

1 **Approved April 8, 2016**

2  
3 California Library Services Board Meeting  
4 September 3, 2015

5  
6 California State Library  
7 900 N Street, Room 501  
8 Sacramento, CA  
9

10 **Welcome and Introductions**

11 President Maghsoudi called the California Library Services Board meeting to order on  
12 September 3, 2015 at 2:08 p.m. She asked those attending to introduce themselves.

13 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Alita Huguenin, Florante Ibanez,  
14 Penny Kastanis, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Gregory McGinity, Peter Mindnich, Eric Schockman, and  
15 Connie Williams.

16 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Deputy State Librarian Gerald  
17 Maginnity, Janet Coles, Wendy Hopkins, Cindy Mediavilla, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, and Annly  
18 Roman.

19  
20 **Adoption of Agenda**

21 *It was moved, seconded (Huguenin/Schockman) and carried unanimously that the*  
22 *California Library Services Board adopts the agenda of the September 3, 2015*  
23 *meeting as presented.*

24  
25 **Approval of Minutes**

26 Member Schockman brought up that the Minutes needed one change. On page six, line eleven,  
27 the tenth word should have been "states" not "state."

28 *It was moved, seconded (Bernardo/Ibanez) and carried by a vote of 8 ayes and 2*  
29 *abstentions (Christmas/Mindnich) that the California Library Services Board*  
30 *approves the draft minutes of the April 28, 2015 meeting as corrected.*

31  
32 **Board Resolutions**

33 *It was moved, seconded (McGinity/Christmas) and carried unanimously that the*  
34 *California Library Services Board waives the reading of CLSB resolution 2015-01*  
35 *for Sandy Habbestad.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

Member Bernardo brought up that there was a typo in the resolution. In the third paragraph, first sentence, the fifteenth word should have been “principal” not “principle.”

***It was moved, seconded (Williams/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts CLSB resolution 2015-01 for Sandy Habbestad as corrected (See Attachment A).***

**Election of Board Officers for 2016**

The Nominating Committee, Members Schockman and Williams, gave an overview of the behind-the-scenes work they had done over the last few months. Member Schockman stated the committee used a process set up by Sandy Habbestad that involved polling the Board on their preference for President and Vice-President. Based on the polling, the Nominating Committee put forward Anne Bernardo as the nominee for President and Paymaneh Maghsoudi as the nominee for Vice-President.

President Maghsoudi announced that the Board would also consider nominations from the floor. No additional nominations were made.

***It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Williams) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Anne Bernardo as President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2016.***

***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Williams) and carried unanimously that the California Library Services Board elects Paymaneh Maghsoudi as Vice-President of the California Library Services Board for the year 2016.***

**Board Meeting Schedule for 2016**

President Maghsoudi brought up that some of the Board members were interested in more in-person meetings. Members Williams, Ibanez, Christmas, and Kastanis all agreed that it took longer to handle the Board’s business over the phone so they would prefer meeting in-person.

Member McGinity felt that one in-person meeting and one phone meeting was sufficient given the Board’s work load. He stated that if the Legislature gave the Board more resources or flexibility, then it would make sense to have more in-person meetings.

Library staff had recommended that the April 2016 meeting be a phone meeting and the September 2016 meeting be in-person. Member McGinity asked why this was as the April 2015

1 meeting had been in-person. Annly Roman responded that in April 2015 the Board had handled  
2 the LSTA advisory portion of their duties. Prior to April 2015 the LSTA advisory session had been  
3 held in the fall. Staff had suggested having the fall 2016 Board meeting in-person because that  
4 meeting would typically be the longer of the two.

5 Member Christmas commented that part of the reason for having the April 2015 meeting in  
6 person was for Board members to meet with their legislators. He was wondering if that had  
7 happened and, if so, how it went. Several members expressed that they felt in-person meetings  
8 with legislators/staff were helpful and face-to-face meetings in April and September to meet with  
9 legislators was suggested. Member Bernardo brought up that, although she would prefer in-  
10 person meetings for both meetings, the benefit to an in-person April meeting was that the  
11 legislature would be in the middle of the legislative session, whereas September is at the end.  
12 She felt that the Board had been able to handle the LSTA component sufficiently at the April 2015  
13 meeting and still get a feel for where the grants were going and how they were being handled.

14 Members Williams and Ibanez felt that it could be productive for Board members to go in one  
15 group, have pre-set up appointments, and target legislators with specific issues. It was asked if  
16 the State Library could put together a list of relevant issues for the Board members. Member  
17 Huguenin suggested having taking points on particular issues that they could leave with the  
18 legislators so that staff can be made aware of the issues and messaging would be consistent.

19 Member Williams asked if in January or February the State Library could discuss what the  
20 potential issues might be and put together a packet for them. Annly Roman stated that the  
21 legislature would reconvene in the beginning of January but would not finish introducing bills  
22 until almost the end of February. Many of those bills would be spot bills, which would not be  
23 amended into their final form until almost the end of March. Annly Roman stated that there  
24 might be issues on the table from the 2015 session but it would be difficult to tell what the new  
25 issues would be until at least March. Connie said that made sense.

26 It was determined that Annly Roman would create information pieces on relevant legislative  
27 issues for the Board to take to the legislator meetings and that she would petition the Board  
28 members for any issues they would like incorporated into the materials.

1 Annly Roman summarized that the Board wanted to meet in person, in Sacramento, in early to  
2 mid-April, and that they wanted to come up a day early to meet with legislators. Additionally, the  
3 Board wanted the State Library to schedule legislator meetings on their behalf and provide them  
4 with issues and information that could be left with legislators. Annly Roman said that she would  
5 put forward a Doodle poll with date options for the Board to indicate when they are free.

6 Barbara Howison, Riverside County Library System, commented that she thought it was great  
7 to have an opportunity to sit-in and listen to the discussion. She requested that the meeting in  
8 Sacramento have a call-in line so that those located in Southern California could participate. State  
9 Library staff replied that it was possible to establish call-in sites in Southern California where  
10 people could listen to the meeting but that any call-in locations would have to be open to the  
11 public for participation and noticed on the Agenda. Member Christmas stated that he thought it  
12 would be useful to establish sites in Southern California and other areas around the state. State  
13 Librarian Lucas agreed to accommodate those sites.

14

15 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

16 **Board President's Report**

17 President Maghsoudi reported that she continued to attend the California Library Association's  
18 legislative meetings on a regular basis and she attended ALA. Additionally, the Whittier Public  
19 Library hosted an event for the Library Foundation at which Greg Lucas was the Keynote Speaker.

20

21 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

22 State Librarian Lucas reported an additional \$2 million to the Literacy program that the state  
23 library helps administrate through local public libraries. He stated that he had just signed letters  
24 adding five more libraries to the program, partially because of the additional revenue. The funds  
25 would help with the backlog of people who want to learn to read but have been unable to  
26 participate in the literacy program because of a shortage of volunteers.

27 The Governor and the Legislature also added \$4 million to the \$1 million that the Board  
28 contributed to the Broadband project. Lucas was not sure if the legislature would continue to

1 allocate money for those kinds of technology improvement grants, but he felt the new money  
2 showed the commitment of the administration.

3 Another item in the budget was \$1 million for a pilot project to conduct Career Online High  
4 School. That program offered participants the ability to get their high school degree online. Once  
5 a participant entered the program they had 18 months to complete it, but, depending on how  
6 many units they already had, some had finished in as little as five months. The \$1 million would  
7 provide about 870 scholarships to cover entrance into the program.

8 The Career Online High School program required an assessment component prior to beginning  
9 to make sure that the people entering the program had the discipline, capacity, and gumption to  
10 finish. The assessment, provided by the company running Career Online High School, had an  
11 online and an interview segment and cost around \$60,000. This cost had been a barrier to  
12 individual library jurisdictions that wanted to participate in the program. Under the pilot project  
13 the state paid one central assessment cost, removing the financial barrier to public libraries'  
14 participation. State Librarian Lucas felt he was not understating it to say that the program could  
15 be transformative. The State Library was finishing up the administration guidelines and State  
16 Librarian Lucas thought the program would be up and running in October.

17 Member Williams asked who, within the public libraries, was going to shoulder the  
18 management and financial personnel responsibility for the assessment. Janet Coles, the State  
19 Library staff member managing the project, stated that public libraries would not have to conduct  
20 an assessment. There was an online pre-assessment process that involved a self-assessment and  
21 then a two week prerequisite course. These were designed to determine if the students would be  
22 successful in the program. Then the students were interviewed by the library staff. If they passed  
23 both those assessment segments they were eligible to receive a scholarship. Janet also clarified  
24 that through the scholarship the student received an online coach, access to tutors, and an  
25 academic call center as part of the Online High School Program.

26 Member Bernardo asked in the \$1 million put toward Career Online High School fell under the  
27 California Library Services Act. State Librarian Lucas clarified that it was a general fund  
28 appropriation and did not fall under the Act.

29

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

2 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

3 **System Plans of Service and Budgets**

4 Monica Rivas stated that the first issue to be addressed by the Board was the 2015/2016  
5 California Library Services Act system population and membership figures. She stated that there  
6 were very slight changes to the actual figures, and these were previously approved by the Board  
7 at the April meeting. These changes were the withdrawal of Hayward Public Library from the  
8 Pacific Library Partnership, the re-affiliation of the Santa Clara County Library to the Pacific Library  
9 Partnership, and the re-affiliation of the Huntington Beach Public Library to the Santiago Library  
10 System.

11 Gerry Maginnity pointed out that on the Hayward Public Library letter that there was some  
12 incorrect information. He believed that there had been some confusion with PLF and TBR. On the  
13 letter is said that "...in order to receive PLF public libraries are required to be members of  
14 systems...", but that was not true. He said that he was not sure what was intended but his feeling  
15 was that there was some confusion with acronyms. To receive some of the reimbursement money  
16 for direct loans libraries did need to be a member of a cooperative library system. To get  
17 reimbursement money for interlibrary loans you were not required to be a member.

18 Member McGinity asked if the Board could get some kind of report to show how the system  
19 communication and delivery program workload and system demographics had changed over  
20 time. He wanted to see if there was any analysis or observations that might suggest different  
21 policies the Board should be considering. He asked if library staff could produce something,  
22 covering the last 10 years, for the 2016 fall meeting when the Board would be considering the  
23 2016/2017 information. Monica Rivas and Annly Roman indicated that they would have that  
24 information for the 2016 fall meeting.

25 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously that***  
26 ***the California Library Services Board approves the System Population and***  
27 ***Membership Figures for use in the allocation of System funds for the fiscal year***  
28 ***2015/16.***

29  
30 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Bernardo) and carried unanimously that the***  
31 ***California Library Services Board approves the CLSA System Plans of Service and***

1 *Budgets for the nine cooperative Library Systems, submitted for fiscal year*  
2 *2015/16.*  
3

4 **RESOURCE SHARING**

5 **Broadband Update**

6 Gerry Maginnity reported that the California State Library just finished up its first round of  
7 grants. The State Library sent out 37 grants and those libraries are working on connecting to  
8 CalREN. For the start of the year two process, libraries have been asked to submit their Letter of  
9 Agency, which then gave CENIC permission to proceed ahead and do an RFP for them, by  
10 September 15, 2015. Once that deadline passed the State Library would have an idea of how  
11 many libraries might be participating. Last year 88 libraries completed the Letter of Agency and  
12 about 40 went to contract, so not every library asked for a grant. About \$1 million was awarded  
13 and there was over a one-to-one match so it seemed like libraries were gearing up for the  
14 program.

15 Member McGinity clarified that in the first round of grants we had more money than we had  
16 applications. Gerry Maginnity confirmed that statement and expressed that the priority was for  
17 the main libraries to be connected. Maginnity said that the assumptions on how that money  
18 would be allocated were based on the fact that 88 libraries did the Letter of Agency. Staff did  
19 learn that just because a library did the Letter did not mean they would go through to contract.

20 Member McGinity expressed surprise that when the request went out to libraries the priority  
21 was the main library in any given city or county. He asked if the Board had known about the  
22 prioritization of main libraries in advance. He thought that two meetings ago the Board had been  
23 clear that they wanted input about how that money was going to be allocated. Whether the  
24 priority was the right one or not, he thought that the Board should have had a chance to weigh in  
25 on any decisions about which libraries or communities were going to receive funds. Member  
26 McGinity asked if consideration was being given to another set of grants and if so, would the  
27 Board have a chance to weigh in on the priorities for those grants prior to letters going out.  
28 Member Kastanis indicated that the Board had never taken action on grants prior to them going  
29 out before.

1 Gerry Maginnity indicated that if the Library had to come back to the Board it could have some  
2 serious ramifications for libraries proceeding to the contract phase. He thought priority should  
3 continue to be given to the main library and the second priority would be the branches. Maginnity  
4 asked if the Board had other priorities they should be discussing.

5 Member Huguenin expressed that the priority should be to increase awareness since so few  
6 libraries went to contract. Gerry Maginnity clarified that there were lots of factors that went into  
7 why a library did not proceed to contract. Member Huguenin suggested that they develop a way  
8 to help the libraries whose information was incorrect or incomplete, preventing them from  
9 proceeding with the process. Susan Hildreth, representing Califa, clarified that the issue was not  
10 that things were done incorrectly. The Letter of Agency allows CENIC to represent the library in a  
11 bidding process to determine the most effective or cost effective circuits. CENIC and Califa  
12 worked closely with all the interested parties to make sure they were making the right decision  
13 and, in some cases, as libraries delved into the process, they found existing contracts with other  
14 providers or issues with bad timing. It was more about getting to really know the details of the  
15 process. Libraries need to submit a Letter of Agency if they are even want to explore the project,  
16 so they are encouraged to submit the Letters even though all of the libraries will not necessarily  
17 make it to the end point.

18 Diane Satchwell, representing 49-99, Serra, and SCLC, indicated that there was a great variety  
19 of applicants, so this process did provide an avenue for rural libraries to participate. The reason  
20 some libraries questioned applying in year one was that they wanted to see how the process  
21 rolled out so that they could participate in year two.

22 President Maghsoudi asked Member McGinity if he had any specific criteria in mind. Member  
23 McGinity responded that he did not have anything specific but he thought the Board had wanted  
24 to weigh in on criteria being considered. He expressed concerns about priorities if the situation  
25 arose where the grants were oversubscribed and had more libraries applying with needs that  
26 exceeded the allocated funds. In that case there would be a scarcity of resources and he felt that  
27 it was the responsibility of the Board to determine how those resources were allocated.

28 Member Christmas remembered that the Board did talk about broadband priorities and that  
29 there was some discussion about the approach. He thought he remembered discussion about



1 Main libraries but he was unsure if the Board voted or if it was just a discussion. Member  
2 Christmas felt that since library staff had already started, it would slow the process to change the  
3 priorities so he is comfortable moving forward. He did feel that in the future the Board should  
4 have a more thorough discussion before the process starts. President Maghsoudi suggested  
5 putting it on the Agenda for the next Board meeting.

6

7 **Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan Programs**

8 Annly Roman stated that the Interlibrary Loan and Direct Loan program was funded through  
9 CLSA money until about 2011. The program had not been funded for several years but the state  
10 library had still been having local libraries give reports on their statistics. Annly Roman reported  
11 that since the program was not funded the California State Library would no longer be requesting  
12 those annual reports.

13

14 **BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2015/16**

15 Annly Roman reported that entrepreneurship had been discussed at the April 2015 Board  
16 meeting and the Board had indicated that they wanted to continue the discussion. State Librarian  
17 Lucas mentioned that the most common public/private partnerships in the library world were  
18 Friends groups and things of that sort.

19 State Librarian Lucas provided several examples of community partnerships happen in  
20 California. The city of Riverside got new computers for the library through a long standing  
21 relationship with local law firms that trade out their desk top computers each year. The State  
22 Library has a Lunch at the Library program with the California Library Association with about 100  
23 libraries around the state participating. In many cases libraries participating in that program are  
24 also partnering with local food banks and other groups. East Palo Alto, for example, brought in  
25 Ravenswood, a volunteer team that provides medical care in a clinical format to lesser served  
26 communities. State Librarian Lucas felt the examples show that partnerships were being pursued  
27 by a lot of individual local jurisdictions. He was not sure how to promote that at the state level  
28 and would welcome anyone's ideas.

1 The caveat on the Career Online High School scholarships that requires, for every scholarship  
2 the State sends to a library, libraries to come up with a scholarship on their own is an example of  
3 encouraging building community partnerships. State Librarian Lucas pointed out that in some  
4 jurisdictions the local economic development arm has been really interested in the Online High  
5 School program because if people get high school degrees they will get better jobs, earn more  
6 income, pay higher taxes, etc. He stated that he could lay out some of the different faces of  
7 public/private partnerships if that would help focus or frame the discussion.

8 Member Williams commented that she thought this discussion was initiated because of Career  
9 Online High School and relationships between public libraries and businesses, such as Gale. She  
10 asked if the discussion would include things like the purchase of statewide online databases. State  
11 Librarian Lucas said he hoped it would because a lot of taxpayer money could be saved by having  
12 a statewide license for databases. He felt that there would be a benefit not only for libraries but  
13 for public schools and state government as well. Member Williams commented that most states  
14 have at least one statewide database and she felt that statewide databases and collaboration  
15 between multi-type libraries should be the main discussions. State Librarian Lucas pointed out  
16 that there was resistance from the makers of the databases because it was better for them to  
17 have multiple contracts.

18 Member Williams asked what the Board would need to do to move this from a thought process  
19 to an action process. Member Christmas liked State Librarian Lucas' suggestion of staff coming up  
20 with some key areas that the Board could focus the discussion around. He thought the Board  
21 could have a more productive discussion if the State Library could come up with some ideas that  
22 would get the word out on different partnerships.

23 Member Ibanez stated that even with database sharing, everyone has their own constituency  
24 that they are accountable to in terms of how they spend their money and who gets covered by  
25 which database. Their law school had conflicts between different campuses about who could use  
26 which database even though, theoretically, they are supposed to be the same campus. He  
27 expressed that hopefully they could figure out how dialogs could be started in different areas.

28 In regards to multi-type library collaboration State Librarian Lucas brought up a group on the  
29 Monterey Peninsula, MOBAC, which involves every kind of library on the Peninsula including the

1 university, public libraries, community college, naval institute, etc. The MOBAC partnership has  
2 every library on the peninsula talking to each other, making it easier for them to find common  
3 ground. He is not sure how to replicate it statewide but it seems like a good first step.

4 When he was in New York he asked the Librarians if they had a single library card for the New  
5 York, Queens, and Brooklyn areas. The librarians said no; the libraries had not really  
6 communicated in the past. They did come together, however, over infrastructure needs. Their  
7 facilities were getting so bad that they felt the best way to sell upgrading them was to work  
8 together. The libraries did a joint report on their needs and as a result they are now more inclined  
9 to talk to each other and look for different ways to unite their voices. State Librarian Lucas said he  
10 would look into how the New York dialogs started.

11 Tom Vose, Director of the Palmdale City Library, commented that the public doesn't  
12 understand why libraries are not already communicating and working together. He felt that  
13 libraries working together would also give more leverage with legislators. Legislators from the bay  
14 area wouldn't care about libraries in Modoc County, but they would care about the California  
15 library system.

16 Susan Hildreth commented that MOBAC, Monterey Bay Area Cooperative, was one of the  
17 legacy, initial CLSA systems. MOBAC is a part of the Pacific Library Partnership but MOBAC was a  
18 geographically isolated group that continued to do a lot together. PLP supported them as much as  
19 they can. She felt that it was interesting to hear the discussion because as the resource sharing  
20 systems have evolved over the years, depending on where you are in the state; there are still  
21 some really tight knit individual groups that now have morphed into larger groups.

22 Additionally, she commented, representing the Califa group, that one of the initial responsibilities  
23 and motivations to form the Califa Group, a 501c3 non-profit that serves the public libraries in  
24 California, primarily, was to do aggregate buying for libraries. They continue to do that and have a  
25 number of contracts with various vendors and they negotiate reduced prices. So they have some  
26 of that in place and would certainly be willing to try to operate on a larger scale.

27

28 **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

1 President Maghsoudi reported that the California Library Association (CLA) Legislative  
2 Committee was working with the State Library to come up with a letter that would go out to the  
3 field on a possible construction bond, probably for the 2018 Ballot. State Librarian Lucas clarified  
4 that, realistically, 2018 was the soonest you could do a statewide campaign for a bond measure.  
5 He did not think that, logistically or politically, 2016 made sense.

6 President Maghsoudi said that CLA would be sending out a letter soon with a needs  
7 assessment for library construction money throughout the state. CLA was also working on their  
8 legislative priorities for 2016.

9

10 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

11 No additional comments from the public.

12

13 **COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS/OFFICERS**

14 Member Ibanez reported that in November the UCLA Diversity Forum was planning an event at  
15 the Los Angeles Public Library, Central Library to promote more diversity within the profession.  
16 They had invited Jose Aponte from San Diego City Library to be the Key Note Speaker.

17

18 **OLD BUSINESS**

19 Annly Roman reported that the Board Strategic Planning Session had been brought to the  
20 Board before. The suggestion was to have someone come in and advise on strategic planning for  
21 the Board's direction. It was something that the Board had discussed wanting to put on hold until  
22 there was a fully appointed Board. The item was left on the agenda to keep it on the Board's  
23 radar for continued discussion if they would like to revisit it. Board members agreed that it would  
24 be best to wait till they met in person to discuss strategic planning.

25

26 **AGENDA BUILDING**

27 President Maghsoudi called for any additional agenda items of interest to Board members.  
28 None were brought forward.

29

1 **ADJOURNMENT**

2 President Maghsoudi adjourned the meeting at 3:36 p.m.

3

**Exhibit A**

**California Library Services Board Resolution 2015-01  
In Honor of Sandy Habbestad**

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Sandy Habbestad on the occasion of her retirement from the California State Library on July 31, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to honor Sandy for her 38 years of dedicated service to the California State Library; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to recognize Sandy's 13 years of exemplary service as the principal staff for the California Library Services Board, where she: developed agendas; composed resolutions, minutes, reports and motions; and ensured that the Board meetings complied with California's Open Meeting laws and operated efficiently; and

WHEREAS, it should be noted that she has also greatly benefited the Board and the people of California in her work as the California State Library Act Program manager; and

WHEREAS, the Board wished to distinguish Sandy for her consistent demonstration of good judgement, outstanding work ethic, and positive attitude in providing service and assistance to all Board members, program stakeholders, and California State Library staff and patrons; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the members of the California Library Services Board do hereby commend Sandy Habbestad on her years of dedicated service, to the Board, the California State Library, and the people of California, and congratulate her upon the occasion of her retirement from the California State Library; and

BE IT FRUTHER RESOLVED, that

**Sandy Habbestad**

Shall be honored by the California Library Services Board for her years of leadership, service, and contributions to the libraries and people of the State of California  
on this day of 03 September, 2015