williams.

13 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Lena Pham,
14 Monica Rivas, Annly Roman, and Rebecca Wendt.

15 **Adoption of Agenda**

16 *It was moved, seconded (Senour/Ibanez) and carried*
17 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the*
18 *agenda for the February 4, 2020 meeting.*

19 **Approval of September 2019 Meeting Minutes**

20 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Ibanez) and carried*
21 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves*
22 *the draft minutes, of the September 17, 2019 California Library*
23 *Services Board Meeting.*

24 **Board Meeting for Fall 2020**

25 Annly Roman reported that the Board had already selected April 2, 2020 as the
26 date for their spring 2020 meeting but wanted to have further discussion on
27 coordinating the fall meeting with the California Library Association's annual
28 conference at the end of October 2020. Multiple Board members expressed
29 support for this option.

1 Monica Rivas brought up that if the Board met that late in the year it could
2 impact the Systems' checks. Rivas stated that the Systems normally received two
3 checks, one after the fall meeting and one later in the fiscal year. Since board
4 meetings had been held later in the last few years so the first check had been
5 going out later. The Systems had expressed that it was a hardship because they
6 had to cover costs from the beginning of the fiscal year in July until they receive
7 the first check. Rivas said those payments would be even later if the Board held
8 their meeting in late October unless the Board released the first payment before
9 they met in fall. This would mean the State Library would release funds before the
10 Board had seen and approved the Plans of Service.

11 Carol Frost brought up that the Board had discussed the payment release issue
12 at the September 2019 meeting. She felt that there had been a consensus from
13 the Board that the payments to the systems should not be held because the
14 systems would be left paying for annual services without those funds. Frost stated
15 that it was her understanding that this would be discussed at the April meeting
16 and at the very least half of the allocation would be distributed to them sooner
17 to pay bills as soon as possible after the budget was approved.

18 Annly Roman clarified that the Board would have to make a motion to that
19 effect. Roman stated that this was on the agenda for the April meeting. Monica
20 Rivas stated that she wanted to bring up the potential effects of a late meeting
21 since the Board had not come to a final decision on the check distribution issue.

22 President Bernardo state that issue could be discussed at the spring meeting
23 but this information gave them a good idea of potential considerations
24 surrounding the timing of the fall meeting. Member Williams stated that waiting
25 until the spring meeting would also give them time to talk to the California Library
26 Association to see how they felt about the Board meeting in coordination with
27 their conference. Roman stated it would also allow time for a poll of the Board to
28 make sure that they could get a quorum.

1 Annly Roman stated that she would check with the California Library
2 Association for feedback and send a poll to the Board.

3 **Nomination of Board Vice President**

4 Annly Roman stated that Gary Christmas was elected Vice President for 2020-
5 2021 at the September 2019 meeting. However, he had decided not to seek
6 reappointment so the Board no longer had a Vice President.

7 Florante Ibanez stated that he would be willing to serve as Vice President.
8 There were no other nominations from the floor.

9 *It was moved, seconded (Murguia/Maghsoudi) and carried*
10 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects*
11 *Florante Ibanez as Vice-President of the California Library Services*
12 *Board for the years 2020-2021*

13 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

14 **Board President's Report**

15 President Bernardo reported that she had been busy with the Council of
16 California County Law Librarians. She had attended meetings and participated
17 in their legislative activities. She was also able to attend a few more webinars and
18 trainings and still participated in Calix and other professional listservs.

19 The Tulare County Public Law Library had been continuing its work on the
20 library refresh for their lawyers in the library program and training workshop area.

21 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

22 State Librarian Lucas reported that since the last Board meeting the Governor
23 introduced his budget for the fiscal year starting July 1, 2020. It included \$1 million
24 in one-time funding for Zip Books and \$1 million in one-time funding for Lunch at
25 the Library. Part of the reason the Department of Finance recognized the value
26 of Zip Books was the ability to deliver services at a lower cost. With Lunch at the
27 Library, the lunches were federally funded, so the more people in California that
28 received lunches, the more funding the federal government sent California.

29 Lucas stated the proposed budget also contained an additional \$170,000 that
30 related primarily to broadband. There was a Public Utilities Commission ruling that

1 would have cost libraries more in participation fees for broadband. The State
2 Library turned in a budget request to have the state cover that amount so there
3 would be no additional cost to libraries. The most significant change from the
4 previous fiscal year was \$2.5 million for additional online content for California's
5 6.2 million public school kids. As part of the K-12 Online Content Project, the State
6 Library helped provide access to three suites of content Britannica,
7 Teachingbooks.net, and ProQuest. The Governor stated that he wanted to
8 provide more STEM and STEAM information. The additional funding was to provide
9 resources that allowed deeper subject matter dives for kids than the Britannica
10 and ProQuest offerings.

11 Member Murguia asked who had put in the \$2.5 million for schools. Lucas
12 stated that it added to the annual amount used to pay for these online databases
13 and subscriptions. It would go from \$3 million in annual funding to \$5.5 million.
14 Lucas stated that each year the amount of money that went out the door to
15 content providers increased somewhere between three and five percent
16 because of annual increases database creators built into their budgets. Lucas
17 stated that if the annual funding amount didn't increase at some point it would
18 be insufficient to maintain current service levels but it was not urgent.

19 Vice President Ibanez asked if there would be the ability to get an increase to
20 maintain service. State Librarian Lucas stated that when the program began it
21 started in the middle of a fiscal year. In the first fiscal year only half the money was
22 spent, so there was a cushion. Each year that cushion got eaten into a little bit by
23 the on-going cost increase. Since the State Library was aware of the situation we
24 would submit something at least two years in advance of when the situation
25 became dire to make sure it got taken care of.

26 Lucas stated that the funding was first made available in 2017 and the online
27 content was made available to school kids at the beginning of the 2018-2019
28 school year. Within a year it was accessible to 84% of public school children. The
29 remaining 16%, just like the libraries that still needed to be connected to faster

1 broadband, were the more difficult ones to reach. Member Martinez asked if they
2 had seen a growth in usage from one year to the next. Lucas replied that the
3 resources had only been in schools for one year so the State Library would have
4 a better idea of the growth after the current year. Based on the first six months of
5 usage in the last school year versus the first six months of usage in this school year
6 there had been an increase.

7 State Librarian Lucas stated that we did need to do more outreach to make
8 sure that people were taking advantage of the resources that were available.

9 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

10 President Bernardo stated that the Board had sent a letter to the Governor's
11 office in November showing what \$14 million more could do for libraries. Annly
12 Roman stated that the letter mirrored the letter that the Board had sent in the
13 2019-2020 fiscal year and reiterated the Board's priorities. Bernardo stated that it
14 was to let the Governor and his people know to keep libraries in mind as they
15 developed the budget.

16 Carol Frost reported that this year, she was the co-Chair of the California
17 Library Association's Advocacy and Legislative Committee. This year, the
18 committee had written general legislative priorities so that they could be more
19 nimble when responded to requests from legislators. Frost stated that the priorities
20 were broken down into general categories CLA supported including infrastructure
21 needs of California libraries, and equitable access. Then statewide initiatives like
22 adult family literacy education, and career support like Career Online High
23 School. They also supported general ideas like intellectual freedom, and privacy.

24 The California Library Association lobbyists had been approached by two
25 legislators. Senator Tom Umberg from the 34th district wanted to do legislation
26 around a free library card for all students. His office heard about the Student
27 Success Initiative, which was a statewide grant program dealing with providing
28 library cards to student, as well as a program the Nashville Public Library was doing
29 offering all students library cards. The Dillons and the Committee thought a good

1 approach would be to ask for a line item in the budget to support collaboration
2 between schools and libraries. So the committee was just watching for right now.

3 Assemblymember Bob Rivas, District 30, approached the lobbyists about doing
4 a library construction bond in the near future. There was a long history around
5 advocacy for bonds for library construction. The last few bond measures had not
6 even made it through the legislative process. Library construction funding was an
7 ongoing need for libraries but there had not been enough support. CLA had
8 decided to spend this year looking at what would be needed to support a bond
9 measure. There had been an informal needs assessment done in 2015. California
10 Library Association was thinking about doing something more formalized to really
11 understand the need. They also looked at a two pronged approach, whether it
12 would be a bigger bond or something smaller and more focused. For example,
13 libraries could focus on making libraries green or emergency readiness
14 renovations like generators in case of power outages.

15 Frost stated that those discussions were both still in preliminary stages but those
16 were issues that the California Library Association had been working on. She knew
17 that both legislators had also spoke with State Librarian Lucas.

18 Member Williams stated that in speaking to the California School Librarians
19 Association there were two main concerns this year. One was a budget allocation
20 to update the school model library standards which were created about ten
21 years ago. They provided vision for strong school library programs in California by
22 identify the skills and knowledge essential for students to be information literate.
23 Since the Standards were written ten years ago there were electronic concerns
24 that had arisen and CSLA would like to amend the Model Library Standards to
25 reflect those changes. A budget allocation for the re-writing of those standards
26 was being requested.

27 The other request related to an audit made in 2016 which determined that
28 there were statewide issues surrounding violations of California code of

1 regulations, Title five on teacher credentialing, concerning the number of teacher
2 librarians available to students and teachers in various school districts.

3 Between the February meeting and when the Board met with legislators she
4 would be working with CSLA to create talking points for the Model Library
5 Standards as well as working to hone in on what could be done legislatively to
6 nudge districts forward to get teacher librarians into schools. There were horrible
7 inequities across the state.

8 State Librarian Lucas clarified that updating the Model School Library
9 Standards was something that had been asked for before. He stated that he
10 recalled there being a couple of estimates for how much of a budget allocation
11 was necessary. Member Williams stated that she did not have the numbers on
12 that but it was not put in the last budget. The previous standards had been
13 approved by the Department of Education and provided the scaffolding for
14 school districts and teachers to understand what children needed to know to be
15 digitally literate.

16 President Bernardo asked if the Department of Education was requesting a
17 budget item for the Model Standards. She stated it sounded like the Board would
18 not know exactly what they were supporting if they supported those requests.
19 Member Williams stated that was correct but what she was bringing forward was
20 that those were the two areas of concern for CSLA and were areas they would
21 like presented to legislators.

22 President Bernardo clarified that the second item dealing with lack of equity
23 sounded like an enforcement issue. Williams stated that was the bottom line,
24 requirements were not being enforced. There also needed to be some
25 clarification because state code for teacher librarians was vague. The audit
26 identified several areas to work on, but given local control it was difficult to define
27 a remedy.

28 Member Martinez stated that in the letter the Board sent to the Governor they
29 had seven potential budget items that they outlined. She asked if they would add

1 the two items Member Williams brought forward to that list. She thought that the
2 Board should prioritize down to three or five items that they thought were the most
3 important for the lobbying effort in April. Martinez asked if the Board thought they
4 wanted to have a list of seven or potentially eight items.

5 Member Murguia asked Member Williams if the CSLA request would go
6 through the Department of Education. Williams stated that was correct. However
7 at previous legislator meetings the Board had passed along information from the
8 school libraries as well since school libraries were represented on the Board.
9 Murguia stated that she was supportive of ancillary programs which enhanced
10 the library experience and learning, but stated she would not want to include
11 those requests with funds that came directly to the State Library.

12 President Bernardo stated that they had taken action on programs outside the
13 Board's particular funding interest. She felt the Board could take-up those items
14 at the April meeting but that the Board should focus on how it wanted to affect
15 budget dollars that could come through its hands.

16 Bernardo felt that there were a lot of success stories from the one-time grant
17 programs created when the Governor gave them \$3 million. She asked if those
18 projects were things the Board would want to continue. The letter that the Board
19 sent also contained some bigger projects like literacy and tutoring. President
20 Bernardo asked how, as a board, they wanted to tailor their legislative visits in
21 April.

22 Member Murguia asked if the California Library Association or the State Library
23 knew how much the line item amount for the Student Success Card bill would be.
24 State Librarian Lucas stated that he did not think that the Senator was proposing
25 a line item. His understanding was that was what CLA was suggesting in lieu of a
26 bill. Lucas stated that he was asked by the Senator's staff to provide information
27 on programs in California to put library cards into the hands of school children.
28 The State Library created a memo that cited the Student Success Card program,
29 and some of the efforts that LA Unified and the LA Public Library did together. That

1 information was provided to Senator Umberg's office. There was nothing in the
2 State Librarian's conversations with the Senator that suggested he was going to
3 request a budget item.

4 Carol Frost stated that it was too early to know how everything was going to
5 play out. She thought that the California Library Associations was watching and
6 would support a line item if that was the recommendation. Frost also clarified that
7 she was getting the information second hand and was not sitting at the table.

8 Member Williams stated she had discovered in propositions pushing school
9 districts to do this, they did not have the infrastructure available to handle privacy
10 concerns and other related economic aspects. Williams stated that she thought
11 any budget conversation would have to include the California Department of
12 Education and the California School Librarians Association to coordinate from
13 that end.

14 Member Martinez stated that she would suggest focusing on programs like Zip
15 Books that had demonstrated success and a clear sense of what the budget
16 request would be. She thought they should start with those items rather than new
17 programs. The idea was to start with programs that had a track record and a
18 certain level of success.

19 Member Martinez asked if the Board's ongoing requests for \$3 million for
20 literacy programs and \$4 million to provide online and phone based tutoring
21 would go through the Department of Education. State Librarian Lucas stated that
22 there was a library literacy program that the State Library administered which
23 received \$7.3 million in on-going funding. The \$4 million program was something
24 the Board had recommended but did not currently exist. There were several
25 companies that provided online or over the phone tutoring services in English and
26 Spanish from 10:00am until 10:00pm that could do a statewide contract so that
27 every kid had access for something under \$4 million. BrainFuse was one of the
28 companies and Tutor.com was another. Lucas stated that some libraries had
29 these programs independently however, all the individual contacts in the state

1 added up to more than it would cost for a single statewide contact for everyone.
2 Member Martinez stated that it sounded like the item with the highest cost was
3 the one without a proven track record. State Librarian Lucas stated that it was not
4 a statewide program but was used in a number of localities around the state.

5 Member Murguia stated that, from her understanding, three of the Board's
6 budget request were in the Governor's introduced budget. The \$1.5 million that
7 Board requested to improve technology and the \$1 million to build partnerships
8 were not. Murguia stated that she thought the Board should continue to
9 advocate for those and try to develop a strategy to get those requests in the May
10 revision.

11 State Librarian stated that the date that the Department of Finance indicated
12 for State agencies to turn in everything for consideration in the May revision was
13 Friday, February 7th, however they might have considered extending until
14 Valentine's Day. Member Murguia asked if the Board should direct State Librarian
15 Lucas to follow-up on their letter and make the case for the funding.

16 Martinez stated that regarding asking for \$3 million for literacy and \$4 million
17 for tutoring, she was not sure how comfortable she felt since those programs did
18 not necessarily have a strong track record. She felt that in April the Board should
19 focus on asking for funding for technology improvements, Innovation Labs, online
20 databases for school kids, Lunch at the Library, and Zip Books.

21 State Librarian Lucas stated that of those priorities online databases, Lunch at
22 the Library and Zip Books were already in the Governor's budget. He advised
23 starting by thanking the Governor for including those very important investments
24 then proposing funding the other programs they knew had an impact on local
25 communities and made fiscal sense because they were one-time. Both the
26 technology grant and the Innovation Lab programs had a high number of
27 applications and there were still people who were eager to participate after the
28 money went out the door.

1 President Bernardo stated that she thought Member Martinez's suggestions
2 about focusing their requests in April were very thoughtful. Member Murguia
3 clarified that the Board was considering a letter to the Governor thanking him for
4 the items he included in the budget and asking him to include technology grant
5 and Innovation Lab support in the May revision. The Board was also considering
6 coordinating that letter with their legislator meetings in April. Bernardo confirmed
7 that was what they were discussing.

8 Member Williams stated that she thought the Board should continue to
9 advocate for all seven items in their original letter. She felt that programs were
10 useful for libraries across the state.. Vice-President Ibanez agreed and stated he
11 thought it was important that the Board be consistent.

12 President Bernardo state that it should be easy to demonstrate success to
13 legislators on most of the programs but the Board would need the State Library to
14 generate information to support the \$4 million in on-going funding for the tutoring
15 program. Member Williams asked State Librarian Lucas if the State Library had
16 concrete data on the tutoring programs. Lucas stated that there was information
17 out there, the State Library just had not pulled it all together in one place. Lucas
18 stated that the State Library could gather the information but clarified it would
19 probably be anecdotal rather than evidentiary, although there should be some
20 usage numbers. Lucas stated that he remembered the Board's discussion around
21 that funding was that it would be a universal safety net for kids.

22 President Bernardo asked if the Board was in agreement that they would
23 continue to support the three items that the Governor had included in his
24 introduced budget and support an additional budget ask, both in a letter and
25 when visiting legislators in April, of \$1.5 million in one-time funding for new
26 technology, \$1 million in one-time funding for Innovation Labs, \$3 million increase
27 in literacy services funding, and \$4 million in on-going funding for online and
28 phone tutoring. Multiple Board members expressed support.

1 Member Williams asked if State Librarian Lucas could talk to the California
2 School Librarians Association about talking points to take with them related to the
3 School Librarians' requests. Lucas stated that he would be happy to do that.

4 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

5 Annly Roman brought up that the California State Library Human Resources
6 Department had asked her to make the Board members aware that some of
7 them might start getting emails from the FPPC on renewing their ethics training.
8 President Bernardo stated that as a reminder everyone's Form 700 was due April
9 1st.

10 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

11 There were not comments from Board members.

12 **OLD BUSINESS**

13 There was no old business brought forward.

14 **AGENDA BUILDING**

15 Annly Roman brought up that the Board had discussed having members do
16 presentations on the group they were appointed to represent and why it was
17 important. Member Buenafe had indicated that she would like to do a
18 presentation but she was no longer on the Board. Members Williams and Ibanez
19 had indicated that they would be willing to do presentations. Roman asked if
20 anyone was interested in presenting at the spring meeting. Member Williams
21 volunteered.

22 **ADJOURNMENT**

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