

1 **Approved October 17, 2017**

2
3 California Library Services Board Meeting

4 April 25, 2017

5
6 California State Library
7 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
8 Sacramento, CA

9
10 **Welcome and Introductions**

11 President Bernardo called the California Library Services Board (CLSB) meeting to
12 order on April 25, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

13 **Board Members Present:** Anne Bernardo, Gary Christmas, Aleita Huguenin,
14 Florante Ibanez, Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Peter Mindnich, Eric Schockman, Sandra
15 Tauler, and Connie Williams.

16 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Greg Lucas, Natalie Cole,
17 Janet Coles, Susan Hanks, Wendy Hopkins, Lena Pham, Monica Rivas, Annly Roman,
18 and Mark Webster.

19 **Adoption of Agenda**

20 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Williams) and carried*
21 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts the*
22 *agenda of the April 25, 2017 meeting.*

23 **Approval of April 2016 Board Minutes**

24 *It was moved, seconded (Maghsoudi/Schockman) and carried*
25 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board approves the*
26 *draft minutes of the October 14, 2016 meeting.*

27 **Board Resolution**

28 Vice President Maghsoudi read the California State Library Services Board
29 resolution 2017-01 attached to this document as Exhibit A.

30 *It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously*
31 *that the California Library Services Board adopts California Library*
32 *Services Board Resolution 2017-01 for Gerald Maginnity.*

33 **Board Meeting Date for Fall 2017**

1 Annly Roman reported that the Board had previously indicated they wanted to meet
2 in-person. For fall, typically the Board met in late August or early September. President
3 Bernardo brought up a previous suggestion to have the meeting in the State Capitol and
4 suggested looking at October dates as well in order to have more availability. Bernardo
5 said they would wait on the Doodle poll to determine the exact date.

6 Annly Roman asked if the Board wanted to meet in person in spring and if so, would
7 Board members want to hold legislative meetings. Member Christmas said it appeared
8 most Board members felt meeting in person was valuable. President Bernardo felt
9 legislative visits would be helpful. Annly Roman said that in order to accommodate
10 legislative visits she could put out a doodle poll and take the two best days together.

11 **Nomination of Board Officers**

12 Annly Roman reported that the Board would need to elect two people to be part of
13 the nominating committee to determine potential nominees. Members Williams and
14 Schockman agreed to serve on the committee.

15 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Ibanez) and carried unanimously***
16 ***that the California Library Services Board appoints Connie Williams***
17 ***and Eric Schockman to the Nominating Committee to select board***
18 ***officers for 2018.***
19

20 **REPORTS TO THE BOARD**

21 **Board President's Report**

22 President Bernardo reported that since the October meeting she attended the
23 Council of County Law Librarians meeting and their February legislative day in
24 Sacramento. She met with local legislators and joined in meetings with legislative
25 leadership about the status of County Law Libraries in California.

26 She also attended the California State Library Strategic Planning retreat as the
27 Board's representative in January. She indicated that a report generated from the
28 retreat was sent out and she hoped that all Board members had read it.

29 President Bernardo continued to serve as the law librarian's liaison to the Executive
30 Committee of the Law Practice Management and Technology section of the State of
31 California. Additionally, Wendy Hopkins had asked Anne to assist with the next LSTA 5-
32 year plan which was currently proceeding.

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

1 Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that her library had unveiled a Pop-up library
2 created with Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds. The project brought
3 goodwill into the community and was being used almost every day. It was a wonderful
4 example of what LSTA could bring to libraries if funding stayed in place.

5 **Chief Executive Officer's Report**

6 State Librarian Greg Lucas reported that state library staff had been working to get
7 the one-time CLSA money out into the field.

8 Lucas stated that the President proposed, in his budget summary, eliminating
9 funding for the Institute of Museum and Library Services. It was a \$230 million program
10 with about \$180 million going to public libraries and about \$150 million of that went in
11 block grants to states on a per-capita basis. Of the funds coming to California, 2/3rds
12 went to the field and the remainder constituted about 1/3 of the State Library's operating
13 budget. Lucas stated that the President had yet to put out a formal budget, but there
14 were a lot of efforts to demonstrate the value of federal investment in libraries.

15 As a consequence of the President's budget, Governor Brown put forward a
16 cautious budget proposal in January. The Governor's rationale was that we didn't know
17 what to expect. One-third of Californians got health insurance through Medical and if the
18 Federal government changed eligibility or the reimbursement formula it could have large
19 financial impacts on California.

20 State Librarian Lucas thought that only smaller or one time funding requests had any
21 chance of being funded in the May revision. He noticed that March, which was not
22 normally a big revenue month, came in \$1 billion over the administration's projections.
23 However, there was still a lot of uncertainty based on the federal government.

24 As a condition of Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) funding, the State
25 Library was required to create a 5-year plan demonstrating how IMLS funds would be
26 spent. The last 5-year plan ended in 2017 and, as required, an outside evaluation was
27 just completed to assess if we accomplished our goals. The State Library was in the
28 process of creating a new 5-year plan that would go until 2022.

29 Among the suggestions in the outside evaluation was using the plan as a living
30 document. It could be revisited each year during the 5-year period to measure progress

1 and goals could be changed or amended if necessary. State Librarian Lucas said that
2 was not done with the previous plan.

3 State library staff would be seeking input from various stakeholders so a very basic
4 first draft showing the goals, mission, and perceived field needs would be sent out soon.
5 Some surveying and focus groups of librarians around the state had already been done.

6 **Lighting Up Libraries: Broadband Update Report**

7 Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to bring high speed broadband to all
8 California public libraries by connecting them to the California Research and Education
9 Network (CalREN) and statewide high speed network managed by the Corporation for
10 Education Network Initiatives in California. Cole mentioned that they had created a
11 broadband infographic which really shows the progress and successes to date. (The
12 infographic could be downloaded at <http://www.library.ca.gov/lds/broadband.html>.)

13 127 of California's 184 library jurisdictions were connected or in the process of
14 connecting to CalREN. Within those jurisdictions, 539 of California's approximately 1100
15 public outlets were currently connected or connecting. Cole said the project was in year
16 three and up to 12 new jurisdictions and 75 new outlets would begin connecting. Natalie
17 Cole anticipated that the project would provide \$1.2 million in grants to support new
18 connections. Additionally, a database was being created on the State Library's website
19 that allowed people to search at the outlet level to see which libraries are connected or
20 connecting.

21 Cole reported that strategies were being explored for helping libraries with significant
22 inhibitors preventing them from taking part in the project. These included extreme
23 financial hardship, or topography or geography that made it hard for them to connect.

24 Member Schockman was concerned that there was a socioeconomic overly over
25 who is getting this money and assistance first. He was concerned there were still areas
26 on dial-up or lacking 21st century connections. Schockman asked how state library staff
27 prioritized the distribution of funds.

28 Natalie Cole said that one of the current focuses was libraries that were unable to
29 participate. In some of these areas it was not just public libraries that struggle to
30 connect but also schools and community colleges so we are working to explore
31 partnership opportunities that can try to address this problem.

1 State Librarian Lucas brought up the federal e-rate program which offered
2 connection discounts depending on the economic level of your community. E-rate was
3 expanded under the previous administration to allow for actual building of broadband
4 infrastructure for struggling communities, but that part of the e-rate program is in flux.
5 One of the California Library Association's budget proposals was not only to create a
6 mechanism to help connect the difficult geographic areas but also offer micro-loan
7 assistance to those libraries that couldn't afford to wait the 18 months before their e-rate
8 discount check arrived.

9 Natalie Cole added that the grant program was expanded this year to allow libraries
10 to put grant funds toward connectivity, which addressed the needs of some libraries that
11 would not otherwise be able to afford the project.

12 Member Tauler said that her County library had major issues due to branch locations
13 and she suggested that the plan for helping small libraries include technical assistance
14 because sometimes they lack the staff to take the time to determine solutions or figure
15 out the program. She felt the one-person staff libraries were being left behind. Natalie
16 Cole clarified that libraries could use funds for technical assistance.

17 President Bernardo asked about the \$2.475 million ongoing budget appropriation to
18 the broadband program. State Librarian Lucas clarified that was general fund money paid
19 to CENIC as the fee for California libraries to be part of the network. Lucas said the
20 grant funding was the remainder \$1 million Board investment and the original one-time
21 money given toward the project.

22 Member Christmas asked if it was correct that some jurisdictions were not interested
23 in connecting to CENIC. Cole confirmed that some jurisdictions were happy with their
24 connections and were not looking for a CENIC connection right now.

25 Christmas asked if there were issues with the implementation process. Natalie Cole
26 said that there were challenges that they are trying to address, such a reimbursement
27 delays for start-up costs. However, the response to a survey done for jurisdictions that
28 had been connected for 12-months showed that the positives were outweighing the
29 negatives.

30 **Library eBook Platform with Library Owned Content Program Report**

1 Lena Pham reported that the Board allocated \$300,000 toward a shared eBook
2 platform called the enki library. About half of California libraries were already connected.
3 \$100,000 of the grant funds would be used to connect the remaining public libraries to
4 the enki platform. Pham reported that as of January 2017, 91 eligible libraries were not
5 connected. A sign-up form would go to those libraries inviting them to sign up for the
6 eBook platform.

7 An additional \$200,000 would be used for expanding the enki library eBook
8 collection. There are 60,000 titles currently in the enki collection, which focuses on
9 popular niche content as well as indie fiction and non-fiction titles. Califa created a
10 collection development survey, which closed in April, which was sent out to subscribed
11 libraries to get their input on new collection items and availability preferences such as
12 always available content. The goal was to make purchases and fully develop the
13 collection by the end of 2017.

14 Member Williams asked what amount of the enki collection were multi-use items vs.
15 single checkout. Lena Pham said that she did not know the exact details of that. The
16 library had a collection of always available classics as well as a self-publishing
17 collection which were both multi-use. Member Williams said that she was interested in
18 what conversations were going on in terms of these platforms and their use within the
19 school day for children. Carol Frost said that there was not a lot of good, hard data. It
20 was apparent that most people do not exclusively use eBooks. When it came to studies
21 on youth and eBook use for curriculum data showed children prefer not to use eBooks.
22 However, it was a good to broaden the base of collections to appeal to youth and items
23 they would expect students to use.

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

25 Lena Pham reported that the cross discovery application, SimplyE was developed by
26 New York Public Library with Institute of Museum and Library Services funding. The
27 purpose of the application was to make eCollections across different vendors
28 discoverable using only one app. Currently, patrons that had access to 360 eBooks,
29 Overdrive, and other eBook vendors through their library had to download a different
30 application for each program.

1 The allocation by the Board was \$200,000 to set-up the base infrastructure to allow
2 California libraries to connect to the app. Those funds would also be used to conduct a
3 pilot project with full set-up of SimplyE for six library jurisdictions. There were three
4 California Public libraries that were involved with the SimplyE project development,
5 Sacramento Public Library, Santa Clara County Library, and Alameda County Library.
6 Califa was working with Alameda County library, which had previously tried to set-up the
7 app but were unsuccessful. When Lena Pham last spoke with Califa they indicated
8 Alameda County Libraries might complete set-up on the SimplyE app by the end of
9 May, 2017. Gary Christmas asked if the Alameda County connection was part of a pilot
10 project to test the connection in one jurisdiction so that it would be spread to others.
11 Pham confirmed that it was.

12 Pham said that there was an ongoing cost for the hosting and maintenance of the
13 app, so a sustainability plan that would probably take the form of a subscription fee from
14 the participating libraries was being developed. More information on the development
15 side of the applications was available at librarysimplified.org.

16 The other project goal reported by Lena Pham was to make the enki eBook library a
17 discoverable platform on the SimplyE app, which was expected to take four months.

18 Member Williams asked if all the titles owned by the library would be integrated in a
19 single catalogue or would she have to know exactly which eBook platform had the Book
20 she wanted. Pham said SimplyE should be searchable across all platforms. Carol Frost
21 clarified that SimplyE created connectors to the different platforms to which a library
22 subscribed and it drew from all of the eBook vendors in real time and allowed the patron
23 to read right from the app.

24 **Innovation Lab Grant Program Update**

25 Wendy Hopkins reported that the Board designated \$200,000 in one-time funding to
26 create Innovation Labs through partnerships with libraries, corporations, and educators.
27 The proposal was modeled on the Chula Vista Public Library “Think-a-bit” lab project.
28 Chula Vista partnered with Qualcomm and the local elementary school district to create
29 a lab in the library building which allowed kids to learn science, technology, math and
30 gain experience in STEM related learning. The program was designed for 6th-8th graders
31 but the library found that the program applied to adults and veterans as well. It was

1 teaching in incredibly innovative ways to encourage excitement around STEM subjects.
2 In the long run it would also help create a stronger workforce base.

3 For this project, the Southern California Library Cooperative, the State library's
4 project partner, would set-up a pool of funding and libraries that wished to create these
5 stations or labs could select from a menu of all the resources that would be applicable
6 to their communities. Giving libraries a choice would allow for the creation of creative
7 labs that will resonate with the local community. This would help re-establish the library
8 as the corner-stone of the community.

9 Hopkins reported that part of the goal was for libraries to develop their existing
10 space. There has been a lot of discussion around new construction and this grant would
11 encourage libraries to repurpose and reimagine the space they already have. It would
12 also encourage technology experimentation for young kids and take them beyond the
13 iPad, iPhone, or games they play while providing them with practical experience with
14 math and science.

15 The funding would be made available for purchasing necessary technology to
16 enable libraries to create those spaces. Best practices would be ensured and shared
17 through survey, social media, calix, email, and webinars. As the project progressed, the
18 goal was for communities to realize what a huge value the program was and that the
19 library was the only place providing these services.

20 Diane Satchwell added that Betty Waznis, the head of the Chula Vista project, said
21 that Qualcomm was looking to partner with other libraries in the state. Also, Microsoft
22 has approached the Chula Vista library looking to expand the workforce investment
23 base.

24 Member Williams asked about making cross connections with local schools. She
25 asked if teachers could participate so that public libraries could use teachers' and
26 teacher librarians' expertise. Wendy Hopkins said they had not had those discussions
27 yet but were planning on looping in schools. Diane Satchwell clarified that the Chula
28 Vista school district actually has one school district funded teacher at the library lab at
29 night and on weekends.

30 **Libraries Illuminated: Software and Hardware Improvement Programs Grant**
31 **Program Report**

1 Natalie Cole reported that the project goal was to help libraries, particularly those in
2 underserved communities, make software and hardware improvements to maximize
3 benefits to patrons as they access new high-speed Internet connections. The project
4 would support the purchase of: cutting-edge technology that helps libraries provide
5 innovative services and programming that fulfills the potential of their broadband
6 connections; functional hardware and software that allows libraries to use their new
7 broadband connections effectively; and technology that enables libraries to make the
8 best use of their non-broadband Internet connections should they not be able to
9 participate in that project.

10 Cole reported that the project would be potentially accessible to all public libraries.
11 Funds would be divided equitably between libraries requesting different types of
12 technology and different types of public libraries—e.g. rural, suburban, and urban; city,
13 county, and special district; lower- and higher-resourced— to provide a variety of
14 programming and service models for the library community to learn from and replicate.

15 She reported that libraries would be asked to work with community partners and
16 provide cash and in-kind matches for the funds. The level of match required would be
17 tied to the library's Local Income Per Capita (LIPC) to allow less well-resourced libraries
18 to participate.

19 A partnership was formed with the national Public Library Association to support the
20 evaluation for this project. Libraries were asked to use the association's Project
21 Outcome evaluation tools to measure the impact of the programs and services provided
22 with the new technologies. Project Outcome surveys measured knowledge, confidence,
23 application, and awareness over a large breadth of topics including civic and community
24 engagement, digital learning, economic development, education and lifelong learning,
25 early childhood literacy, job skills, and summer reading programs. This would allow the
26 gathering of consistent data on the project regardless of the programming provided with
27 the new technology.

28 Cole reported that a portion of the funds would provide libraries with virtual reality
29 equipment to contribute to a State Library technology project that was supporting
30 innovative programming in public libraries. Aligning the two projects provided an

1 opportunity to combine state, federal, and private resources for the benefit of
2 California's public libraries and their communities.

3 Natalie Cole stated that an advisory group would be formed to guide the
4 development of the project to ensure that it meets the needs of California's public
5 libraries. The group would represent a variety of geographic areas and bring a variety of
6 skills in technology and evaluation.

7 The next steps for the project would be to finalize the application materials and
8 guidelines and distribute those in late spring. It was anticipated that applications would
9 be completed in the fall and libraries selected to receive funds.

10 Member Schockman expressed an interested in how virtual reality could be used to
11 enliven and enrich academics. He was wondering if, at the next meeting, state library
12 staff could provide the board members with a demonstration of virtual reality headsets
13 so they could see what the children were using. Janet Coles said that would be
14 possible.

15 **Impact Study and Online Clearing House Grant Program Report**

16 Natalie Cole reported the project was to create an impact study and online
17 clearinghouse cataloging the economic and social value of libraries. A first set of
18 approximately 65 resources had been gathered and organized for the online
19 clearinghouse. The resources were created between 1998 and 2017 and were selected
20 for their relevance to California.

21 The resources focused mainly on the economic and financial return on investment
22 provided by public libraries. They provided a solid foundation for the project and
23 demonstrated that investing in libraries was a sound use of public funds. The resources
24 also provided potential methodologies that could be considered for the original research
25 phase of the project.

26 The preliminary finding showed that for every dollar invested, \$2-\$10 is returned,
27 with an average of between \$3-\$6. These numbers were compelling, but were just one
28 way of demonstrating libraries' value. A more complex approach would consider the
29 many dimensions of value such as user satisfaction, economic impact, and social
30 impact. With libraries, it is particularly important to consider the more difficult-to-

1 measure indirect value of the growth of an informed population with equitable
2 opportunities for learning, leisure, and connection.

3 The next steps for the project were to prepare the collected resources for inclusion
4 on the State Library's website; continue to identify and collect resources that
5 demonstrate other dimensions of libraries' value; and begin planning an original study
6 demonstrating the impact of California's libraries.

7 Member Christmas asked how we promote these one-time grants and their value to
8 the legislature, Department of Finance and the Governor's office. He wanted to know if
9 all the information was provided to the library jurisdictions. Christmas felt that we should
10 be promoting these programs.

11 Natalie Coles said promotion was part of the reason they wanted to get everything
12 up on the website. President Bernardo pointed out a report needed to be submitted to
13 the legislature by September.

14 **Zip Books Grant Program Report**

15 Janet Coles reported that the \$1 million in onetime funds allocated to Zip Books was
16 awarded to the NorthNet Library Cooperative System and the grant period would run
17 from January 1, 2017 through June 30, 2019.

18 A detailed project plan had been created by NorthNet and they would be working
19 with the Califa group which has managed the project for the last four years. One of the
20 activities scheduled for the first six months was the addition of 14 new libraries to the
21 project. The libraries will be drawn mostly from the central valley and the central coast
22 area.

23 An advisory group was selected and held its first meeting in March. The new 14
24 libraries were in the process of coming on board and those libraries were expected to
25 be offering Zip Books to their patrons by December.

26 27 **CLSA PROGRAM ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/ACTION**

28 **BUDGET AND PLANNING**

29 **CLSA Proposed Budget for FY 2017/18**

30 Monica Rivas reported that the preliminary budget of \$3.63 million had been sent out
31 to the systems already with the annual plans of service.

1 *It was moved, seconded (Schockman/Tauler) and carried*
2 *unanimously that the California Library Services Board adopts,*
3 *contingent upon the passage of the budget act, the 2017- 2018 fiscal*
4 *year California Library Services Act budget as directed in the*
5 *governor’s proposed 2017-2018 budget, totaling \$3,630,000 for*
6 *allocation to Cooperative Library Systems.*

7 **RESOURCE SHARING**

8 **Consolidation and Affiliations**

9 Annly Roman stated that this item was a reporting item only. The State Library had
10 received a letter from the City of Goleta Library indicating that they wanted to separate
11 from the City of Santa Barbara Library. The letter was notifying the Board that they
12 wanted to form their own library and join the Black Gold Library Cooperative.

13 Member Schockman asked why the City of Goleta wanted to separate. Annly
14 Roman said that the City of Goleta, currently contracting with the City of Santa Barbara,
15 owned the library building and wanted to provide their own library services to their local
16 population. Schockman asked if they would be in a system. Roman reported that Goleta
17 was a member of the Black Gold Library Cooperative under the City of Santa Barbara
18 but would need to join a system independently once established as a library jurisdiction
19 or municipality. The Board would need to approve that affiliation.

20 **CLSA System-level Programs**

21 Monica Rivas reported that Board members had been provided with the System
22 Annual reports, which show all Systems on track to meet the goals submitted in the
23 plans of service, and a breakdown of funds used for communication and delivery and
24 administration.

25 Member Schockman said that the information appeared to show a local contribution.
26 Rivas said that was correct, that systems did receive some local funds.

27 **D. CLSA REGULATIONS**

28 Annly Roman reported that at the October Board meeting the Board had discussed
29 necessary regulatory amendments including: updating language to comply with
30 changes made to statute by budget trailer bill AB 1602 in 2016; changes requested by
31 board members such as having a biennial election for Board officers and removal
32 reference to the word “contiguous” in article 5; and changes to comply with existing
33 Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements. State Library staff took into account:

1 changes conforming to statute; suggestions from Board members; and suggestions
2 from the Cooperative Systems when providing recommended updated regulatory
3 language (Exhibit B).

4 In October, the Cooperative Library Systems submitted a letter recommending
5 specific changes to the “Communication and Delivery” section in regulation to expand
6 what was allowable under the section such as databases and supporting technologies.
7 This section contained definitions of reporting terms and adding the requested language
8 did not appear to permit the systems to expand the use of funds. It appeared to expand
9 the reporting requirements. Staff proposed including a new section, Section 20236. The
10 section referenced education code sections which addressed communication, delivery,
11 and resource sharing fund allocations and the ability of cooperative systems to request
12 funds for planning and assessment of system services. Section 20236 was written that
13 way to address the systems’ expressed wish of being able to use Communication and
14 Delivery money to assess system wide programs. The new section also clarified that
15 communication, delivery, and resource sharing also included technology resources and
16 accompanying supportive services and fees.

17 President Bernardo suggested proceeding by discussing each regulatory section
18 individually. In section 20107(a), President Bernardo mentioned a reference to the
19 initiating 1979 statute which should have referenced the 2016. President Bernardo also
20 questioned the staff recommended definition of resource sharing in Section 20107(b),
21 item 6 which required sharing between at least three libraries. She felt requiring sharing
22 between at least two instead of three would be less restrictive. Member Christmas
23 agreed.

24 Annly Roman stated that a minimum of three had been a system recommendation.
25 Carol Frost commented that system coordinators had discussed this issue and felt that
26 a minimum of three libraries would be better than two. Member Christmas asked if
27 resource sharing done by the systems would be approved by the Board. Annly Roman
28 said resource sharing was an approved use of communication and delivery money and
29 would require approval by the Board as part of the system’s plans of service but not as
30 individual projects for approval.

1 Member Williams commented that by sharing with a minimum of three or more you
2 are accomplishing a larger pool or sharing. Carol Frost indicated that was the systems'
3 thinking.

4 Member Christmas said that he still felt there might be an ideal project in the future
5 but only had two participants. He felt adding language for sharing to be done between
6 three or more libraries limited opportunities for smaller options that might be
7 appropriate. State Librarian Lucas said that he believed the Systems' purpose in
8 recommending a larger number than two was to encourage more collaboration and
9 cooperation and stretch the finite amount of available money.

10 Jane Chisaki, Alameda Free Library, stated that Alameda liked the minimum of three
11 languages because they found it beneficial to have a third, due to the small size of their
12 library and number of staff, to equalize sharing of labor. It also seemed more equitable
13 because there were more people to exchange and assess ideas and it spread
14 resources around when you require three or more.

15 Member Ibanez said that he felt what the system representatives were saying made
16 sense. President Bernardo said that those explanations helped with understanding the
17 reasoning behind the recommendation. Most Board members stated that they agreed
18 with the three library recommendation.

19 President Bernardo also commented that the definition of the State Board in section
20 20107(b), number 7 was already in statute and so was unnecessary. She
21 recommended removal. Bernard also had a small wording change in section 20122 to
22 remove a superfluous word.

23 In Section 20136, President Bernard recommended removed the date of July 1,
24 1979 from the requirement that Systems create a System Administrative Policy Manual
25 by July 1, 1979 since that date was no longer relevant. Additionally, in Section 20140
26 the Ralph M. Brown Act was sited and the code section was incorrectly shown as
27 54950-54961 instead of 54950-54963. Annly Roman said those changes could be
28 made.

29 President Bernardo stated that she was confused why Section 20158, Article 4,
30 System Reference was still included. She thought the whole article should be removed
31 because the system reference program had been repealed. Annly Roman reported that

1 Section 20158 was the only spot in the regulations to reference population number
2 review and approval which was still needed for the Communication and Delivery
3 allocations. Roman offered removing that section from Article 4 and adding it elsewhere.

4 President Bernardo suggested moving it to Article 3, General Provisions for
5 Systems. Member Williams agreed because a section in that article referenced a
6 population profile. Member Christmas agreed as well.

7 President Bernardo also indicated that the first of the two sentences that comprised
8 Section 20158 gains its authority from a repealed code section referencing an annual
9 allowance for the systems. State Librarian Lucas clarified that the important language in
10 Section 20158 was the collection of population numbers. Lucas recommended moving
11 that portion of the language into Article 3, General Provisions for Systems which would
12 then allow for the removal of Article 4.

13 Member Williams commented in Section 20135(a), number 2 a reference to systems
14 providing a description of non-users and a list of major unmet information needs of the
15 System population had been removed. She felt that information would still be useful and
16 wanted to be sure systems were considering and planning for the full population in their
17 area. Member Christmas asked why those references were removed. Annly Roman
18 stated that it was conforming the language to what the systems were current reporting.

19 Diane Satchwell said that the systems' databases did not have that capability to
20 track information on non-users and so they did not report that information. The systems
21 did still pursue who that non-user. Member Williams said it was important, especially for
22 grants, but that a regulation mandate might not be the best place to require that
23 information.

24 Annly Roman commented that as "Article 5: Consolidations and Affiliations" was
25 currently marked in the documents before the Board, the word "contiguous" was
26 removed as well as references to programs and grant funds that were removed from
27 statute. Those changes were consistent in Sections 20180-20190. Roman commented
28 that there were board members who felt that in the 21st century there was no reason
29 why libraries should be required to have contiguous borders. However, the cooperative
30 library systems provided letters detailing concerns about the removal of the word
31 contiguous from the regulations. Based on the diverse opinions, State Library staff felt

1 this issue needed further discussion and more research. The draft language was
2 marked up with the word contiguous removed but staff recommended the Board delay
3 making a decision. The regulatory process was fluid and the Board could always make
4 additional language changes down the road. President Bernardo mentioned that
5 Member McGinity could not join the Board that day but that he, she was sure, would
6 want to discuss the issue further.

7 Roman reminded the board that it was incumbent on them to only approve changes
8 to system or library jurisdiction affiliations that further the purposes of the California
9 Library Services Act.

10 Member Tauler stated that she wanted to oppose the deletion of the word
11 contiguous because she felt geographical continuity in library systems was important.
12 Tauler thought removing that term it would create the possibility of larger systems
13 banding together and leaving out smaller library systems. If the spirit of the Act was to
14 promote resource sharing then smaller systems need the ability to participate with the
15 larger systems. She felt very strongly that “contiguous” should remain in the regulatory
16 language because it was important for small libraries throughout the state. Vice-
17 President Maghsoudi agreed.

18 Member Christmas indicated he thought the Board should wait to decide. He felt the
19 State Library should conduct a study on the impacts of removing the word contiguous
20 and delaying a decision until the next Board meeting. Member Williams and President
21 Bernardo indicated they were in favor of Member Christmas’ suggestion.

22 Annly Roman stated that the State Library was unsure of what form a study would
23 take. A study of the impacts would be difficult because it was dealing with hypotheticals.
24 State library staff could run the financial numbers if various libraries joined alternate
25 systems but the information would be “what if” information and would create an
26 indigestible volume due to the number of potential library and system affiliations. Roman
27 said staff thought there was more information to be collected. Staff had considered a
28 survey of libraries to see how they feel about the potential language change and its
29 impacts. There could also be an examination of what the Board’s responsibility might be
30 to prevent mergers of large systems or library jurisdictions.

1 Member Williams said conversation around the word contiguous based on
2 geographical location was limiting and she felt the conversation was more around the
3 idea of 21st century sharing. She felt the conversation needed to center deeply around
4 the possibilities of “what if” in virtual and physical locations.

5 Member Bernardo said that when the term was discussed in 2014 discussion of the
6 term “contiguous borders” was held open until a new term and definition could be
7 developed for “universal access”. She said maybe that should be part of the study, the
8 definition of direct lending provisions or the need to explore one broad universal access
9 policy.

10 Annly Roman said the discussion also needed to include how much system sharing
11 was done via vans and physical delivery and how quickly systems were moving away
12 from physical delivery. Carol Frost, speaking on behalf of the Pacific Library
13 Partnership, said that their Board felt that if the term was removed now without
14 changing anything else there could be negative impacts. Frost reported that several
15 libraries were very interested in a product that provided cloud based eBook sharing
16 through consortia, location didn’t matter. She thought it was a great idea that would be
17 an allowable use of CLSA funds under the amended regulations would allow different,
18 distant systems like PLP and SCLC to share resources. Frost stated that maybe some
19 concepts to be explored were providing people the ability to share resources in a
20 different way.

21 Carol Frost expressed concerns about a survey and because she file it would be
22 difficult to get comprehensive responses due to a lack on context. Diane Satchwell
23 stated System coordinators were also concerned potential impacts to the cooperative
24 systems if contiguous was removed; would it impact their JPAs, would there be legal
25 costs for them to recreate systems. The systems were also concerned with how the
26 affiliation process would change.

27 Donna Ohr, Chair of the Serra Library Cooperative, expressed support for a study on
28 the impact of changing the language from contiguous to non-contiguous. It was difficult
29 for them to support the language change with no analysis of potential financial and
30 political impacts, or impacts to library services the cooperatives provide. Ohr felt the

1 suggested change was intriguing but that libraries would be remiss as stewards of
2 taxpayer dollars not to study all of the implications of that change.

3 Member Christmas said that he thought hearings, maybe in Northern and Southern
4 California, were a good formal assessment alternative to a survey.

5 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Schockman) and carried***
6 ***unanimously that that a study be conducted, in a form to be***
7 ***determined by State Library Staff, of the contiguous vs. non-***
8 ***contiguous borders issue in the regulations, including possible***
9 ***hearings in northern and southern California to get input from the***
10 ***field.***

11 President Bernardo said that she had concerns about language in Section
12 20203 which contained “he or she” and “his or her” language. She wanted to
13 replace those with gender neutral language. Bernardo also brought up section
14 20205, item a, which mentioned a borrower’s home library. She wondered if
15 there was a definition of “home library”. Annly Roman said there was not an
16 official definition but it would be the library that served a patrons place of
17 residence. Other Board members expressed confusion on what constituted a
18 home library.

19 Diane Satchwell stated that Irwindale had 1500 actual residents, but during
20 the day the population was over 4000. Many of those people reside in the County
21 of LA Library System. If Irwindale decided to charge a non-resident fee borrowers
22 would have to show evidence that they live or rent in Irwindale to avoid the
23 charge. If, for example, someone lived in Pomona but worked in Irwindale they
24 would be charged the fee because it is not their home library. Bernardo said that
25 she understood that explanation but wanted to add a definition of a “home library”
26 to Section 20107.

27 Article 7, Section 20235-20236, was the Communication and Delivery section
28 that Annly Roman reported on at the beginning on the regulation discussion.
29 Some of the changes being made were to conform to statutory changes such as
30 adding references to resource sharing, and digital materials. There was also the
31 addition of the new proposed section 20236 which referenced funding
32 allowances in statute as well as clarifying that communication, delivery, and
33 resource sharing funds could be used for technology, fees, etc., to support

1 communications, delivery and resource sharing programs and products. There
2 was one system suggestion that was not included the recommended regulatory
3 changes. The systems had recommended a definition of “other” which included
4 “any service” and staff felt that language was overly broad and extended beyond
5 what statute authorized. Diane Satchwell commented that the systems
6 supported those new provisions.

7 Audience members expressed support for the changes to the articles and the
8 Board postponing a decision on the “contiguous” language.

9 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously***
10 ***that the California Library Services Board approves the amended***
11 ***California Library Services Act regulatory language as discussed at***
12 ***the April 25, 2017 California Library Services Board meeting, except***
13 ***for the removal of the “contiguous” language in Article 5, and directs***
14 ***State Library staff to begin the regulatory approval process.***

15

16 **E. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

17 Annly Roman reported that the California Library Association had one sponsored bill
18 for 2017, SCA 3, which reduced the vote threshold for bonds for public library facility
19 construction from two-thirds to 55%. CLA had done state legislative visits recently and a
20 contingent was going to Washington DC. Vice-President Maghsoudi reported that library
21 staff had also had local meetings with legislators that were very successful.

22 Member Williams wanted to bring SB 390 before the Board. The California School
23 Library Association with the California Teachers Association had sponsored SB 390
24 authored by Senator Dodd. This measure amended section 520260 which pertained to
25 school Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP), which deals with how schools
26 spend their funds. SB 390 included the addition of state Model School Library
27 Standards, which had been passed by the State Board of Education, as one of the
28 guiding principles for writing those plans.

29 State Librarian Lucas clarified a formula was used to give out money to schools but
30 local districts had flexibility to tailor spending of their funds to local needs in their LCAP.
31 There were a series of standards that districts should consider in creating their spending
32 plan. SB 390 would include the Model School Library Standards as an additional factor

1 that should be considered but did not mandate that districts spend money on those
2 standards.

3 Member Williams asked the Board to write a letter in support of SB 390, which had
4 passed the Senate Education Committee. Annly Roman reported the bill was going to
5 the Senate Appropriations Committee. Member Christmas asked if there was any
6 opposition to the measure and Member Williams said not to her knowledge.

7 ***It was moved, seconded (Ibanez/Christmas) and carried unanimously***
8 ***that the California Library Services Board supports SB 390 and***
9 ***directs State Library staff to draft a letter of support on behalf of the***
10 ***California Library Services Board***

11 President Bernardo asked if the Board should write a letter of support for SCA
12 3, the California Library Association's sponsored bill.

13 ***It was moved, seconded (Christmas/Tauler) and carried unanimously***
14 ***that the California Library Services Board supports SCA 3 and***
15 ***directs State Library staff to draft a letter of support on behalf of the***
16 ***California Library Services Board.***

17 **F. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS 2017/2018**

18 Member Schockman asked if the Board should do a strategic plan in parallel with the
19 State Library's plan. He just felt the Board needed to be more strategic about what they
20 are doing and be more intentional. Schockman indicated that he did not think there
21 would be a need for additional meetings. He thought they could integrate planning into
22 Board discussions.

23 Member Schockman said that, thinking strategically, given the resources available
24 the board needs to advise smartly. As they go through the process he felt the Board
25 would become more agile as critical thinkers in the role they play for the state. He felt it
26 could be done in collaboration with staff and what staff has done for the State Library
27 plan.

28 Members Christmas and Bernardo agreed with the suggestion. Annly Roman
29 specified that a strategic planning session would have to be open to the public but it
30 could be incorporated in the next meeting depending on how much business the board
31 had to conduct. President Bernardo indicated they could at least start the process.

1 State Librarian Lucas asked how the state library could be of help to the board.
2 Member Schockman asked if the state library had an outside person helping with their
3 strategic process. Lucas said that the state library had an outside facilitator who helped
4 lay out the original strategic plan. The state library had a second meeting planned for a
5 six-month update with her then we would proceed internally. Member Schockman asked
6 if the Board could get some of her time to help create a plan in parallel to the state
7 library. Annly Roman said that based on the set-up she did not think the working with
8 the Board would be included in her fee to the state library. Vice-President Maghsoudi
9 asked if there was funding available for an outside person. Wendy Hopkins said that if
10 they used LSTA funding to facilitate a strategic plan it would leave less for the libraries.

11 State Librarian Lucas said that he was uncertain the process the state library was
12 following was what the Board needed. Annly Roman stated that she thought a plan for
13 the Board would be different than something done for a larger department like the state
14 library but she felt that if the Board set a direction or priorities that would be helpful.

15 Vice President Maghsoudi asked for clarification on what Schockman meant by
16 strategic plan. Schockman said that he thought the plan should be aspirational,
17 directional, big picture and staff should deal with the weeds of planning and allocation.
18 Annly Roman brought up the funding allocation process for the \$3 million in one-time
19 when the Board set broad priorities and the individual projects put forward fell under the
20 umbrella of one or more but were not necessarily designated for a specific priority. She
21 wondered if that was what Schockman was thinking.

22 President Bernardo said that there was an existing strategic plan, it was just
23 outdated and needed to be revisited. Member Schockman asked to see the existing
24 plan and the Board could start there.

25 **G. PUBLIC COMMENT**

26 There were no public comments brought forward.

27

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

29 Board members expressed appreciation for all of the information staff provided and
30 the hard work that went into it.

1 **I. OLD BUSINESS**

2 There was no old business brought forward.

3 **J. AGENDA BUILDING**

4 No additional agenda items were brought forward.

5 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

6 President Bernardo called for adjournment on the California Library Services Board
7 meeting in honor of the late Dr. Kevin Starr in honor of his service to the Library and the
8 State of California at 1:46 pm.

California Library Services Board Resolution 2017-01

In Honor of Gerald Maginnity

WHEREAS, Gerald “Gerry” Maginnity has provided the people of California with exemplary service and leadership in the many roles he has held during his tenure at the State Library; and

WHEREAS, Gerry Maginnity began his career at the California State Library in 2005 in the Library Development Services Bureau where he served as Assistant Bureau Chief and Bureau Chief, he also served as Acting State Librarian in 2012 until his appointment as Deputy State Librarian on May 22, 2014; and

WHEREAS, prior to his tenure at the California State Library Gerry was deeply involved in the California library community, including working as the supervising librarian at the Lassen County Free Library, regional librarian for the Solano County library, associate county librarian for Fresno County Free Library and working as coordinator for both the Serra Cooperative Library System and the Mountain Valley Library System; and

WHEREAS, Gerry’s in-depth knowledge of librarianship allowed the state library to better serve its patrons, enhanced staff capability and camaraderie and improved service to the more than 22 million “customers” at California’s 1,100 public libraries; and

WHEREAS, Gerry provided high-level vision to the California State Library and its partners during the turbulent fiscal time of 2008-2010, consistently promoting positive relationships between federal, state and public library staff; and

WHEREAS, Gerry educated and mentored staff, inspiring them to engage in work that would serve as a lasting model of professional excellence in the library community; and

WHEREAS, Gerry extended library community cooperation and collaboration beyond the borders of California through his passionate support of and participation in the Seguimos Creando Enlaces Conference which brings together librarians from the United States and Mexico to share knowledge and ideas; and

WHEREAS, Gerry’s knowledge of and experience with library programs, the California Library Services Act, the state Cooperative Systems and the library community as a whole made his advice and input a valuable asset to the Library of California Board and the California Library Services Board that will be sorely missed; and

WHEREAS, the California Library Services Board desires to recognize Gerry for his contributions to the California State Library and his leadership role in and advocacy for California libraries; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board expresses its sincere gratitude to Gerald Maginnity for his guidance, assistance, and never ceasing support California State Library, the people of California and the library community as a whole; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the members of the California Library Services Board commend Gerry for his achievements and extend to him sincere best wishes in his retirement.

Gerald Maginnity

shall be honored by the California Library Services Board
for his distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of April 25, 2017